

# **WERE THE JEWS THE FIRST NAZIS?**

*Racial and Religious policies  
of the Jews analyzed*

### **PUBLISHER'S NOTE.**

The term "anti-Semitic" is so loosely used by many people that K.R.P. Publications Limited consider it advisable to inform readers that, while those of their publications which refer to Jews are uncompromising in their attitude to facts which expose the designs and activities of powerful Jews and also certain characteristics and activities general to Jews, the *purpose* of these publications is to show how the individual, including the individual Jew, can be released from the tyranny of centralised control. The *action* recommended in these publications is not anti-Semitic; it is entirely the reverse. It marks the way to freedom from all forms of persecution for Jew and Gentile alike. If the *facts* made known in these publications are anti-Semitic, then the Jews themselves must accept responsibility for this.

JOHN MITCHELL,  
Manager, K.R.P. Publications Limited.

### **Note to Australian Edition.**

The Democratic Federation of Youth (Australia) gratefully acknowledges the kind permission to republish this publication in Australia.

## FOREWORD.

A few words are necessary to explain the omission of the letters of the Rev. Dr. Abraham Cohen, the well-known Jewish publicist, from this correspondence which was called forth by his letter to the *Birmingham Post* of November 14th, 1940.

At a moment when the discussion was well under way, Dr. Cohen made the continuation of it dependent upon my providing the name of a Professor of Economics or History willing to endorse my historical views, as well as my procuring and studying a work on Anti-Semitism by a Swedish lecturer, Mr. Hugo Valentin. Such a proposal being wholly unacceptable to me, I chose to terminate the correspondence.

When, later, Dr. Cohen was asked for a direct answer as to whether he would agree to publication or not, he stated that he must have a written assurance from those who were to publish my pamphlet to the effect that their publications were not of an anti-Semitic nature. The evidence with which I provided Dr. Cohen did not satisfy him and he decided to withhold his consent.\*

Dr. Cohen's reason for not allowing his part of the debate to appear before the public seems a curious one, since, if his arguments had been sufficiently convincing they would have neutralised any tendency to "Anti-Semitism" contained in our letters. On being presented with a last proposal that the letters be published privately and unconnected with any publisher whatever, Dr. Cohen was equally emphatic in his refusal.

Although legally entitled to give the gist of Dr. Cohen's letters, I prefer to leave undisturbed the void created by his decision.

BORGE JENSEN.

Birmingham,

February, 1941.

\* See publisher's note.

---

*Correspondence with a Jewish Publicist—  
from P. R. Masson and Borge Jensen*

---

**ORDER FROM**

**SONS OF LIBERTY**

**P. O. BOX 214**

**METAIRIE, LA. 70004**

## **"A SYMPTOM OF HITLERISM."**

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Birmingham Post*.

SIR,

The remark addressed yesterday by Mr. Justice Tucker to the woman whom he sentenced to ten years' penal servitude for an act of treachery against the State deserves wide publicity and close attention. He said:—

"You have undoubtedly been led to do this by your anti-Jewish obsession, which the Solicitor-General rightly described as a virus which had got into your system and had destroyed your mental and moral fibre."

It is more than a coincidence that the men and women who were active in fomenting anti-Semitism in this country have all been interned under the Defence Regulations because their liberty was thought to be a menace to Britain in this time of crisis.

Anti-Semitism is a conspicuous symptom of Hitlerism. Note should therefore be taken of the question asked yesterday in the House of Commons about hotels which refuse to "cater for members of the Semitic race." The Home Secretary, in his reply, said that a person who is the victim of such discrimination can take legal action. I suggest that even more effective would be the boycott of these hotels by Christians who value the ideals for which the British Empire entered the present struggle.

A. COHEN.

2, Highfield Road, Edgbaston,  
*November 8.*

"Birker,"  
173, Walmley Road,  
Erdington,  
Birmingham, 24,  
November 13th, 1940.

THE EDITOR OF THE *Birmingham Post*,  
NEW STREET, BIRMINGHAM, 2.

[This letter was not published by the *Birmingham Post*.]

SIR,

Dr. Cohen, writing in your correspondence columns on November 11th, attempts to dispose of the anti-Semitic question too easily. No doubt any racial hatred can be carried too far and become an "obsession" and a "virus" leading to the deterioration of "mental and moral fibre," but however far it is carried it cannot be identified with "treachery to the State," which is a different thing.

Most Englishmen have a reasonable sense of fair play and that includes a repugnance to cruelty of an unreasonable nature; many of us believe that Hitler's anti-Semitism is merely a blind to cover the fact that he has received powerful support from highly-placed financial interests.

There are one or two aspects of this question which should not be overlooked. In the first place Jews are not the only sufferers to-day, in fact they are not likely to be the chief sufferers. Secondly it is perfectly reasonable that any country should take precautions to see that key positions affecting the lives and happiness of individuals should be filled by nationals only. The most important of those key positions to-day, and possibly, in all times, is the power inherent in the control of the money system.

It seems likely that the Jewish "question" arises from the activities of a handful of Jews. I have been told that the "decent Jew" knows of and deplors the activities of "less than 10% of Jews." At bottom it is a question of checking the anti-social behaviour of evil-disposed persons regardless of race, although race can be some indication of a pre-disposition to certain habits; if we had to leave young children alone with a strange dog most of us would choose a poodle rather than a greyhound, but we would probably reverse the choice for catching rabbits.

