
MARXISM AND JUDAISM

BY

Salluste

60¢

FOREWORD

MARXISM AND JUDAISM is a translation from the *Revue de Paris*, of July and August, 1928.

The *Revue de Paris* was then in its thirty-fifth year of reputable service to the French. That it presented spokesmen for both sides is apparent from reading this work. That it is fair, will become obvious as you proceed.

Matters of the utmost importance are discussed and, we might say, revealed. In this fact alone, this is a valuable work. One student, before publication here, said it was the most important thing he had seen in twenty years' research on the question itself.

In the superlative wit of the argument, no reader can help but enjoy the *repartée*, the delicate irony, the quick thrust of sarcasm, for which so many brilliant French writers have been famed.

We believe this scholarly study will help materially in a growing American understanding of an important influence disturbing the peace of the world.

THE PUBLISHERS

MARXISM AND JUDAISM

by

Salluste

La

REVUE DE PARIS

Juillet - Aout 1928

EXAMINER BOOKS

P.O. Box 144, Station Y

New York 21, N. Y.

This translation from the French

Copyright 1947

by

**Examiner Books
New York, N. Y.**

All Rights Reserved

Price

Sixty Cents

ERRATA

Page 7, 1st para., line 4: Civlization should read Civilization.

Page 10, line omitted at top of page reads:

Society for Civilization and Science of Berlin (1819-

Page 21, line omitted at top of page reads:

After all this foregoing, we are obliged to state that

Page 21, 2nd para., line 15: kneel should read knell.

We Review a Long Discussion

MARXISM AND JUDAISM

The study that Salluste has been presenting, in the *Revue de Paris*, on the "Secret Origins of Bolshevism", has provoked the same heated discussion that marked, last year, his revelations on the subject of "Lenin, Agent of the Okhrana". Applause and condemnation have joined in a chorus, in a tumult that is not yet over. Salluste does not vaunt himself over the sensation that he has caused; it is entirely natural that, tearing the veil from before this vital question of the present time—that is, the Marxist conspiracy against civilization that has grown up out of Christianity—he wake the attention of a large public. His purpose, in the present article, is not to list the principle criticisms and remarks that have been made about his work, but to tie together the conclusions of that work and to defend it against certain unjustified criticism.

We shall pass quickly over the favorable reactions in the French and foreign press. Among these, it is impossible not to refer to an excellent analysis published by *le Temps*, which succeeded in putting into less than one column the essentials of our thesis. Also a study, in perfect sympathy, of our colleague Felicien Pascal, in the *Ami du Peuple*, together with a solid page of historical analysis, by a Belgian writer, M. Charles d'Ydewalle. In addition, two articles by Leon Daudet, one of them keen and penetrating in the *Action Francaise*, and the other powerfully constructed, in the *Nation Belge*.

The entrance of this robust polemist on the scenes brought a reply from the opposing camp, by M. Emile Vandervelde, Belgian Minister and obvious head of the Second International since the death of Jaures. However biting the tone of this reply, published in *le Peuple* at Brussels, it couldn't worry us much as it doesn't grasp the essential of our thesis, as witness the two principal passages we quote herewith:-

“It is, of course, absurd to see nothing but a Jew and a Prussian in Karl Marx, most international among men, who wrote in 1848 that “Prussia is above the level of history” and who, baptised at the age of six, published at the age of 30, an indictment a la Drumont against Jewish capitalism, picturing it as the most vicious of world capitalism.

“It is absurd to see nothing but Marxism in a movement as international as Socialism, where Saint Simon, Fourier, Robert Owen and Anglo-Saxon socialism (to which he owes a great deal but which owes little to Marx) count for nothing. . . .

“But, on the other hand, it is true to state that Jews, those persecuted people, have played and do play a great part in the working-class movement; that, of all the socialists of the 19th century, Marx is the one who most successfully expressed the aims of the workers, Jews and non-Jews; Britons, French, Germans, Italian or Russian; that, of all the socialisms, there is none that has made itself so felt in the program for action as has Marxism.”

And this is all! M. Emile Vandervelde, certainly well qualified to do so, if he had thought it advisable, does not contest the account we have given of the origins and behind-the-scenes of the First International, of which he is one of the direct heirs: he does not touch the earliest stage found in the obscurity of secret Jewish-German societies; nor the trickery of its apparent founding at St. Martin's Hall in 1864; nor the comedy enacted to capture the good faith and to assure the protection, of Emperor Napoleon III; nor Karl Marx' preparation of the horrors of the Commune; nor his treason in delivering the insubordinate members of the First International to the courts of M. Theiers and the Spanish police; nor the continuation, behind the Second International — organized, as was the First, by Marx—of a secret neo-Messianic organization, the proof of the existence of which lies in the letters that we have already quoted.' M. Vandervelde even appears

¹- June 1, June 15, and July 15, 1928.

to confirm this latter point when he acknowledges "that the Jews, those persecuted people, have played and continue to play, a great role in the working-class movement".

We cannot help but take note of these admissions, tacit or expressed, of one of the unchallenged successors of Karl Marx at the head of the working-class movement, of this man most qualified to expose us, in the name of international Socialism, had our thesis not been based upon unchallengeable documentation.

As for his statement that we saw "nothing except Marxism in Socialism", how can we accept this, when we devoted (no less than) five pages of the *Revue de Paris*² to a study of the social environment in which grew the roots of Marxism, especially (citing) the work of Buchez, disciple of Saint Simon?

No more did we "see only a Jew and a Prussian in Karl Marx".³ confining ourselves to the anti-French intrigues of Marx during the War of 1870, intrigues that had for their end the employment of our defeat (only) to further the interests of the Revolution.

There remains the question of "the indictment a la Drumont", that, he alleges, Marx "published against Jewish capitalism, pictured as the most vicious of (all) world capitalism". For a little, M. Vandervelde, who enjoys some authority for a number of reasons, in Jewish circles, would accuse his master, Karl Marx, of the crime of anti-Semitism. . . That would certainly be unjust, as we propose to show in the course of this article; the reply of rabbi Liber, that our readers found in the last issue of the *Revue de Paris*, in effect will oblige us to discuss the fifty pages of a deep neo-Messianic intent that Marx gave to the "Jewish Question".

With M. Prague, director of the Archives Israelites, French organ of liberal Judaism, the tone changes abruptly. And, right at the start, our contradictor claims to know

²- June 15, 1928.

³- July 1, 1928; p. 163-165.

from what source we took our documentation on the secret revolutionary committees among which Heinrich Heine and Karl Marx conspired their whole life long. We quote:

“The author appears to us to have allowed himself to be inspired by the famous Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion, a work of the greatest fantasy gotten out to foster the idea so dear to anti-semitic writers, and according to which a mysterious Kahal, one that never existed except in their imagination, calls yearly Congresses and plots a conspiracy of Israel against the entire Christian world.”

Well, and there are the readers of the Archives Israelites completely informed of our documentation!

It is unnecessary to state, for those who have read our articles, that not once have we made allusion to the text by which M. Prague imagines we have “allowed ourselves to be inspired”. At no time, moreover, have we engaged ourselves in the discussions that have raged back and forth around the Protocols. And, should we do so one day, it would only be by utilizing the methods of documentary criticism as would any other who were to enter the discussion.

Having ascribed to us a source that we have never used, M. Prague consents to speak of the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science, and continues his travesty on our theme in the following manner:

“Yes, the Jewish Society for Civilization and Science is alleged to have no other purpose than to alienate Christians from the Church, in sowing doubt among them on its origins and divine character. One could burst with laughter!”

M. Prague would be most agreeable if he could suggest in what part of our study we said that the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science had no other purpose than to make Christians doubtful as to the divine character of the Church. We never mentioned the question. While we devote entire chapters to the evolution of a

group of modern Israelites toward a new Messianism, thoroughly agnostic because purely social and political, neo-Messianism is not, nor can it be, other than the bitter enemy of the Civilization that has sprung from Christianity. We showed this neo-Messianism both preparing and inspiring the horrors of the Paris Commune and of the Bolshevik revolution. Of all that, which is the substance of our work, M. Prague says not a word, while he lays at our feet opinions that one looks in vain for in our text. Is that an honest approach to discussion?

In concluding, M. Prague at last consents to speak of Socialism (not of Bolshevism). It is to make eulogy to Moses, who "organized the socialism reign by instituting, for example, the Sabbatical year, the Jubilee, the forgiveness of debts, all means of stuffing into one egg the creation of a capitalist society". If Salluste wants to "demonstrate the Jewish paternity of the socialist system" he should certainly look "to Moses himself" who would be the one really to blame, with his "radiant torch whose great flame would enlighten Israel and obtain for her the beneficence of social peace".

M. Prague forgets, quite simply, to state that Moses, in regulating the right of private property, made it the basis of Jewish society and places it under the overlordship of God Himself. . . The neo-Messianists, to the contrary, have declared war on the private property and do not exactly dream of social peace.

We are sorry for the readers of Archives Israelites, who believe, in good faith, after having read M. Prague: (1) that our documentation is predicated on the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion; (2) that our only complaint against the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science is that they have placed the divine character of the Christian Church in doubt; (3) that we have attacked Moses and the social code of the Pentateuch.

There only lacks in this expose of our imaginary crimes one little accusation, "incitement to pogroms", and our account would be full. . .

At last we get to our reply to rabbi Liber, whose refutation of our thesis the readers of the Revue de Paris have found herein, thanks to the high degree of impartiality of its Director.