The following names should be scrutinized: Rothschild, Mayer, Baruch, Schuster, Warburg, Kahn, Guggenheim, Niemeyer, Schiff, Sieff. They are the names of men or families who move about in the shadows behind Governments and wield enormous influence almost unknown to the general public.

A Jew once assured me that they are cleverer than we are; and it is possible this is correct, but many of us cannot rid ourselves of the suspicion that the Jew is fundamentally incapable of understanding the conception of all men being "free and equal in respect of their rights," to quote from the French Declaration of the Rights of Man. America has embodied the same fundamental idea in the Declaration of Independence. It is the central idea in Christianity. The "Rule of the Road" on land and on sea embodies the idea in a practical form. The "queue" is an almost instinctive acknowledgment of this equality. Our Laws—at least in theory—work from that conception. It is the only possible conception on which to build a social organization that will "work," i.e., produce stable conditions likely to give mankind the conditions he desires.

An implication of this conception—of the natural equality of men in respect of their rights—is that "cleverness" above the average confers nothing on the fortunate individual beyond a greater opportunity to serve his fellows.

Anti-Semitism would disappear or take on a correct perspective if the "decent Jew," of whom I am sure Mr. Cohen is one, came out into the open and joined with the "decent non-Jew" in exposing and curbing those "evil things" which Mr. Neville Chamberlain may have had in mind when he used that expression.

Yours faithfully,

P. R. MASSON.

**(Dr. Cohen's Second Letter.)**

173, Walmley Road,  
Erdington,  
Birmingham, 24,  
*December 6th, 1940.*

The Rev. Dr. A. COHEN.

DEAR SIR,

I have to thank you for your letter of the 18th November and enclosed leaflets, which I have read with interest.

Before attempting to explain and answer, if that is possible, the points raised by you—may I be allowed to preface the following with the remark—that as a realist, I have little interest in a man's ideas, spiritual or otherwise, except in so far as they inspire his actions.

Hitler has said many things against Jewish domination but I maintain that the sum total of his actions contradict all he has said. In all probability he is the most potent agent through which the leaders of world Jewry are carrying out their final attempt of world domination. This statement requires some explanation.

(1) *Hitler's anti-Semitism is merely a blind.* You say that, in this connection, I ignore the Nazi ideology of "Blood and Race" of which anti-Semitism is but a part.

Now it should be remembered that Hitler is not the only person who attaches importance to "blood." None have been more interested and laid more stress on the importance of "blood," in its social aspect, than the Jews themselves. Hitler's blood theories have resulted in his Nuremberg laws which are but the transplantation on Gentile "soil" of those marital laws to which the orthodox Jew attaches so much importance.

Hitler's Jew laws are, as you know, the only original addition to a programme of aggrandisement and centralization of power which he has taken over direct from Bismarck and Wilhelm; both these gentlemen were constantly surrounded by Jewish advisors, and all the German Reich-constitutions have been framed by Jews. Mr. Roth, a co-religionist of yours, writes on page 274 of his "Jewish Contribution to Civilization":

"Karl Rudolph Friedenthal . . . was one of the founders of the Free Conservative party. He it was whom Bismarck invited in 1870 to formulate the Constitution of the German Empire . . . it was overthrown in favour of the Weimar Constitution, one of the principal architects of which was Hugo Preuss [a Jew]."

At the close of the wars to which this new "Empire" was so addicted, the Jewish banking house of Bleichroeder (1870) and Warburg (1918) negotiated the financial arrangements. The proclamation of the Republic was written by Max Warburg of Hamburg for Prince Max of Baden. The German inflation of the early twenties was planned by the same agencies, and a large part of the enormous loans to Weimar-Germany were provided by the Jewish house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. There can be no doubt, then, of the Jewish contribution to the framing of that Weimar-Germany which ruined the German middle classes and thus provided the background for a man of Hitler's type.

As for his theoretical programme, Mr. Roth once more furnishes interesting information on page 275.

"Henrich Friedjung [a Jew] was by conviction a passionate German Austrian. In 1880, in collaboration with Georg von Schoenerer (later leader of Austrian anti-Semitism) and the Jew Victor Adler (subsequently founder of the Austrian Social Democratic party) he produced the Linz programme as a basis for the future policy of the German Austrians. Two years afterwards this programme was adopted by the German Nationalist party with the addition of a single clause: 'No Jew can be a member of the German Nationalist Party.' Thus the programme of the movement which is now



menacing the existence of German and Austrian Jewry, was in the first instance drawn up by Jews."

Comment is superfluous.

(2) You say that a person who is of the opinion that certain precautions should be taken in the choice of people for "key" positions, if by that he means the exclusion of the Jews, has a Nazi and not a British mentality.

In the first place I am not going to be trapped into accepting the terms Nazi and British at their face value. I am fully aware that there are certain powerful interests working through the media of press and wireless which, by propagating in and out of season such terms as these, hope to create two huge "entities" of persons who will go on hating each other for as long as it is deemed necessary. Some of us are still aware that behind this label of Nazi there exists a multitude of peoples who, in pre-Reich days (when the Jews were still in their Ghettoes) formed the individual states of Bavaria, Saxony, etc., and hope that once the Reich is broken up, and has resolved itself into the original states of which it is culturally composed, these people will once more be worthy descendants of Schiller and Goethe. We know also that the whole weight of world Jewry was thrown against the process being carried out immediately after the last world war.

Nor can the term "British" (which does not—as a common appellation of the people of these islands—go much further back than to the days of Disraeli) make us forget the colour and vigour of the England of Elizabeth and Shakespeare, when the Jews had not yet made their reappearance on the English stage. I am not very much interested in the kind of "nationality" that anyone can have for the waiting.

To get down to essentials: I, and the people with whom I am associating, are not so much concerned with discriminating against, or excluding Jews from certain positions, as of ridding ourselves of the influence exercised over our daily lives by such Jewish institutions as the present financial system. In our long fight for the re-establishment of the sovereign right of the people to control and decide their own affairs (which fight has been fought under various names all over the Empire) the Jews have distinguished themselves chiefly by their absence. They are at the moment conspicuously active in the final communisation or Ghettoisation of our country, and thus excluding themselves from the "key" positions of the future.

(3) You write "Certain Jews, who are connected with finance and big business, and because they are Jews, you insinuate that their activities are mischievous."

The question of deciding exactly how many Jews and how many non-Jews (with which your apologists, Salomon,

Roth, etc., are so everlastingly taken up) is one of minor importance. The names of those given by me are framers and chief executants of the orthodox financial policy followed by this country since the readmission of the Jews in the 17th Century. The families of Rothschild, Montefiore, Goldsmid of the last century and the families of Warburg, Schiff, Baruch, Sieff of this century wield an influence which is *fundamental* and concerns policy. I need refer you only to the statement of Bernard Baruch concerning his part in the last world war: "I suppose I was the most powerful man in the United States during the war." Bernard Baruch is at this moment the power behind President Roosevelt.

A knowledge of Gentile and Jewish history shows that the leaders of Jewry are quite prepared to give up the everyday administration of one of their institutions *provided* it follows the policy laid down by them.

Thus, it is not so much with the individual Jewish banker or financier as with the entire fallacious *system of finance* to which all the countries in the world are constrained to adhere that we quarrel. Who were the originators of this financial system, and the "science" of Political Economy on which it is supposed to rest? In "Jewish Contribution to Civilization," page 279, Mr. Roth states:—

"Orthodox economics are to a large extent the creation of David Ricardo, the most illustrious English economist of the 19th century and founder of the science of Political Economy,"

and, on page 288 (quoting Joseph Jacobs):

"Thus, the economic form of the modern state was due to the activities of the Jews as purveyors and financiers, in providing the state with capital for war and development."

The juxtaposition of the words "war" and "development" is significant.

(4) "Can you or anyone else bring a specific charge against any one of these men?"

If you will consult such Jewish works as the Jewish Encyclopaedia, and the Encyclopaedia of Jewish Knowledge, such biographies as "Jacob Schiff,—Life and Letters," etc., etc., you will find that *all* European revolutions since the English one of 1688 (financed by the Belmonte family of Amsterdam) to the Russian one of 1917 (financed by the Warburgs and Schiffs of the German-Jewish-American firms) were made possible by Jewish finance, that all wars of the same period have been planned, precipitated, financed and consequently *won* by the same interests.

(5) The amazing assertion that "the Jew is incapable of understanding the conception of all men being free."

It is my experience that the Jew is constitutionally incapable of understanding the true meaning of freedom and of allowing the same rights to others as he demands for himself; this may be accounted for by the conditions of abject serfdom under which for centuries he has lived. You will understand that the Jew is by no means alone in this complaint. Freedom can be defined as the power to choose or refuse alternatives as they arise. This power of choosing or refusing has been rapidly circumscribed owing to the maintenance of a financial system which must have been devised for an age very poor in potentialities compared to the present. We know now that this financial machinery, which takes our economic freedom away from us, is originated by and controlled by Jews.

We cannot therefore be expected to pay too much attention to quotations from one part of the Jewish law, the working of which we know all too well in practice. Besides there is another part of the Jewish law, the Talmud, which has something quite different to say on this score.

We know that there was no law but the law of "money" in the Jewish Ghetto where a few wealthy families ruled despotically over the vast majority of very poor Jews, and that in post-Ghetto days Jews have everywhere, in the old as in the new world, discriminated quite openly in favour of their own people. I do not blame them for this; it is in the "blood."

Yours faithfully,

P. R. MASSON.

**(Dr. Cohen's Third Letter.)**

Tyn Twtl,

Bonwm Corwen,

North Wales,

*December 16th, 1940.*

The Rev. Dr. A. COHEN.

2, Highfield Road,

Edgbaston,

Birmingham.

DEAR SIR,

My friend, Mr. P. R. Masson, has asked me to reply to your letter of December 9th, as he himself cannot, at the moment, find the time to write the kind of reply he feels your letter deserves. He has shown me the letters exchanged between you, and has paid me the compliment of consulting me over his last letter to you.

I gather that it is your opinion (Deuteronomy vii, 4)

that it is the question of religion (i.e., the adherence to Judaism) which has been uppermost in the minds of the Jewish lawgivers when they framed the marital laws, and, as far as I can gather from the official Jewish works on Anti-Semitism and kindred subjects, adherence or non-adherence to Judaism, orthodox or reformed, is still in the eyes of official Jewry what makes a man a Jew or a non-Jew. Your subsequent statement that there has been throughout history an admixture of blood with the original Jewish stock, I shall deal with later.