A refutation, to tell the truth, most incomplete, for the good rabbi Liber, no more than M. Vandervelde, does address himself the crux of the matter. The conspiratorial existence of Karl Marx, at an epoch when all his biographers depict him as devoting himself exclusively to social research; the tortuous manoeuvres to which his fanatics resorted in order to assure themselves of the protection of Napoleon III, the preparation for, and the excusing of, the crimes of the Commune, the secret intrigues that permeated the organization first of the First and then of the Second International—all that—took up three-quarters of our study, provoked not the slightest protest from rabbi Liber. Hence, theatre.

In fact, it is largely on our first article, the one where we took up the study of the role of Heinrich Heine in the origins of Communism, that rabbi Libers fastens, and possibly he might never have dreamed of defending the poet of Atta Troll had we not been led, in the course of our work, to bring up the question of the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science, whose influence is considerable on present-day Judaism, and its (titular) head, Leopold Zunz who was, for almost an entire century, all but a prophet of Israel.

We will not conceal from our eminent opponent the fact that his entry into the lists appears regrettable to us. Rabbi Liber, in fact, occupies an official position in the church of Israel; he directs that cult, he explains the Torah and the Talmud. So it is only courtesy to him to suppose that he believes the doctrine that he reveals. Well, that doctrine announces the coming of a Messiah, son of David and envoy of Jehovah, who will restore the temporal power of the Jews. That is, to give it a name, Messianism that is as old as Israel, and on which our study of Heinrich Heine and Karl Marx directed not the slightest attack.

Quite the contrary, we expose the misdeeds of an heretic sect, one that we called neo-Messianic the better to distinguish it from Jewish orthodoxy, a sect that denies (the other's) belief in the traditional and personal Messiah, and claims that the era of the Messiah will have come when the Jewish race (not the religion of the Jews) will dominate everywhere on the political and social fields. We showed these neo-Messianists to be at the bottom of the main social troubles of the 19th and the 20th centuries. Having done this, we were convinced that we would have the approval, not only of the Christians but also of the orthodox Jews, (that is) of the believing Jews. Old Braunstein, pillar of the synagogue, did he not strike his own son, the neo-Messianic Trotsky with the Herem (high excommunication), not only because he was a Communist, but as a heretic and an atheist? Great is our surprise in finding a representative of the orthodox Israelite church in the opponent's corner, flying to the defense (aid) of the very doctrine for which Trotsky vaunts himself. . . Would rabbi Liber be a neo-Messianist, perhaps without himself knowing it?

Starting from such flagrant violation, it was fatal that the refutation of rabbi Liber be deplorable, confused and full of contradictions. The twenty pages that comprise his reply are full of petty detail—that, by the way, we are careful not to take notice of here, as we reveal them later one by one; but the entirety has something inorganic, without backbone, that shows the difficulty that our opponent found himself in, in meeting our thesis face-to-face and confounding it. Rabbi Liber himself sensed this sufficiently well—all that was lacking in his expose—that he concluded, most acceptably to us because it enables us to take out of the text of our adversary explicit points, on which we shall bend our best efforts.

Let us see (just) what these points are. We will quote, giving them numbers for greater clarity.

1. There is no relationship between the Jewish

1824) and either Socialism or Communism.

2. The "neo-Messianic" sect never existed at all.

3. The savant Leopold Zunz had nothing of a neo-Messianist about him, no more than of any Socialist or Communist. He knew Heine in 1823 but later lost him from sight.

4. Heine was in touch with Marx but was deathly afraid of Communism.

5. Heine and Marx (the latter above all) did not like either Jews or Judaism; they don't owe either their political or their social ideas to it.

The care of a debater for perfect clarity obliges us to first take up point No. 2, that has obvious priority over point No. 1, since the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science (we cling to our own translation and we will tell you why) quite evidently was only a page in the history of the neo-Messianist sect which (latter) is already more than a century and a half old, also was we shall see.

When rabbi Liber bluntly affirms that "the neo-Messianic sect never existed" he means evidently that this appellation is new to him and that he has never found it in the catalog of the sects of Judaism. The reason is the one we have already shown: it is we who invented the term "neo-Messianic", in order to define a Jewish sect that has two characteristics: (1) to deny the belief in the coming of a personal Messiah sent of God; (2) to make alive in the entire body of Jewry the promises of victory and of temporal domination over all peoples of the only son of David, (as revealed by) the Jewish prophesies.

In creating a new denomination by giving a name to a new sect, we have done exactly as the botanist, when he has found the species and the genus of a newly-discovered plant; he gives it a name expressing as clearly as possible its principal characteristics. Were a sect to form tomorrow, within the realm of Christianity, that denied redemption by Jesus Christ and substituted therefor the idea

of a redemption by the collective merits of its devotees, we might call this sect, not "Christian" but "neo-Christian", as it would be a matter of a new Christianity differing completely from the old.

Now that we have settled that matter, rabbi Liber is certainly too well versed in the Jewish sciences not to immediately recall the hebrew term that gives not the translation, but the objective equivalent of our own word "neo-Messianism". We refer to (it is a question of) the Hascala movement, which dates from the second half of the 18th century and whose founder was the German Jew, Moses Mendelssohn. This personage is, with no doubt whatever, well known to rabbi Liber, as he is to all Jewish men of letters. He is very much less well known to our readers (so we will) give them a brief sketch of him.

Moses ben Mendel, who germanized his name to Moses Mendelssohn, was born at Dessau, on the estates of the Duke of Anhalt, in 1728 or 1729. He was the son of one of those poor masters of Hebrew that rabbi Liber seems to hold in such low esteem.¹ While still a child, the young Moses showed such a passion for the study of the Talmud that he contracted a nervous ailment that was to last his entire life. Put with that a short and stooping figure, a huge hump and a face full of intelligence, but foreboding, and you will get an exact picture of the physical appearance of the founder of the Hascala movement that identifies itself with "neo-Messianism". The intellectual appearance of this personage was yet more interesting.

At Berlin, where he settled in 1742, young Moses Mendelssohn first became copyist to rabbi Frankel; but he employs every moment of his spare time in increasing his knowledge. He learns mathematics with a master of the Galician school, Israel Moses; Latin with a young Jewish doctor from Prague, Risch; the philosophy of Luke with rabbi Frankel himself; at last, 19 years old, doctor Samuel Gumpertz familiarizes him with the modern languages

¹- See *Revue de Paris*, Aug. 1, p. 615, and 617, on the master of Heinrich Heine, Rintelsohn.

and the philosophy of Leibnitz. Chance, through a game of checkers, later brings him to meet Lessing, who will teach him Greek. But already, underneath all this science of the classics, the political and social tendencies of the young Jew are beginning to assert themselves, and he will show them at the very first work from his pen: a German translation of "Discourse on the Origin of Inequality Among Men", by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, a declaration of war on the idea of private property and veritable manual of social warfare, of which Villemain would say: "This sombre treatise full of specious reasoning and passionate exaggerations . . . contains axioms that, repeated from mouth to mouth, would one day reach our national assemblies to reason, or to justify in their own eyes, the hardest of levellers".

A young Jewish man of letters, chock full of Christian philosophy and science, but who goes about like a shadow in the intellectual movement of the West, with the most subversive ideas, ideas which preach the destruction of the City, there (you have) young Mendelssohn, who was to be found in the Hascala movement. To have the means of realizing his dream, only material independence was lacking him. One of his fellow-religionists, the great manufacturer Bernhard, who had at first taken him in as tutor to his children, provided this when he took him in as a partner:

His fortune, which must have been considerable, was augmented by his marriage to the daughter of the rich Jew Hugenheim, who was most happy to find herself in company with a young and already celebrated savant. When she (first) saw him, though she could not hide her painful expression that (the sight of) his malformation caused her; Mendelssohn never batted an eye. "Do you believe", he asked her, "that marriages are made in heaven?" "Without a doubt", she replies to him. "You know, according to Talmudic tradition, when they send a soul from heaven they call out at the same time the name of the one with whom this soul shall be united on earth. Thus it was at my birth; but they told me at the

same time that my wife would have a tremendous hump. Great God!" I cried, "leave to my wife her figure and her beauty, and give me the hump—Which will heighten her own charms". In the twinkle of an eye, the young maiden looked at herself in the mirror, saw the graceful smoothness of her breasts and looked up at Mendelssohn with understanding. The marriage was consummated. . . There is plenty of subtlety and a good amount of the mystic in a disciple of Jean-Jacques Rousseau.¹

The life of Mendelssohn is so varied that there can be no question of reviewing it in this article. We shall content ourselves with taking note of its triple character:

1. Moses Mendelssohn is intensely a Jew. But this he is by sentiment and by solid racial tie, not at all by attachment to the Mosaic religion. Without doubt he will spurn the offers of Lavater when the latter, finding him considerably afield from the traditional beliefs of Judaism, will advise him to become a Christian; but it is for this reason than an abjuration, which will enable him to be accepted by the world about him, will solve none but his own individual case, and not at all that of his blood brothers, for whose civil and political equality he dreams first of all; something better later. To work for these people, to convince them to adopt his own method of penetrating into Christian society, it is necessary that he himself preserve contact with orthodox Jews, that is to say, profess at least the outward semblance of the Jewish religion. That is why Mendelssohn, though agnostic,² goes to the synagogue: that is why he will publish the "Ritual Laws of the Jews" (1778), a translation of the bible into German with notes on the prac-

1. The descendants of Moses Mendelssohn and the lovely Hugenheim direct today, in Berlin, the great bank of Mendelssohn Brothers.

2. One was badly looked upon, in Germany of the 18th century, if one proclaimed himself an athiest; so Mendelssohn affected to profess a vague theosophy. But he confesses to his real beliefs in his "Matinees", where he poses the following, which certainly leaves no room for the Revelation or mystic philosophy: (continued on page 14).

tice of the Jews, and at last his "Jerusalem, or Religious Power and Judaism" (1783). But all that is only a means of maintaining his authority among his blood-brothers. His purpose is the new promised Land that he shows to them: the marvellous structure of Christian society, slowly built up through eighteen centuries, and now must be conquered by the new Canaanites.

And that will be enough on Mendelssohn and traditional Judaism.

2. In order to reach his political and social objective, Mendelssohn becomes the head of a school: he founds the Hascala movement, whose purpose it is to bring the Jews to the study of Western sciences and to adopt the outward forms of Christian life in order to more easily mix in with both and be accepted by them. But this has nothing to do with any adherence to the civilization that has come out of Christianity: the Jews, reformed, the **Maskilim** (rabbi Liber will understand) must guard intact the memory of their racial origin, their hebraic culture, that assures their unity throughout the world, and the hope of their rise as a whole through a Revolution which will give them their (rightful) place by overthrowing the old Christian world . . . Baruch Hagani (Political Zionism and Its Foundations: by Theodor Herzl, p.20) agrees with this inasmuch as he says "that a work of adaptation as a prelude to the Revolution, was accomplished. Mendelssohn had proclaimed the accord (existing) between the great Jewish tradition and **modern thought**, and the reformed Jews had resolutely deleted from Judaism everything that seemed **to them to be incompatible with the needs of today**".

1. What is true should be able to be recognized as such by a positive intelligence.

2. That whose existence cannot be proven by any positive intelligence does not exist in reality; it is an illusion or an error.

Through the help of rich Jews such as Friedlander and Daniel Itzik, Mendelssohn founded schools where young Jews, chosen for their intelligence, received an instruction which prepared them for the political role that they were destined to play among Christians. As the Jewish Encyclopedia says (Hascala article), "the extraordinary success that Mendelssohn obtained made it possible to uncover a world of heretofore unheard-of possibilities where initiated Jews could exercise their influence".

3. These possibilities were above all of a revolutionary and political character. Freemasonry, something new on the continent, enjoyed an extraordinary vogue both in Germany and in France, as much from the mystery that it surrounded itself with as from the pleasures of its affairs for most of its adepts. Getting to the heart of this association, accentuating its idea which was still but little revolutionary, employing its power for the furtherance of the interests Judaism, such was the goal that he set for himself. This goal he reached, thanks to his correspondent, the Jew Cerfbeer, who had amassed a great fortune through furnishing materials to the French Government and who was in the confidence of Louis XVI; thanks to his friend Dohn, archivist of the King of Prussia, who in 1782 launched—at the very time of Freemasonry Convention at Wilhelmsbad—the program for the political emancipation of the Jews; thanks above all to Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, his old Professor of Greek and close collaborator, who opened the Masonic organization to reformed Jews who lost no time in taking over a dominating position. LeF. Findel, one of the classic historians of Freemasonry, specifically bears witness to the role of Lessing, who first succeeded in making it possible for Jews to become members of the Grand Orient Lodge, or the Order of Abraham.

This Grand Orient Lodge was no small matter. Such members as Prince Charles of Hesse (designated as

“adopted” under the name of Ben Our ben Mizram), as Duke Ferdinand of Brunswick (called Isch Zadik). Later, Ferdinand was to become President of the World Freemasonry Convention at Wilhelmsbad, where the French Revolution would be decided upon; still later, he would command the Prussian army at Valmy, that farce of a battle, where his incomprehensible retreat preserved Dumouriez’ army and the September massacres at Paris. Yes, “the work of adaptation as a prelude to the Revolution” that Baruch Hagani speaks of, was done, and was well done. . . .

Must we recall, besides, how that legal entree of Jews, into Christian society was worked, what was its aim, the purpose behind the Hascala movement? Prof. Dr. H. Graetze¹, whom rabbi Liber recommends us to read, explains it in talking of the salon of the beautiful Jewess Henriette Lemos, wife of Dr. Herz, at whose home both the daughters of Marx and the ladies of the highest Prussian society were frequently guests. “Outside of his secret mission to Berlin (1786), Mirabeau was one of the habitués of this salon. That is where Mirabeau began his relations with Dohn, author of a book on the emancipation of the Jews. Jewish interests (first) entered his heart at the salon of Henriette Herz; listening to the readings of the works of Mendelssohn, he only looked for the slightest excuse to express his devotion to Judaism”.

From the very next year he expressed this (feeling) by his book on “Moses Mendelssohn and the Political Reform of the Jews” (London 1787). He expressed it considerably further during the two year’s fight, in the National Assembly when his zeal for the Jewish cause had no equal other than that of Robespierre, of the tragic Abby Gregory and duF. Adrien Dupont, the same who is forever famous as having set out the detailed plan of the terror.

Moses Mendelssohn died in 1786, in the Promised Land itself, was there for no other purpose than to be present

¹- History of the Jews from Ancient Days to the Present: —
Leipzig, 1863-1876 Vol. XI. p. 158.

at the first victory of the movement that he himself had created. But the thought of him who has been called the third Moses' would hover over the successors to his work. Surely rabbi Liber himself knows that Lazerus ben David, one of the greatest theoreticians of the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science, was the pupil of Mendelssohn?

We think we have shown sufficiently that "the neo-Messianic" sect (really) existed, quite the contrary to proposition No. 2 of rabbi Liber. This sect even exercised, through High Masonry, a considerable influence over the French Revolution that was to give civil rights to Jews. Let us get on now to proposition No. 1. of our opponent: "There is no connection between the Jewish Society for Civilization and Science, of Berlin (1819-1824) and Socialism and Communism".

Great is our surprise in finding a man as well informed on this question as rabbi Liber appears to be, making the brazen denial. . . It is not only, in fact, in the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science that Socialism and Communism appear (both of which mean the same thing, the abolition of private property). It is right at the beginning of the Hascala movement that we find Moses Mendelssohn making himself the translator and propagandist of the hateful "Discourse" of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, against the rights of property, this "Discourse" whence all modern modern Socialists and Communists have taken their inspiration. If the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science is the continuation of the work of Mendelssohn, it certainly found Socialism and Communism in its cradle.

Well, Leopold Zunz and his friends in the Union were the ones who continued Mendelssohn's work: Rabbi Liber expressly acknowledged that.

He even quite nonchalantly gives us all the desirable details in that regard. He recalls to us that in 1815 the Jewish cause made its appearance identified with the

¹- The second being Moses Maimonide, celebrated rabbi of the 12th century.

French Revolution' as the Holy Alliance, has adopted a mistrustful attitude toward them: civil rights were bartered or were refused to them somewhat everywhere. The Society which sprung from Christianity was closed to those who had received from the translator of Rousseau, the inspirer of Lessing and Mirabeau, the mission to invade it. It is then, to overcome this resistance that there was organized again at Berlin, a second wave of attack: this was the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science.

Rabbi Liber very kindly recalls for us that the articles of association, founded November 7, 1819, laid down its aim "the reforming of Judaism in order to put Jews in harmony with the times and with the countries wherein they dwelt." That is the very thought and even the very words of Mendelssohn. . . There, also, is his formula of forsaking the traditional beliefs and the rallying around the neo-Messianic politic. Rabbi Liber quotes for us, in fact, Lazarus ben David, "pupil of Mendelssohn" and close collaborator of Leopold Zunz, who revealed the program of the sect, in the sect's publication, as follows: "That one must not think badly of the Jew who finds his Messiah in the fact that good princes have placed him on equal footing with other citizens and who have given him the hope of getting all the rights of citizens if he fulfills all the duties".²

Rabbi Liber does not deny, here, that the expression "neo-Messianic" becomes appropriate, but finds "that neo-Messianic falls flat and is really (very) little subversive". Let us say that the formula was clever and prudent. Prussian censorship, in 1823, wouldn't have tolerated, certainly, anything more precise.

To know what this neo-Messianism was really like, one must recall that, at the same time, the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science entrusted to Heinrich Heine its courses in history, to Heinrich Heine who was so ardently,

¹- Because of the work, quite evidently, of Mendelssohn and of the Hascala movement.

²- Revue de Paris, Aug. 1, p. 613.

so mystically revolutionary that he made the pilgrimage to Munster to pay homage to the relics of Jena Brockenraw, called Jean de Leyde (John of Leyden: Ed.) head of the 16th century Communists. "I kissed most respectfully", he writes, "the relics of the tailor Jean de Leyde, the chains he bore, the pliers they tortured him with". . . We have already quoted the text, which proves, among many other things, to what point Heinrich Heine was really a Communist. Rabbi Liber passed this over in silence in his rebuttal. This is really unfortunate.

In fact, the courses of the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science couldn't have been much different from those of a Leninist school of our own days. In the Leninist schools they also talk of history, of sociology, of new legislation for the emancipation of the Jews; and it all ends up with civil war. . .

Rabbi Liber, it is true, shows us Heinrich Heine, in his classrooms "filling his young hearers with enthusiasm, praising the feats of Germans of other days and with tears in his eyes relating to them the Battle of Artimius against the Romans." It is a touching picture, but very little in accordance with the facts. Of two things, the one, in effect: where the classes of the Union, as Rabbi Liber claims, were addressed to **Jews only**—so the emotion of these people would certainly be nil in listening to the account of a war dating some two thousand years back and between two people who were complete blood-strangers to them. But how an account of Titus' siege of Jerusalem would have moved them—how! or where, those who so passionately interested themselves "in the battles of Artimius against the Romans" were young Germans—and where does that statement of Rabbi Liber's come from (when he says) that the Union didn't address itself to Christians at all?