As I share Mr. Masson's view that we should judge a man by what he does, and not by the principles he professes, I must admit that I cannot take seriously the view that an open profession of Judaism should be taken as the hall-mark of the genuine Jew. The history of the Dispersion shows too many wholesale "conversions" at opportune moments, as well as equally wholesale backslidings at favourable times, for such a view to be tenable.

The clearest example of what one might call the "policy of conversion" is that of the Marranos of Spain, who first gave up Judaism, then as "Catholics" or even "Protestants" entered the various countries of the old and new world, becoming leaders of the local Jewish communities as well as chief traders, bankers, diplomats, etc., of what the Jews call the "general" communities, after which they in most cases reverted to Judaism. In some cases they stayed "converts" for generations or even centuries, as in Portugal, where five thousand families who had been "Catholics" since the 15th century returned to the Judaic fold not so very long ago.

What matters is, of course, that the vast majority of the members of the Jewish race (or if you prefer, the Jewish people) can be seen from their own histories to have carried out, in the case of the majority quite unconsciously, what one might describe as the Policy of the Jewish race.

The aim has everywhere been the same: the creation of vast, highly centralized, totalitarian Empires, or Federations, directed by a small, mostly anonymous group, invariably members of the Jewish race. Whether they appeared before the world as bankers, merchants, owners of department stores, or industrialists, is a matter of no importance so far as the carrying out of the central *policy* is concerned.

If you will consult the Jewish Encyclopædia under such titles as "Alexander the Great," "Napoleon the Great," "Bismarck," "Bleichroeder," "Cromwell," "Manesseh ben Israel," "Disraeli," "Rothschild," "Sassoon," "Schiff," as well as England, Italy, Germany, France, Russia, Poland and Spain, to say nothing of such individual works as "Jacob Henry

Schiff, *Life and Letters*," by Cyrus Adler; Lucien Wolf, "Essays in Jewish History"; Roth, "Jewish Contribution to Civilization," you will find some startling evidence in support of the theory that all the "Great" military despotisms from that of Alexander to that of Wilhelm of Germany, as well as all the modern financial despotisms generally known as the "Democracies," have been sponsored by members of your people.

### RUSSIA AND THE U.S.A.

In the creation of all modern Federations, especially those of Australia, South Africa, Germany of 1870, the U.S.A., and the U.S.S.R., Jews have been pre-eminently active. In all known cases of Federation there has been a perceptible decrease of *individual* freedom as well as a distinct increase of the power of the central government. The most extreme cases of Federation are the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., the two countries which are now, as you know, the chief depositories of Jewry. The U.S.A., like Soviet Russia, was born through a revolution. The Revolutionary War in America was "brought on"<sup>1</sup> by the efforts of Benjamin Cohen, Jewish councillor and attorney-general of Philadelphia, and a continuation of the war was made possible by subsidies from European Jews, mostly of Amsterdam, and negotiated by the New York Jew, Haym Solomon. The Anglo-American war of 1812 was financed by the same agencies, the richest man in New York being the Jew, Hendricks. The Civil War, which once and for all disposed of the right of the individual states to secede from the Union, was financed by Messrs. Seligmann of New York, who "obtained all the American and European finance available for the Civil War."<sup>2</sup> Then begins the epoch of Jacob Schiff of Frankfurt. His firm, Kuhn, Loeb and Co. (like the Warburgs, etc., in Germany), obtained control of many of the railways and pursued with great energy the work of making the whole economic life of the Union dependent upon the central money trust. In this work he was ably assisted by the "Gentile" banking house of Morgan, and to what extent he succeeded was seen in the findings of the Pujo Commission appointed by the U.S. government to look into the activities of the money-ring, before which Mr. Schiff, with Messrs. Morgan, had to appear. (1913).

The Russo-Japanese war was almost exclusively financed through the efforts of Mr. Schiff (*vide* "Life and Letters"), and the Russian Revolution of 1905 was equally made possible through "Western" finance (*vide* Francois Coty: "Financiers who sport with the World"). The two Russian revolutions of 1917, which brought an end to the Russian Empire

<sup>1</sup> Encyclopædia of Jewish Knowledge.

<sup>2</sup> Encyclopædia of Jewish Knowledge.

and native Russian culture and resulted in the emancipation of the vast Russian Jewries, were directly financed by Messrs. Schiff and Warburg in collaboration.

For the part played by Jewish leaders in the bringing about of the chief results of the last war, namely, the League of Nations, the financial subjugation of Great Britain, and the Russian Revolution, I can refer you to the "Letters" of Sir Cecil Spring-Rice (British Ambassador to Washington during the last war), the work "Geneva versus Peace" by the Comte de St. Aulaire (French Ambassador to the Court of St. James), and to "One Hundred Red Days," by Edgar Sisson, President Wilson's representative in Russia during 1917.

With regard to the actual *financing* of the Russian Revolution I would refer you to American State Papers Document Catalogue Volume 14, p. 2050, and as regards the participation of individual Jews in the actual uprising see British White Paper "Russia I, 1919," containing a warning against Bolshevism to the powers of the world, by His Excellency M. Oudendyke, the Netherlands Ambassador to St. Petersburg.