The truth is that the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science held over international Jewry, in the 19th century the same galvanic action as did Mendelssohn and

the first Maskilim in the 18th; the Union launched it out to the assault of this Christian society, which held back before the acceptance of a race up to that time considered as unassimilable; the Union turned over to its aggressive (conquering) spirit explicit and immediate political aims; the Union provided Jewish leadership for the rabble-rousing and socialist agitation that was to culminate in the Revolution of 1848—this 1848 Revolution “which gave the air to the German Jews” as rabbi Liber declares. Just as the French Revolution of 1789 - 93 had given it to the French Jews. . .

In fact, the Union was the torch of Israel, of which a notable part followed, from then on, the ways of neo-Messianism. One must not be surprised if it be true that “at all times there has been a central union among Jews, even among those who have been scattered all over the globe. It doesn’t matter where found, Jews maintained relations with this spiritual center. Never has a nation felt in such an acute a manner as Jews, the force emanating from such a center. With them, every suggestion is broadcast with the greatest speed to the extreme ends of the national organization”.

Our opponent will cry that he catches us up on the fact that we got that from the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion. . . Not at all! We quote one of the (very) adepts of the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science, the celebrated Moses Hess, friend of Heinrich Heine and Karl Marx, whom Arnold Ruge, according to the Jewish Encyclopedia, called the “Communist rabbi”. M. Seignobos (Political History of Modern Europe, p.688) shows him to us organizing the first Communist groups in the Rhineland. A quarter of a century later he will be a member of the First International and representative of Germany at the 1868 Bruxelles Conference, and at Basel in 1869. This quotation is taken from his book ROME AND PALESTINE, which was, says its translator, Dr. Waxman, “the herald and trumpet of Zionism”. Rabbi Liber will find it at page 261 of the American edition.

our opponent is mistaken when he attests, in his first proposition, "That there is no relationship (at all) between the Jewish Society for Civilization and Science and Socialism or Communism." It is (quite) the contrary that is true.

Let's see if our contradictor is happier when he objects to us that the brief existence of the Union would not have allowed it to have the decisive influence on the beginnings of Communism that we attribute to it. Founded in 1819, the association was assertedly dissolved in 1824, **for lack of funds**, rabbi Liber reveals. This objective appears to fit in. . . . Regrettably, we don't agree, neither on the cause of this disappearance nor on the date on which he finds it convenient to set it.

We don't agree on the cause, because the Union had, precisely in 1824, a (most) excellent reason for announcing its dissolution, without its financial situation having anything to do with it: it was just on the point of being investigated. The attention of the Prussian police had at last been awakened by its propaganda; they mistrusted its purpose to "civilize the Jews"; they understood the dangers (coming) from the "reform of Judaism"—which shows that the Prussian men of police were not lacking in perception or in information. Briefly, in 1824, Prussia decided to look into the matter most closely, and, from the account of the encyclopedist S. Cahen (known as the translator of the Bible) "in the Rhineland provinces, they forbade the Jews even the **reform of their cult**". Dire death-kneel for neo-Messianism! This first restriction foretold others, so (naturally) the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science resolved not to (sit back and) wait for them. With a loud noise the Union announced it was going into liquidation. . . .

Did it really disappear? The question doesn't even occur to anyone who has studied the history of secret societies. The first care of any group of conspirators that senses its discovery is to shout that it doesn't exist any

more. Thus; in France, Barbes and Blanquin, whose life was no more than one long conspiracy, kept ceaselessly the same General Staff and the same troops, in limiting themselves, each time they were unmasked, to declaring their group dissolved. They (simply) re-grouped themselves three months later under another name, and we had, successively, the Society of the Rights of Man, the Society of Families, Society of the Seasons, etc. . , which employed the very same personnel for (precisely) identical ends.

For one to believe that the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science was really dissolved in 1824, one will have to prove: (1) that its moving spirits stopped having relations with each other; (2) that individually they modified their out look on life.

But, if we examine the facts, quite the contrary appears. Rabbi Liber himself pays homage to the singleness of purpose of Leopold Zunz, who stood up for the same ideas obstinately during a lifetime of nearly a century. All his collaborators without exception showed the (very) same tenacity. In vain will one pose to us the objection of the conversion to Protestantism of Edouard Ganz and Heinrich Heine; we have shown, in our study, in quoting from letters of acute cynicism, what the latter's conversion was worth. . . We even regret that rabbi Liber hasn't in reading our efforts, noticed the text, no more than he has noted that relating to Heinrich Heine's pilgrimage. In any case, one fact is certain: after the apparent and enforced dissolution of the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science in 1824, its guiding souls modified nothing, individually, of their political activity.

And, no more did they cease their close associations, of collaborating among themselves. We even ask ourselves how rabbi Liber can be tempted to deny it! How could he write, for example (proposition No. 3) that "Zunz knew Heine in 1823 but then lost him from view". Let us send our opponent again to the Jewish Encyclopedia, which will bring back to him: (1) that "the friendship between Zunz

and Heine lasted the entire life" of the latter; (2) that "Moses Moser had the prime influence over the life of Heine" . . . Friendship that lasts an entire lifetime, the principle influence over the direction of every activity of a life, is what rabbi Liber calls "losing people from view"? And (yet) it is he who gives us advice on knowing questions on which we speak. . .

We would not like to leave the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science without replying to the tiny quarrel. . . of German (translation) that rabbi Liber has sought with us on the matter of the name of the association so dear to him. This name is worded, in Lessing's language Verein fur Kultur u. Wissenschaft der Juden. And our opponent says didactically (wishes absolutely) that that means Society for Civilization and Science of Jews. From which he gets the conclusion that this association had for its aim "not to disseminate among Christians I do not know what Jewish civilization or science, but to propagate modern culture among Jews . . . it is so little the same thing that it is rather the contrary", triumphantly concludes rabbi Liber, and fires at us with malice — but in wounding it, alas — the verse of Boileau: "From one word in the right place, learn power".

Let us follow, inasmuch as he demands it, rabbi Liber on this linguistic terrain and let us depose right off that Verein, in German, is translated by Union and not at all by Society. It is the word Gesellschaft that corresponds to Society. Thus our opponent begins his (own) version by being in error. . .

We perceive, however, that he doesn't make this mistake without need. The word Verein, meaning literally the coming together of several units, (ein) demands its complement designating these units. But, it cannot, in the phrase in question have anything to do with other units except those expressed by the words der Juden (the Jews) This complementing finds itself, to tell the truth, rejected at the end of the phrase; but this construction, although not a happy one, is not without (its) example in German.

That is why having duly weighed the question, we have translated: Union of Jews for Civilization and Science, etc. . . Rabbi Liber, on the other hand, quite resolved to impose upon us his meaning of an association reserved to Jews and not concerned with other than them, has determined to consider der Juden as the complement of fur Kultur und Wissenschaft (for Civilization and Science). But if so, he is thrown up against the word Verein (Union), which now has no complement (at all); and, as this word (now) becomes embarrassing, he has categorically suppressed it, and replaced it with Gesellschaft (Society). This is, evidently, what he calls "putting a word in its place".

We note, moreover, that rabbi Liber is not in accord with the director of the Jewish Archives on this translation. He protests, in effect, against the above version of ours all because it would give us to suppose that it was a question of propagating "I don't know what Jewish civilization or science". But precisely, M. Prague, translating from his point of view this incriminating title, renders it as follows: Society for Civilization and Jewish Science.¹ In good justice, it is not to us, but to his co-religionist of the Archives Israelites, that rabbi Liber should take the matter up.

All this linguistic chicancery has really little of interest and we only take it up out of deference to our contradictor who appears to attach (such) importance to it. As he seems to believe that the name of the association allows us to determine exactly its purpose, let us send him once again to the Jewish Encyclopedia. There he will find that Heinrich Heine, lecturer of the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science, called it Young Palestine. . . The meaning of this nickname is very, very clear, as all the revolutionary Committees then (found) all over Europe called themselves Young Italy, Young Germany, Young Switzerland, etc. . . Nearer home, we had Young Portugal, and

¹- Refer to quotation from the Archives Israelites at the beginning of this article.

the Young Turks. It is impossible to state more clearly among the initiate, that the famous Union was a revolutionary organization.

And Heinrich Heine knew it far longer, about the association of which he was one of the guiding spirits, than ever in our days did rabbi Liber.

We find (now) that we have replied in advance to the second part proposition No. 3 of our adversary, set forth in this manner: "The Jewish savant Leopold Zunz has nothing of the neo-Messianist about him, no more than he has of a Socialist or a Communist. He knew Heinrich Heine in 1823, but then lost him from view". The first part of this proposition seems to us to refute itself. Inasmuch as the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science inspired the original adepts of Communism, as the Union deserved to be called Young Palestine by Heinrich Heine, it is evident that one can hardly call him a man of order who was its founder and head. All the praises, albeit deserved, coming from his skill as a writer, and from his knowledge, can change nothing in regard to that brutal fact.

Rabbi Liber offers as, true, a mixture of declarations made, between 1848 and 1865 from Leopold Zunz "in popular societies or in electoral meetings". Well! So he took the (good) word among the Christian political circles, this man who according to our opponent occupied himself exclusively with the teaching of his co-religionists? We presume this resumé to be exact on all points and not tendacious at all. What comes out of it? That Leopold Zunz gave as the basis of the order "voluntary obedience"; that he broadcast (everywhere) the absolute equality of all citizens; that he declared war on the "privileged classes" such as the Church and the Army; that he considered that "progress being thwarted by vested interests (acquired situations)", revolutions could not be brought about "without shock" and that warfare is a law of evolution; that he proclaimed that the Revolution would be nothing until

a State founded on democratic law (right) were set up throughout (all of) Europe, etc. . .¹

And so! he wasn't doing (so) badly, this gentle savant that rabbi Liber depicts for us as solely concerned with synagogic poetry and the history of his race. . . As one understands that the Prussian police had opened its eye to his activity and to that of his colleagues.

But these ideas "are at the other end of the pole from Karl Marx" cries rabbi Liber. Come, let us permit ourselves to refer him to the Manifesto of the First International (London, 1864), edited under the control and with the collaboration of Karl Marx:

"As the emancipation of the workers must be the effort of the workers themselves; that the efforts of the workers for the conquest of their emancipation must not have a tendency to constitute (any) new privileges, but to establish for all equal rights and duties and to alienate the domination of (any and all) classes . . . the undersigned . . . etc., declare that the International Association of Workers, as well as all Societies and persons, shall recognize as the basis of their conduct in regard to all men, Truth, Justice, Morality, without regards to race, creed or color. They consider it a duty to demand for all the rights of man and of the citizen. (There shall be) no duties without rights, etc. . .²

It is enough to confront these two texts to show that, at the same date, approximately, Leopold Zunz was showing (quite) other(wise) in damning and in aggressivity than the chief of the First International. Nevertheless, it was already a quarter of a century that Karl Marx was conspiring toward the ruin of all civilization.

Rabbi Liber's enthusiasm for Leopold Zunz is so great that it comes to pass that he imputes to us proposals that are harmful to his spiritual master, (proposals) that are

¹- See Revue de Paris, Aug. 1, p. 610-611.

²- See Revue de Paris June 15, 1928, p.922; Aug. 15, 1928

nothing more or less than the literal translation of letters written by the man himself. We quote:

“If he had been twice called upon to renounce his offices as a rabbi, at Berlin (1822) then at Prague (1835), it (certainly) was not because of I do not know what private ideas, as Salluste insinuates at (was)”, etc. . .

But some few lines later, our opponent quotes the version that Zunz himself gave of this incident:

“My opinion and my principles go badly together with the political and religious make-up of the people here. It were better that I left. I wouldn’t be able to bow to the rabbis and to the officials of the community. I can more usefully employ my time than to play charades”.

“Opinions” and “principles” that go badly with the political and religious make-up of the heads and the members of a community, to the point that one feels obliged to leave it, are not really “private ideas”? Would it have been better to say they were “communal ideas”? (Play on words here: Ed.)

We come to proposition No. 4: “Heine was in touch with Karl Marx but was afraid of Communism”.

Our study has accumulated the proofs of the revolutionary part played by Heinrich Heine and of the assistance that he gave to Karl Marx. This same study could have formulated an identical indictment if we had been concerned with the relations of Heine with Ferdinand Lasal, known as Lasalle, the great German Jewish agitator. You will excuse us from reverting (again) to facts ten times shown. We content ourselves with replying to the objections raised by rabbi Liber.

Rabbi Liber makes us say — and he amuses himself considerably in so doing — that Heinrich Heine was the agent of “payments” between Karl Marx and his occult

inspirers. So! On just what page did we say that? Our savant opponent would be most gracious if he would tell us that. . . We said that Heine "offered useful encouragement and recommendations", that he introduced Karl Marx to Arnold Ruge, etc., all of which facts were duly proven. We never (once) called Heinrich Heine "an agent of payments" made to Karl Marx, or to anyone else. So?

We note that rabbi Liber feels, (which is) the most natural thing in the world, that if Heine "had accepted, in order to transmit them, any funds of a Jewish society, something of them would have accrued to him". A lovely sidelight on morality! We would never permit ourselves to hold the honesty of the great Jewish poet so low.

We pass on to the poverty of Heine, which has nothing to do with his political tendencies. This poverty is, however, neatly forged in the analysis. Heinrich Heine had some private resources; he had an annuity of 4800 francs from his uncle in Hamburg; he also had an annuity of 4800 francs from the French government; lastly, his rights as an author brought him around 12,000 francs each year. Quite a sum under the July Government! Eugene Sue, a personage who had a large town house, stables, carriages and seryants, says, to impress the crowd, that he spends 20,000 francs every year—and they look upon him with envy. We must recall that the gold franc of 1840 was worth three of 1914 and, in consequence, would be worth fifteen of our paper francs (of today). Would a man of letters who earned in our times, 300,000 francs a year really be considered a beggar? We ask the experts of M. Pioncaré.

The favorite procedure of rabbi Liber appears again when he makes the observation that Heine couldn't be a "prophet and apostle of the First International" inasmuch as the International was founded eight years after his death! It seems "that with his biting spirit Heine would have made a jest of it. . ." ¹

1- Rabbi Liber evidently meant to write "satire".

Well, Well! Our work was written to show that the International had "origins" twenty years anterior to its "official founding": 1844 instead of 1864. We brought in voluminous proof to show that the study of these "origins" makes the collaboration of Heine crash (with a loud noise) at every step. Heine, who died in 1856, therefore had 12 years (from 1844) to further the preparatory work of Marx. There is the fact that we have affirmed. Rabbi Liber makes the bluff that he did not read the numerous pages that we devoted to the "origins" of the International, **the only ones where we spoke of Heinrich Heine.** He supposes that we admit the founding date as 1864—(precisely) against which our entire work was written. Then he triumphs: in 1864, Heine was already eight year dead, therefore he could never have taken part in the "founding". . .

True it is that rabbi Liber believes, in sum, he has counted a point against us. He is at least persuaded of it . . . Did we not say that the thought Engels, in bringing about the proposal of the First of May as the date of festival for the world proletariat, was to commemorate the arrival, safe and sound, of Heinrich Heine at Paris, the first of May 1831? (Our adversary has read "the crossing of the Rhine"). His Socialist manual in his hands, rabbi Liber transcribes the whole classic explanation of the revolutionary festival: in 1886, at Chicago, a fracas took place, the 3rd of May, between strikers and the police; the 4th of May, a bomb killed seven policemen and wounded sixteen; following which, at a date that is (certainly) not the 1st of May, seven of those guilty were condemned to death. There—that is why the 1st of May is a great Socialist and Communist holiday. . . But, says the classic account, the strike that was the setting for these tragic events had begun on the 1st of May! Sorry explanation! One would have understood (it) had the proletariat commemorated the anniversary of the murderous bomb, or that of the condemnation to death of the guilty; but the anniversary of the first day of the strike, in a land that

has seen so many of them! Further, it is false to say that this strike (even) commenced on the first of May; the Press of the time show that a state of strike was in existence before that date. So?

Well, it is precisely because this argument cannot stand by itself that we searched for another. Can one imagine the French national holiday set for the 10th of July, under the pretext that the Federation Holiday, in 1790, took place on the 14th of July? Quite to the contrary, the respect with which Marx and Engels enveloped the memory of Heine, protector of both of them, savior of Marx in 1848, gives every (mark of) truth to our interpretation.

And, if it be necessary to go back further, let us recall that Adam Weishaupt, founder of the communist order of the "Illuminati", himself created a 1st of May. Why? Because the 1st of May was an old pagan fete, marked by ceremonial and customs of which strong traces are found in the Middle Ages. Recall the Maypole, that the French peasants set up on that day, still in the 17th century, and that lived again, in the revolutionary period, in the "tree of liberty"? And also the "princes of May" of the 15th and 16th centuries? Or, again the "queens of the May", in England?

It is the 5th and last proposition of rabbi Liber that reveals to us his secret thought, the one that inspired his refutation: "Heine and Marx, the latter especially, did not like either Jews or Judaism; they did not owe their political or social ideas to it". Our esteemed antagonist accuses, in advance, of racism, those who would claim that a Jewish birth is ineradicable, just as a black or a yellow one, and independently of beliefs or of denials. As an Israelite", says our opponent, "I reply: Judaism wants to be judged by its faithful, not by its renegades".

As it is to be a "racist" to hold Judaism responsible for the misdeeds of Heinrich Heine and Karl Marx, we must guard ourselves well against having a personal opinion on this question, and let rabbi Liber discuss it with several of his own race. These are no renegades, far from it! but,

on the contrary, veritable glories of Israel whose name is pronounced with respect in every synagogue in the world. One, Prof. Dr. H. Graetz, is a giant of Jewish History, whom rabbi Liber, in his reply, quotes with deference. The other, Bernard Lazare, has been honored with a statue by his blood-brothers. We humbly beg the pardon of rabbi Liber; but, from the Israelite point of view his own authority is small in comparison with the two celebrated Jews with whom we ask him to enter into discussion. And, behind these, we shall present several further ones to him.

Let us see what Prof. Graetz says, in his HISTORY OF THE JEWS FROM ANCIENT TIMES TO TODAY (Leipzig, 1870; Vol.XI, p. 368).

“Do Boerne and Heine belong to Jewish history? Entirely! Not only did Jewish blood flow in their veins, but the Jewish spirit (essence) was in their nerves. The lightning-bolts that they caused to strike in Germany . . . were charged with Talmudic Jewish electricity. No doubt these two were outwardly divorced from Judaism, but only as two champions who put on the armor and the flag of the enemy the more efficiently to deal him blows and the more completely to render him ineffective.”

Is rabbi Liber content with this definition?

Or would he prefer the one of Bernard Lazare, who, in his book ANTI-SEMITISM, ITS HISTORY AND CAUSES (Paris, Leon Chailley, 1894), devotes some thirty pages to “the revolutionary spirit of Judaism”.