So much for the creation of the two largest Federations of the world, the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. I think it is a complete mistake to imagine that there is any essential difference in the economic systems of the two countries, just because one is *called* "Capitalist" and the other "Communist." If we examine the facts we shall find that from the very inception of the Soviet State there has been intimate *business* connection between the two Unions, although diplomatic relations, diplomatically enough, were not resumed until many years later. If you will turn to the Encyclopædia Britannica under "Russia, New Financial Policies," you will find:—

"The State Bank was established in 1921 and gives authority to issue bank notes as well as to serve as a credit institution . . . *the rouble was thus given its pre-war gold equivalent.*"

In other words, the Jewish system of finance, i.e., the issue of credit based on gold, was adopted by the "new" and "proletarian" country as obediently as by all the other "Capitalist" countries. The link between the two largest Federations in the world is, fittingly enough, the ruling Jewish financial house of the world, Kuhn, Loeb and Co., and when members of the families of Warburg, Kahn, etc., visit the Soviet capital they are received with royal pomp, the Soviet troops (whose caps are adorned with the five-pointed Star of David) presenting arms as they pass.

As for the participation of the Jews in the various Continental revolutions you should consult such works as "Secret Powers behind the Revolution," by Vicomte de Poncins; "Le Peril Judeo-Macconnique," by Jouin; "Waters Flowing Eastwards," by Mrs. L. Fry, and "Socialism," by Mrs. Nesta Webster.

You will find that Jewish leaders everywhere prepared the ground for revolution through the instrumentality of Secret Societies and other indirect methods, then financed the revolutionaries, and finally (when the tumult was at its greatest) achieved the aim of the revolution: civic equality for their co-religionists and, as often as not, "key" positions in the new "Parliamentarian" administrations. And this brings me to the party-system and its relation to the Jewish question.

The party-system appeared everywhere on the Continent under the auspices of Jewish party-leaders, and I am glad that you mention that this was also the case with the German Liberal Party. The whole party-system would seem to be the most ingenious device for splitting the Gentile populations up into groups professing different principles, but in reality all furthering the same fundamental policy—that of complete Socialisation of the countries as a preparation for a Federation of the Socialist states of the world. It will no doubt have surprised you that it should have been a "Conservative," Mr. Churchill, who was chosen to introduce measures of taxation and confiscation of property rights which all true Socialists can applaud, and which suspiciously resemble that Nazi and Communist legislation that have made Germany and Russia what they are to-day: totalitarian slave-states.

At this supreme moment all parties agree on the need for more restriction, more governmental interference, more National Socialism in fact, and their past quarrels on matters of administrative detail can be seen to have served the purpose of disuniting the people, and preventing them from demanding their birth-right of a fair share in that vast abundance which Anglo-Saxon engineering genius has made available, an abundance which the Jewish restrictive banking system has deliberately destroyed. A just distribution of the enormous wealth of the world would soon do away with the complex of laws with which we are now hampered, and result in a vast increase of *individual* freedom, based on economic security. Instead, every country in the world is being governed according to Jewish dogma of rewards and punishments: "If a man does not work neither shall he eat," and the available goods are as a consequence held back from the

people because work cannot be found. The work-policy has been carried to its logical conclusion only in two countries, Russia and Germany, with disastrous results. The present world conflict has, of course, to some extent obscured the fact that the work-policy does not work, but only to some extent. Even at this moment thousands of people cannot find work and suffer accordingly. The constant pre-occupation with "work" and chances of remuneration, etc., has so far prevented the majority of the Gentiles of all countries (with one notable exception) from discovering the central fraud of our age, namely, that we are ruled by a world government of Jewish financiers who restrict and issue the world's credit, which they have surreptitiously usurped from the people, and who deliberately and repeatedly engineer slumps and booms at will.

On these fundamental fallacies, the necessity for keeping the people constantly employed and the sacred right of private bankers to manipulate the world's credit, none of the existing parties have anything to say. Do you think that the fact that party-programmes (as shown in Mr. Masson's letter to you) have in so many cases been drawn up by Jews, and the fact that all parties depend on certain *secret* funds has any significance in this connection, or are they merely accidents?

Jews, as we have seen, have everywhere played important, often decisive, parts in revolutions, party-politics and war-finance. Sometimes they have been "professing" Jews, and sometimes not. A good many of the Jewish revolutionaries had even strayed so far from the Judaic fold as to be atheists. But whatever belief or non-belief they professed, their activities always helped to further the policy of the Jewish race, and they have invariably been financed from the same source. The financing by the "professing" Schiffs and Warburgs of the atheistic Trotsky and Lenin is a case in point.

Now you will perhaps be able to understand why I cannot accept the theory that official adherence to Judaism is in any way a determining factor in the Jewish make-up. If, however, you would say that a man remains a Jew as long as his actions prove that he is still under the influence of Judaic training, then I should be perfectly willing to agree with you. The chief characteristic of the Jew, as I have found it, is his ready acquiescence to conform to a set of arbitrary rules, as long as these rules have behind them the sanction of power. He sometimes tries to contravene the laws (as it is amply proved by the history of crime of Chicago) but he rarely, if ever, participates in any movement that aims at fundamental changes in the rules of the game of this present order.