With a high moral probity, great Israelite that he was, Bernard Lazare admits that, even in the times of their independence in Palestine, the Jews were

“. . . always malcontents . . . forever restless, looking to a better day they never found realized; . . . from which that constant agitation among Jews that showed itself not only in their prophesies, in their Messianism and in Christianity which was its extreme

personification, but also in their dispersion and at that in an individual manner.

“The causes that gave birth to this restiveness . . . are internal causes that have to do with the very essence of the Hebraic spirit. Life according to the Hebrew should give all the pleasures to the (human) being and it is only from life that he should expect them. . . Having no hope of reward in the hereafter, the Jew could not resign himself to the trials of life. To these trials that beset him, he responded neither by the fatalism of the Musselman nor by the resignation of the Christian; he replied with revolt. Being in possession of a solid ideal, he wanted to realize it, and everything that retarded his accomplishment aroused his wrath.

“It is the idea of contract that dominates the entire theology of Israel. When the Israelite has fulfilled his duties to Jehovah, he would demand his quid pro quo. If he felt himself cheated; if he judged his rights were not being respected, he had no good reason for temporizing, since the minute he lost was a minute that had been stolen from him and that they would never be able to return to him. . .

“On his return to Babylon . . . the psalms are, for the most part, diatribes against the wealthy; they symbolize the hatred of the **Ebionim** against the powerful. When the psalmists speak to those who own, to those glutted (with riches), they wholeheartedly say with Amos: ‘Hear me, devourers of the poor, parasites on the poor of the country. . . The wealthy one is the evil one, he is the man of violence and of bloodshed; he is canny, treacherous, proud; he does purposeless evil; he is abominable, because he exploits, oppresses, persecutes and devours the people. . .’ Inflamed by the words of their poets, the **Ebionim** . . . would dream of the day that would avenge the injustices and the wrongs, of the day when the evil-doer

would be toppled and the just exalted; of the day of the Messiah.

“So, the concept of life and death that the Jews set up for themselves provided the prime element of their revolutionary spirit. Their concept of a divinity . . . brought them to conceive the equality of man, it led them even to anarchy. Every government, whatever it might be, is bad, as it tends to substitute itself for the rulership of God; it must be fought, as Jehovah is the sole head of the Jewish republic, the sole one to whom the Israelite owes allegiance. When the prophets insulted the kings, they reflected the sentiment of Israel. . . They were driven to revolt against human law; they were unable to accept it and, in the epochs of their revolt, we see Zadoc and Juda the Galilean leading the zealots and crying: **Call anyone your master?** No man can lift himself above others; the stern heavenly master demanded terrestrial equality and long since primitive Mosaism had within itself this social equality. It is God himself who commanded this equality and it is the powerful who are the obstacle to its realization.¹ . . . As for the wealthy, it is thanks to their iniquities that inequality exists.

“The hatred of the Israelite for the maker of injustice is made more complex by a hatred for the rich man who denies the demand for equality. The Hebrew lays it down that every fortune has come out of evil, from sin; he (or it: Ed.) says that every wealth is ill-acquired.”

“Love of liberty contributes as well to the making of the revolutionary spirit of the Jews and in speaking of liberty, I do not mean political liberty. The concept of personal liberty always has existed with the Israelites, as it was an inevitable corollary to their dogma of the divinity. All power belonged to God and the Jew could not be governed except by Jehovah. He

¹- One thinks to hear Leopold Zunz, as quoted by rabbi Liber.

gave no account of his actions other than to Adonai who rules heaven and earth; none other had the right to restrain his action nor to impose his will over him; face to face with the men of the earth he was free, and he ought to be free. This conviction made the Hebrew incapable of discipline and subordination. The Judean princes never ruled except over a people composed of rebellious individuals, incapable of existing under any restriction or restraint."

And Bernard Lazare shows how this spirit of revolt within his race came to manifest itself in regard to God Himself.

"The account of the dispute between rabbi Eliezer and other rabbis and colleagues gives us a sufficiently typical example to merit our reporting it (here)

"During a discussion over doctrine the divine voice made itself heard and, breaking into the debate, the voice stated that rabbi Eliezer was right. The colleagues of the favored one did not accept the divine decision. One of them, rabbi Joshua, rose and declared: 'It is not mysterious voices, it is the majority of the wise men that should from henceforth decide questions of doctrine. No more is reason hidden in heaven, nothing exists in heaven but the Law: it has been handed down to earth, and it is to human reason that belongs (the duty to) understand and to explain it.'

" If divine words were treated in this manner, when these words permitted themselves to do violence to individuals and (allowed themselves) to impose over human reason a strange (foreign) will over its own, how would human words be treated (accepted)! M. Renan was right when he said of the Semites; 'Nothing counts to these people (souls) (when it is in) opposition to the supreme I'. (This refers to the supreme Ego: Ed.), and this is most particularly true of the Jews.

¹- Talmud, Babe Mezia, 59a.

“So, the individuals, filled with idealism, is and will (continue to) be everywhere and always a rebel

“We have examined (taken apart) all the elements of which the revolutionary spirit of Judaism was formed: these are the idea of Justice, that of Equality and that of Liberty. If, among the nations, Israel was the first to propound these ideas, other peoples, at different times in history, supported them, but they were not, because of that, peoples of revolting (spirits) as was the Jewish people. Why? Because if these people had been convinced of the desirability (excellence) of Justice, of Equality and of Liberty, they did not consider their complete realization as a possibility, at any rate on this earth, and consequently they did not devote themselves solely to their realization.

“On the contrary, the Jews believed not only that Justice, Liberty, and Equality could become sovereign on this earth, but they held themselves (as) singled out especially to work for such sovereignty. All desires, all the hopes that these three ideas gave birth to, ended by crystallizing around one central idea: that of the times of the Messiahs, of the coming of the Messiah.

“. In none of those who claimed to be the Messiah did Israel want to believe. It spurned all those who said they were sent of God. It refused to listen to Jesus, Barkokeba, Theudas, Alroy, Serenus, Moses of Crete, Sabattai Levi. The reason is that Israel never found its ideal personified in reality. None of the prophets that appeared to Israel carried in the folds of his robe either a divine Justice, or an Equality triumphant, or Liberty indestructible; the Jews saw not in the voice of these anointed ones, their chains fall, the walls of the prison crumble, the lash of authority rot to pieces, or dispersing like a futile smoking the ill-acquired treasures of the wealthy and the despoilers.

“...The narrow straits (limits) in which the doctors enclosed the Jews made their instincts of revolt (but) lie dormant. The Talmud, however, did not cause all Jews to bow down; among those who rejected it were found the ones who persisted in the belief that Justice, Liberty and Equality were bound to come down to earth; there were many of these who believed that Jehovah's people were charged with working to that end. This is what enables one to comprehend why Jews were mixed up in all revolutionary movements, since they did take an active part in every revolution. as we discover in studying their role in (all) the periods of trouble and of change.

“Thus the complaint of the anti-Semites appears well-founded: the Jew has the spirit of revolution; wittingly or not, he is an agent of revolution. . .

“ . . . It is these thinkers and philosophers (Jews) who, from the 10th to the 15th century, right up to the Renaissance, were the auxiliaries of what we may call the general Revolution of Humanity. They helped, in certain measure, mankind to free himself from his ties of religion. . . In that time when Catholicism and the Christian faith were the basic structure of States, to combat them or to supply arms to those who attacked them, was to do the work of a revolutionist.

“The Jews did not confine themselves to this. They supported Arab materialism that so strongly shook the Christian faith and spread disbelief to the point that we (can or—it was asserted) affirm the existence of a secret society sworn to the distruction of Christianity. . . M. Darmesteter was right when he wrote:

‘The Jew has been the doctor of disbelief, all revolts of the spirit have come from him, whether shadowy ((indistinct) or (out) in the light of day, He has been at (behind the) labor of the immense workshop of blasphemy of the great Emperor Frederick of the Princes of Suabia and of Aragon. . .’

“ . . . The historian confines himself to studying the part that the Jew, considering his spirit, his character, his nature, his philosophy and his religion, has been able to take in the process and in the revolutionary movements. I understand by revolutionary process the ideological march of Revolution that can be represented on the one hand by the gradual destruction of the Christian state and of religious authority, and on the other by an economic revolution. . .

“ . . . (The Jewish savants) translated the apocryphal books, the lives of Jesus, such as the Toledot Jeschu, and (during) the 18th century repeated the fables and the disrespectful legends of the Pharisees of the 2nd century that one finds at the same time in Voltaire and in Parny, and whose studied irony, bitter and deliberate, relives in Heine, in Boerne and in Disraeli, just as the power of reason(ing) of the doctors relives in Marx, and the libertine rage (passion, fire) of the Hebraic rebels (relives) in the enthusiast Ferdinand Lasalle.

“ . . . They cannot deny that Illuminism and Martinism were powerful precursors of the revolutions. . . What did the Jews have to do with these secret societies? That is what is not easy to make clear, because authentic (serious) documents are lacking. . . However, it is certain that there were Jews at the very cradle of Freemasonry, Kabbalist Jews, which is proved by the retention of certain (of their) rites; very probably, during the years that preceded the French Revolution, they joined the councils of that society in even greater numbers, and themselves started secret societies. There were Jews around Weisshaupt; and Martinez de Pasqualis, a Jew of Portuguese origin, organized numbers of illuminist groups in France. . .

“ . . . During the revolutionary period the Jews did not remain inactive. Considering their small numbers in Paris, we find them occupying a considerable place.

“. . . We have seen how, clustered about Saint-Simon, they brought the economic revolution of which 1789 was a step. During the second revolutionary period, that which begins in 1830, they showed more ardor even than (they did) during the first. They were moreover, directly interested because, in most of the States of Europe, they did not yet enjoy full rights. Even those among them who were not revolutionists by reason and temperament were so through interest; in working for the triumph of liberalism, they worked for themselves. It is beyond (the peradventure of a) doubt that with their gold, their energy, their talent, they both supported and seconded the European Revolution. During these years, their bankers, their writers, their industrialists, their poets, (all) impelled by quite different ideas, certainly, concurred in the same end. . . But whatever may be the end sought, selfish or ideal, the Jews were at this epoch among the most active and most indefatigable propagandists. We find them mixed up in the Young Germany movement; they were in number in the secret societies that made up the active revolutionary army, in Masonic lodges, in the Carbonari groups, in the Haute Vente of Rome, everywhere, in France, in Germany, in Switzerland, in Austria, in Italy.

“As for their actions and their activity in contemporary Socialism, it is, and it was, we know, very great. It is Marx who gave impetus to the International, by the Manifesto of 1847, gotten out by him and Engels.’

“Here the Jews were numerous, and in the General Council alone we find Karl Marx, secretary for Germany and Russia, and James Cohen, secretary for

1. How sorry we are for rabbi Liber! Here his illustrious co-religionist Bernard Lazare is of the opinion, as is Salluste, that the International dates from some twenty years prior to 1864 . . . Is it that Heinrich Heine “with his bitter spirit” . . . would also have made “a parody” of the statement of Bernard Lazare?

Denmark. Besides Marx and Cohen, one may cite Neumayer, secretary of the office of correspondence for Austria; Fribourg, who was one of the directors of the Paris Federation of the International, of which Loeb, Lazare and Armand Levi were parties; Leon Frankel, who was at the head of the German division at Paris; Cohen who was the delegate of the London cigarmakers to the Congress of the International held at Bruxelles, 1868; Ph. Cohen, who was, at this same Congress, delegate of the Antwerp branch of the International, etc. . . Many Jews connected with the International later played a role in the Commune, where they found other co-religionists.

“As for the organization of the socialist party, Jews contributed powerfully to it. Marx and Lasalle in Germany, Aaron Liebermann and Adler in Austria, Dobrojanu Gherea in Romania, Gompers, Kahn and de Leon in the United States of America were or still are the directors or the originators.”

Rabbi Liber has formally taxed our list of the chief Jewish Socialists with inexactitude and carelessness. To illustrate a little, he would accuse us of having taken the list from the Russian anti-Semites, which is, as everyone knows, the height of all that is horrible. But the list here given by the celebrated co-religionist, Bernard Lazare, contains all the names that were in our own, plus several others, (most) interesting to note. . .

“I have, then, very briefly condensed the history of the Jews, or at least I have tried to suggest how one can do this; I have made it possible to see how they go on ideologically and actively, how they were among those who prepared (the way) for the Revolution by thought, and (were) among those who translated that thought into action. You will object to me that, on becoming revolutionist, the Jew most often turns into an atheist and that thus he ceases being a Jew. This is only (true) in a certain way, in the

sense above all that the children of the Jewish revolutionist melt into the population that surrounds them, and that, in consequence, the revolutionary Jews are more easily assimilated; but in general the Jews, even if revolutionists, have retained their Jewish spirit and if they have abandoned all religion and all faith, they have no less atavistically and educationally been under the influence of the Jewish national (spirit). That is above all true with Israelite revolutionists who lived during the first half of this century and among whom Heinrich Heine and Karl Marx offer us very good examples.¹

“Heine, whom one held as German in France, and of whom, in Germany they reproached with being French, was before all a Jew. It is because he was a Jew that he extolled Napoleon and that he had for the Kaiser the enthusiasm of the German Israelites, liberated by Imperial will.

“ . . . It is just the same with Marx. This descendant of a long line of rabbis and doctors inherited all the logic of his ancestors; he was a clear and lucid Talmudist who created sociology, and applied his native qualities of (penetrating) criticism to his critique of political economy. He was animated by the ancient Hebrew materialism that dreamed perpetually of a paradise on earth, and always repelled the distant and problematic hope of an Eden after death; but he was not only a logician, he was also a rebel, an agitator, a bitter polemist, and he took his gift of sarcasm and invective from (just) where Heine got his: from Jewish sources.

“One could go on to show what Boerne, what La-salle, what Moses Hess and Robert Blum owed to their Hebraic origin, the same for Disraeli, and thus one

1. Salluste's study receives support from Harold Berman in his article, HEINRICH HEINE, *The American Hebrew*, Jan. 17, 1947. Berman quotes Heine, “I am . . . an admirer of communism . . . a Jew by birth, a Christian by necessity and an atheist by conviction.”

would have the proof of the persistence, with thinkers, of the Jewish spirit, this Jewish spirit that we have already remarked in Montaigne and in Spinoza."

The texts that we print above reply, we believe, with sufficient clarity to the 5th proposition of rabbi Liber, who claims that Heine and Marx "do not owe their political and social ideas to Judaism". We could quote plenty of others, just as conclusive, and all coming from qualified Jewish sources. But space is limited for us and this expose cannot continue indefinitely.

We must, nevertheless, inasmuch as M. Vandervelde in the Bruxelles Peuple, and rabbi Liber, in his refutation, have spoken of the anti-Semitism of Karl Marx, study the brochure of the latter known as "Requisitore a la Drumont". The document is interesting because of the date, which coincides with the beginnings of the Communist activity of Marx in France (1844); it is even the more (interesting) due to its neo-Messianic significance.

The Israelites of Germany, hurled to the assault by the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science, fought for obtaining full and complete rights as citizens. Everything was indicating that they would soon get it, as did come to pass, in effect, several years later, thanks to the Revolution of 1848. But two trends showed up among them (these Jews of Germany): the **radical**, that did not hold the fight for political equality as more than a means of social and revolutionary agitation (trend represented by the neo-Messianic leaders whom we have presented to our readers): the **moderate**, that held the conquest of political rights had its own (very good) price in itself, and that, joined together with the hold that Israel held over the finances of the State, the Bank and Commerce, it could formulate an aim reasonable to the ambitions of the race.

Among these moderates were found many of the great Jewish capitalists whom the social extreme of

Marx, in the Rhenish Gazette, had made uneasy, and who refused, or only agreed luke-warmly, their subsidies for revolutionary propaganda. It is for them that he wrote his little work on the Jewish question, to which he most cleverly gave an indirect approach (limning it) as an article of criticism on a book by Bruno Bauer. It is they whom he makes his opponents, whose capitalist selfishness he denounces, and whom he makes recall, in thinly veiled terms, their racial duty.

With his usual brutality (bluntness), Marx first recalls to them that the aim pursued by the race is not equality with the Christians, but the total ruin of Christian society, whose (continued) existence is held as intolerable. The bit is worth being quoted:

“Do the Jews demand to be put on an equal footing with the Christian subjects? If they recognize the Christian State as based on law (right), they recognize the rule of general bondage. Why (then) does their (own) special yoke irritate them when the general yoke please them?

“The Jew has within himself the privilege of being a Jew. He has, as a Jew, rights that the Christian does not have. Why does he demand rights that he does not have and that Christians enjoy?

“In demanding his emancipation from the Christian State, he demands that the Christian State abandon its religious prejudice. And he, the Jew, does he abandon his (own) religious prejudice? Has he then the right to demand of another that he relinquish his religion? . . . As long as the State remains Christian, as long as the Jew remains a Jew, both are equally incapable, the one to give emancipation, the other to receive it.”

Statement of implacable logic and that events are destined to show. For a State to really be capable to cause its barriers to fall, not for the Israelites as the exception but for the entire Jewish people, it is neces-

sary for this State to renounce its being Christian; we will call it for the moment "neutral", "indifferent", etc. . . . but, in reality, and the sequence of events will prove it straight away, it will have passed on to anti-Christianism. There, there is a law of history.

Karl Marx quickly brings forth another.

"The Jew can not have, in regard to the State, (anything) but the attitude of the Jew, that is to say, that of a stranger: to the true nationality he opposes a chimeric nationality; to the true law an illusory law. He fully believes he has the right to hold himself aloof from the rest of humanity. In principle, he takes no part in the historic movement and looks askance at a future that has nothing in common with the general future of mankind. He considers himself a member of the Jewish people, and the Jewish people as the Chosen People. For just what reason, Jews, do you demand emancipation?"

Having thus rudely recalled his co-racials to their duty for racial warfare, Karl Marx shows them the purpose, the ruin of the Christian State by the establishment of a general atheism:

"The most rigid form of opposition between the Jew and the Christian is the religious opposition. How does one get rid of an opposition? By making it impossible. And how make impossible a religious opposition? By suppressing the religion".

And he wants that atheism to reign over the Jew (as well as) over the Christians, so that both of them see no more in their respective religions "than the reptile skin shed by the serpent that is mankind". Are we right in saying that neo-Messianism is an heretic and materialist sect in its relation to the old Judaism of Jehovah and the supernatural?

Marx then takes up the fight with still the same brutal logic, against those inconsequential Israelites who want to stop at democracy without going on to Socialism!

From the moment that the law of the majority exists, he points out, this law works toward the expropriation of the possessors, who are not a majority.

“From the moment they decide that the electorate and eligibility are not any longer allied with the franchise (cens), as they have done in a number of States in North America, the State suppresses private property, and man decrees politically the abolition of private property. Hamilton shows very exactly this fact from the political viewpoint: ‘The great mass (of people) has brought victory over the landowners and finance capital (financial richness)’. Is not private property, theoretically abolished as soon as he who does not possess anything becomes the law-maker of him who possesses?”