It is significant that all that the majority of intelligent Jews can think of as a cure for the evils of our times is to combine all the corrupt and inefficient governments of the world under one central world government "backed by overwhelming force," which idea they present to the public under the name of Federal Union.

Instead of abolishing the gold standard they want to universalise it, instead of giving the power to issue credit back to the individual governments from which it has been usurped they want to yield that right to a world government for ever.

This characteristic of submitting to a set of fallacious, because unnatural rules is, I think, directly traceable to Judaism. The Jewish conception of a personal God who rules his people through a set of rules, and served by a priesthood endowed with all-powerful sanctions, has tainted the Jewish people, and through them, alas, the Gentile populations, to such an extent that it is nowadays quite rare to meet a person able to view each problem that comes along individually and freely. Making up rules, and then drawing-up blue prints and plans according to them, and trying to make reality suit the plans, is, I think, the chief Jewish contribution to our Civilisation. Unfortunately the Jewish rabbis, lawyers, and bankers, have never checked up their laws with those of nature, and it is through their complete unnaturalness that all Jewish rules and plans (the supreme of which is that of world-federation now in process of being put over) are bound to come to grief.

Whether the rest of the world will be involved in the débâcle, caused by a universal insistence on the maintenance of a purely arbitrary and fallacious money-system, remains to be seen. If individual Jews are to help in avoiding such a thing they will have to forget their traditional or "collective" fear of the sanctions of their priesthood, whether these be rabbis, bankers or Cabinet Ministers, and adopt a new attitude of fearless, personal approach to each problem as it appears. They will have to give up their habit of detailed planning of *other people's lives* and learn the supreme lesson of Jesus of Nazareth: "*The Kingdom of God is within YOU.*"

### **INTERMARRIAGE, "BLOOD," ETC.**

One of the problems to which such a personal fearless attitude must be adopted is that of Anti-Semitism. All Jewish works on this question are quite traditional, and therefore almost valueless, except in so far as they can furnish the student with some technical details. None of them so much as hint at the origin of the whole trouble.

You will recall Disraeli's description of the Jews as a

splendidly *organised* race. The expression is extremely apt. While other races have simply grown, the Jewish race has been "organised," they are, as the Moderns would say, the result of a very long process of conditioning. In one sense we are, of course, all the result of conditioning, but we should distinguish between more or less natural, and more or less artificial conditioning. The Jews have perhaps been the victims of more artificial conditioning than any other race we know.

In this process of conditioning, the "Law" has been the chief instrument. From Millman to the most modern historian it is obvious that the daily lives of the Jew of the Diaspora was hemmed in by a complex of laws, most of which were completely arbitrary, and it appears clearly that everywhere, from the Judarios of Spain to the Ghettoes of Russo-Poland, the pattern of law was fundamentally the same. You state that Abrahams is of the opinion (and Abrahams is an authority!) that the organisation of Jewry in the Ghetto of the Middle Ages was a "thoroughly democratic one; the only aristocracy being one of merit and learning."

It is characteristic of that traditional or collective attitude that I mentioned, that not one of the Jewish scholars of these matters have been struck by the fact that all the Jewish communities were ruled by a very few families whose chief members occupied most singular double-positions as the chief Rabbi, Banker-Legislator of their own communities (over which they in many cases had full and *absolute* authority) and at the same time as chief financial advisor, tax-collector or body-physician of the local Popes, Emperors and Kings. This is curious, as this fact would seem to furnish the key to the Jewish (or anti-Semitic) problem.

Mediæval Jew-baiting can be traced more especially to the Code of Justinian, the implementation of which resulted in the complete segregation of the European Jewries. If you will refer to Justinian in the Jewish Encyclopædia you will find that the Emperor and Empress had highly influential *Jewish* friends and advisors. Theodosius was one of them.

If you turn to Italy you will see that there was hardly a mediæval pope without his Jewish body-physician or financial agent, and at one moment there was even a Jewish pope, as in early days of the Church of St. Peter's. The Catholic Church was responsible for several of the major prosecutions of the Jews.

If you look up Spain you will learn that King Ferdinand was a quarter-Jew and surrounded by "converted" Jewish advisors. King Ferdinand was responsible for the edict of expulsion of all *orthodox* Jews from his domains. He intro-

duced the Inquisition, which incidentally was introduced in Portugal by King John on the advice of another "converted" Jew.

I will then ask you to consider the fact that most of the persecutions started *everywhere* by that curious accusation of Ritual Murder. Does it not strike you as being strange that all the Gentile populations should have thought of exactly the same device for getting things going?

Let us, however, leave aside assuming and turn to one page of Jewish community-life where we can prove that the originators of the restrictive legislation were actually the Jewish leaders themselves. Under the titles of Kahal, Poland, Russia<sup>1</sup> (I hardly dare refer you to an unauthoritative writer like Brafman: "The Kahal") you will find an enlightening description of life in the largest Ghetto of the modern period. Here was a community virtually autonomous, i.e., the ruling "board" or government, consisting of the usual few wealthy families, had supreme power (even right of capital punishment) over their own people. At the same time we read that the "Gentile" government, under which the Jewish government was supposed to be, on several occasions quite openly was influenced by the decisions of the Jewish Elders, or Board.