“. . . The State abolished distinctions of birth, social rank, education, private occupation, from the moment that the State decrees that birth, social rank, education and individual occupation do not create political differences, from the moment when, without taking into account these distinctions, it declares every member of society (the people) as of equal right in the popular sovereignty.”

Sovereignty, however, that he does not consider very highly:

“In the State (the democratic State) man . . . is the imaginary part of an imaginary sovereignty, stripped of his real and (uniquely) individual life end filled with an unreal generality”.

After having let himself be carried away, through several pages, by his hatred for the Christian State, after having stated, with glee, that the destruction of the old corporations has already ruined the vital bases of that State, Marx returns to his object, the disappearance of Christian society:

“If they want to be free, Jews must not become converted to Christianity overnight, but to a dissolved

Christianity, that is, to philosophy, to logic (criticism) and to its result: to a free Humanity.

“We recognize in Judaism a general and an actual anti-social element that, by the historic development to which the Jews have, under this bad relationship, actively collaborated, has been pushed to its culminating point in the present time”.

For that anti-social element to do its required work, Marx does not think that having political rights will be useful to it. Is not Christian society on its way to dissolution? Does it not lose every day something of its character in order to be organized according to Jewish (ends)?

“The Jew is already emancipated, but in a Jewish manner. The Jew, for example, who is merely tolerated in Vienna, determines by his sole financial power the future of all Europe. The Jew who, in the smallest of the German States, may be without rights, decides the future of Europe.

“The Jew has been emancipated, not only by making himself master of the financial market, and because, thanks to him and by him gold has become a world power, and the practical Jewish spirit has become the spirit in practice of the Christian people. The Jews have been emancipated in (precise) measure as the Christians have become Jews.

“. . . In theory, the Jew is deprived of political rights, but in practice he disposes an enormous power and exercises overall his political influence which in details is restrained (diminished).”

Marx, then feels that political rights are nothing for the Jew, only empty shells and that he is employing his efforts badly in letting himself be influenced on this point. He thunders against the Jews of affairs, those builders of fortunes, whose “gold is the jealous god, above whom no other god would exist”. He even de-

nounces "Jewish jesuitism, the same practical jesuitism whose existence Bauer proves (to exist) in the Talmud."

In sum, vehement as was the attack of the neo-Messianist Marx against the liberal Jews (who were) concerned above all in political rights useful to their individual prestige and material profits, there you have the work in which M. Vandervelde perceived a "requisitore (indictment) a la Drumont".

Karl Marx, born revolutionary, heir to the social agitators whose action Bernard Lazare shows us in the entire history of Israel, takes issue with the wealthy, with the "glutted" of his race, with those who are traitors to the common cause by attempting to ingratiate themselves into Christian society instead of working to destroy it.

What could be more logical on his part than the role of prophet, spewing invective and calling for the destruction of the City?

We would not like to bring this study to a close without calling attention to all there is of Hebraic mystery in the spirit of present-day Communists, heirs to the neo-Messianism of Heinrich Heine and Karl Marx. Space is lacking. . . We content ourselves with quoting the Henri Barbusse, the only literary man of value that Communism counts in France, (and) whose Israelite family ties are well-known. The passages hereinafter, whose freely biblical style you will note, are excerpts from his book: JESUS. They confirm all that Graetz, Darmesteter, Bernard Lazare and Karl Marx himself have been able to say on the Jewish inspiration of social Revolution. It is neo-Messianism itself that this time takes the floor and announces to the Civilization that came out of Christianity that it is about to die:

CHAPTER I.

18. And now, we also are at a grave hour in our common drama.
19. On all sides today, the glad tidings are again resounding:
20. The days are near. The old world will die its death.
21. And they say that it is the high-point of the times, and the hour of the revolution, and that it will flash from the shadows of the earth, and will come the rainbow of justice.
22. For the Eternal will glow from Zion, and the God of justice will send (those to) overturn the kingdoms of the earth whose glory is of the Devil, and he will make a great lessening on earth. This was announced to us in the precepts of the angels.
25. The heavenly Messiah will have a counterfeit, and the earth will be destroyed. He will pursue the blameworthy: If he be drowned in the sea, saith the Lord, I will send forth the monster to fish him out; mingle he among men and I will send forth the sword to his throat; ascend he to heaven, I will make him to fall; descend he to the tomb, I will tear him out.
26. The Kingdoms shall fall, Those who shall rule nations will make them crumble. The heavens will pass. And all the islands will disappear, and the mountains will no longer be there. There shall be a day of trial and anguish, when the sun will grow dark, when the horsemen and the ghosts will throw themselves into the skies and into the highest of the clouds. For that day the earth will give up its host of the dead and hell will give forth those who are deserving.
27. And the hero of the Revolution will install a new era where Israel shall be elevated above the eagles. And the stars will shine seven times more

(brightly) on the just, and the Eternal will make with us a compact of happiness.

28. Such is the dream that makes our people for the images that make a people are as the dreams that make a man from (little) bits of himself.
29. We, whose hopes have been crushed one after the other, we are the people of hope, the man-people.
30. Sorrow has made us what we are, world without end.
31. That is what we cry, we who are sleeping still.
32. In the street where I pass on my return home, the sitting sun is casting lengthened rays. People are thinking of the Revolution.
33. And one of them says: You think it will come, this Revolution? And the other says: It seems as though it is for tomorrow.
34. And all look toward the lowering sun, palace of justice of the world.
42. I have in my spirit a rising, it resembles the Revolution.
43. The great degradation of my fathers cries out to me.
44. One is created to do something that is right.
45. One is created to undo that which is unjust.
46. It is writ: I will make of right a rule, and of justice a level.
47. And like a torrent!

CHAPTER X.

32. The wealthy, those who do not have to work, the satisfied, with proper clothes and thick lips, those who have the hands of others at the ends of their

arms, and who harvest their work, who surround one and say, with caressing voice: we are just. . .

77. And the Revolution will not come from heaven unto earth, but will go from the earth unto heaven!

CHAPTER XXVII.

31. The multitude is lazy, and all memories flee from it. But we, the Saints, we make the courage of Israel come out of the earth.
32. And it is faith.
33. For Israel is the Chosen People. The universe was given to the Jews by God who told them this, by messenger, on Sinai. The race of David is no less chosen to command them, to reign over Judea and over the non-marine portions of the earth in fulfilling the compact of alliance handed down by Moses, the tablets of the Commandments, chiselled by God with his own hand (finger), (not once but twice), and to bring about the victory of the vanquished.
34. We, Zealots, Canaanites, Nazarenes, heirs to the Promise.
35. We shall carry, for the last thousand years of the world, that are just now to commence, the success of the Jews over the usurper of Rome, the monster with seven heads, Pontius Pilate, and Antipas the red dragon, who has the face and the reddish skin of Esau the edomite, and who has ten horns of the Decapole.
36. And we will scourge the nations with a rod of iron.
47. For justice, it is the re-establishment of the dynasty of David; pity, it is that of the condition of the Jews; faith, it is that of their revenge.

48. What have you to reply to that? be still! For you have nothing to say.
49. I tell you we are the true and the sole ones to bring forth the Law, the final battle for the kingdom of God and for life eternal, that is the immortal glory of the conquering Jew.
55. I beg of you, be the Messianic plague.
56. Turn water to blood, and learn to make scars on the earth of its (green) fields.
57. Dare kill the wealthy to enrich yourselves and to bring the torch right up to within the temple.
58. Dare raise the price of bread and of the grain of wheat (so it will cost the last (penny) and that there be famine (in the land).
59. For there is the good revolutionary condition.
60. O that through you the Word of the Lord roll through the cities like a Jugernaut.
61. Bring ye not peace, but the sword, across the stomach of the Herods and the Romans who want nothing but hateful tranquility.

These "Dociles of the Temple" whose extermination Henri Barbusse consigns to the sword, are the Jews not rallied to neo-Messianism, whom Barbusse hates no less than Karl Marx hated them. This cry of fanatic hatred in our ears, is it not justification for our historic thesis?

Salluste.

BOOKS FOR COLLATERAL READING

THE EMPIRE OF "THE CITY",

E. C. Knuth (1946) 111 pages \$1.00*
Traces the history of the imperialistic dictatorship which controls the foreign affairs of the United States, and the commerce, finances and politics of the world (cloth \$2.00)

UNCOVERING THE FORCES FOR WAR,

Conrad Grieb, (1947) 120 pages \$1.00*
A documentary survey of the three world girdling international forces that have brought war, death and destruction to all nations of the earth.

THE JEWISH WAR OF SURVIVAL,

Arnold Leese (1947) 116 pages \$1.00*
A provocative analysis of why World War II was fought. By a British patriot cruelly persecuted for his efforts to keep his country out of war.

WORLD EMPIRE

Geo. W. Armstrong (1947) 126 pages \$1.00*
A well documented survey of the influences behind Bolshevism and world chaos.

THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

and Its Use in The World Communist Offensive

Robert H. Williams, 44 pages35*
A survey of the secret police force of the B'nai B'rith and its relation to the world communism as reported by an Army Reserve Intelligence officer.

THE RIGHT TO WORK VERSUS SLAVERY,

M. B. Pinkerton (1945) 100 pages50*
A survey of the theories of Turgot and the Internationalist influences barring men and nations from the right to enjoy the fruits of their own toil.

* *paper covered.*

EXAMINER BOOKS
P.O. Box 144, Station Y
New York 21, N. Y.