Law-making and law-enforcing had reached quite ridiculous proportions. No one could do anything without the written permission of the "Board." The study of the Talmud flourished exceedingly, and the misery and degradation of the Jewish masses, the Amharez of old, were so great that they time and again in vain entreated the Gentile Government to rid them of their own government. In the words of the Jewish Encyclopædia the Jewish administration had become "an oligarchy . . . the administration of the Kahal was monopolised by the rich, who managed to remain in authority through ties of relationship and common interest. At times the administrative authority was retained in the hands of a few powerful families."

It was from this Russo-Polish "Pale" that batches of Ghetto-Jews, at propitious moments, were fetched over to the Western World by the Jewish leaders such as Schiff, and the centre of gravity of Jewish life began to shift from Poland and Russia to the U.S.A. Everywhere they participated as agitators, socialists and leaders of "movements" in establishing, on a world-wide scale, the same kind of law-hampered socialistic (or if you prefer "democratic") society from which they had come. It is, of course, only too obvious that not one in a thousand knows what he is doing. But the results of their

<sup>1</sup> In the Jewish Encyclopædia.

actions are there for all to see. New York, Chicago, Birmingham, Liverpool. are monuments to the "efficiency" of Jewish administration. In the final bringing about of complete socialism, i.e., complete subjugation of the individual to an authority called the "state," which is now taking place in the U.S.A. under the name of "New Deal" (Baruch, Frankfurter, Sol Blum), and here under the auspices of Mr. Moses Israel Sieff of Political and Economic Planning (in conjunction with Churchill and his socialist friends, Greenwood, etc.), the Jewish hand is only too visible. Everything has to be done communally, including eating, and Lord Woolton hopes that it will all be continued after the war. In the Ghetto the Jews had to take their turn over "communal pots and pans." So you see, we are almost home again. Almost . . .

In conclusion, a word on the question of intermarriage. There does not seem to be any doubt that the Jewish marital laws aimed at preserving a central core of ethnically distinct individuals as that, in fact, is what they have resulted in. But I am perfectly well aware that a certain margin of Jews have always been allowed to stray outside the Judaic fold. We know for instance (Encyclopædia of Jewish Knowledge) that merchants of the first guild and *Jewish prostitutes* were allowed outside the Pale of Settlement in Russo-Poland. We know also that a surprisingly large percentage of the Rothschild daughters married into the local aristocracies of Austria, France and England, in which countries the families soon acquired large landed estates. And then, of course, there are all those "converted" intellectualists and politicians who remained "converted."

You object to Mr. Masson using the term of banker in connection with Mr. Baruch of New York, whom you describe as an industrialist. In the States, however, he is better known as "the Eagle of Wall Street" or even as the "unofficial president of the U.S.A." He was already before the world war connected in business with Jacob Schiff of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., and was during the war appointed by Schiff (via Mr. Wilson) to supervise all Allied purchases, in which position he had more power than any other man" as he himself has stated. He "has been identified with the New York Stock Exchange" is the comment of the Encyclopædia of Jewish knowledge. He has been known to suggest appointees to directorships of the Federal Reserve Board, most powerful central bank in the world, and his suggestions have been known to have carried weight. Perhaps the term "financier" would be more suitable.

Finally I would refer you for proof of the inconsistencies between the various parts of Judaic law to that collection of

extracts from the Talmud commonly known as the Shulcran Aruch, which was compiled by your co-religionist Rabbi Joseph Caro. Law No. 55 states, "It is always a meritorious deed to get hold of a Gentile's possessions." It is of this legal work that the Jewish intellectual leader Ginsberg in his reply to Rabbi Lohi said in 1897 "with all its uncouth sections it was the book that best suited the spirit of our people."

Yours truly,

BORGE JENSEN.

P.S.—I rather envy you the possession of the stately volumes of the Jewish Encyclopædia, particularly as they appear to have been withdrawn from circulation.

**(Dr. Cohen's Fourth Letter.)**

Tyn Twll,  
Bonwm, Corwen,  
North Wales,

*January 12th, 1941.*

The Rev. Dr. A. COHEN,  
2, Highfield Road,  
Edgbaston,  
Birmingham.

SIR,

I have to thank you for your letter of the 8th inst. I am interested in the information that the Jewish Encyclopædia has not been "withdrawn from circulation" but that it has become so out-of-date since 1906 that the publishers have stopped printing it. It is strange, however, that the usual procedure of adding modern matter to the already published articles should not have been adhered to in the case of the first Jewish work of reference of this kind to appear in the English language. All the more so, as interest in Jewish matters has increased among English-speaking peoples proportionately with the increase of Jewish citizens among them.

I might relate, as a matter of interest, that in two different libraries I have found matter torn out of this work, in one case the article on the Kol Nidre prayer had been subjected to this form of vandalism.

I am equally interested in the fact that you make the continuance of this correspondence dependent upon (a) my providing professorial support for my historical views and (b) my procuring a copy on anti-Semitism by a lecturer at the University of Upsala. These conditions of yours have prompted me to reconsider the nature of that arresting phenomenon, Authority.

Looking up the word authority in the Concise Oxford Dictionary I find it to mean: *power, or right to enforce obedience*, and further, a person possessed of such power.

Now I think you will agree with me that throughout their Ghetto-history the masses of the Jewish people have lived under a virtually absolute dictatorship, ruled by a power which had the right to enforce obedience. This authority was generally exercised by the former incumbents of the priestly office you hold, and the chief rabbis were in many cases also the chief lawgivers, judges and bankers.

For two thousand years the Jews have been content to delegate the power to rule themselves to an external authority having behind it overwhelmingly powerful sanctions, and it matters little in this connection whether we accept the traditional view (which is yours) that the real despot was the Gentile ruler, or mine that it was his Jewish advisor.

The fact that the Jews have for so long been subjected to an external authority has produced in them what I should call an authority-complex, the two main characteristics of which are a deep respect for, and fear of, authority, and a great desire to wield such authority themselves.

The surprising speed with which the Jews everywhere on the opening of their Ghettos rose to positions of influence and authority can, in part at least, be explained by their burning desire for the kind of authority to which they for centuries had been subjected. It is perhaps understandable that they in their anxiety to "get to the top" should for the most part have been unaware of the fact that their personal successes furthered the creation of those vast centralized states of which I have spoken.

The two outstanding examples of such centralized despotisms are, of course, Germany and Russia. That the administration of one is largely in the hands of Gentiles and the other, to some extent at least, in the hands of Jews should not blind us to the fundamental similarity of their policies.

We are to-day engaged in a supreme struggle not, as certain Jews maintain, because so many Gentiles succumbed to Hitler's anti-Semitic propaganda, but because the totalitarian view of life and the democratic view of life cannot exist side by side. The fundamental issue to be decided once and for all, is whether it is right for any man to exercise any kind of power over another man except with the other man's consent, or whether it is wrong.

The true democrat and the true Christian does not recognise any outside authority whatsoever. He knows that his

life must be regulated by what he thinks is right, that the Kingdom of God is within him. He knows that he has no right whatsoever to lay down laws for other people to follow. This view of life is instinctive with the majority of the Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian peoples, and it is for that reason they have attained their high level of friendly co-operation. This is also the reason why the British Empire, the last bulwark against Totalitarianism, is the chief object for the evil designs of the world's dictators *and their backers*.

It is now obvious to all intelligent observers that there are powers at work who under cover of war are busily drawing up vast blue-prints for turning Britain into a work-for-all-state on Russo-German lines, in which there will be no room for free initiative of any kind; and only if a sufficient number of people can challenge the totalitarian attitude of "leaving it to the authorities" and assert their independence as free citizens shall we emerge victorious from the present struggle. The question now is: shall we get any help in this matter from members of the Jewish race? Will they be able to discard their inborn totalitarian frame of mind? Will they give up their aptitude to accept anything that comes from an "authoritative source"? Can they overcome their traditional inclination to lay down the law for other people? Will they, in fact, begin to exercise their own judgment?

You will have understood from the foregoing that even if I were able to comply with your stipulation I should not want to do so, and this must therefore be considered my last communication to you.

I would, however, like you to consider for a moment the nature of the two branches of learning for which you evidently cherish so high a respect, History and Political Economy.

The kind of political economy that is taught at British and other universities originated, as we have seen, with a member of the Anglo-Jewish banking family of Ricardo. The methods employed by academic economists, whether of the "Liberal" or the "Marxist" variety, are deductive rather than inductive, and whenever "remedies" suggested from these quarters have been carried into effect the results have been disastrous. It is but natural that we should find the Jewish financier Sir Ernest Cassel (an intimate friend of Jacob Schiff of Kuhn, Loeb and Co.) endowing an institution like the London School of Economics. It is, as one might say, in the family tradition. It is just as much in the order of things that one of the leaders in the present "Socialist" attack on English property rights like Dr. Hugh Dalton, should have occupied the position of Cassel lecturer at that institution. Political Economy can in

fact now be seen largely to have served the purpose of giving an air of academic respectability to the Jewish system of finance.

When we turn to official History we find most historians mainly occupied in giving surface descriptions of past events, much in the same manner as the press and the wireless with regard to present-day happenings. The techniques employed are practically identical, and productive of the same result: a feeling, at first, of puzzled helplessness in the face of the chaotic series of catastrophes presented as "history" and later the lasting impairment of that imaginative faculty which enables the individual to discern amidst the welter of "events" the forces that shape them.

From what we now know of the workings of International Diplomacy, Freemasonry, and Finance, we are justified in concluding that academic history, like orthodox Political Economy, has served only as a prop and a smokescreen for those invisible and powerful forces of which Disraeli told us. There is consequently nothing strange to me in the fact that Mr. Fisher, the expert historian, never refers to any of the facts I have put before you, and I would not hesitate to prophesy that if he so much as hinted at the existence of the real "power behind the throne," his official life would be made just as uncomfortable as Mr. Priestley's at the B.B.C. when this gentleman said a word too much on the subject of the control and issue of the Nation's Credit.

In conclusion I would like to state, as you do not seem to have grasped it, that the burden of my argument is this: anti-Semitism is an integral part of the administration of the Jewish masses by their own leaders. It can be seen to have served the purpose of (a) keeping the Jewish masses in conditions such as would make them willing to carry out any undertaking if sufficiently rewarded and (b) of dispersing them throughout the civilized world in a manner to ensure their usefulness in the furtherance of the Jewish Policy: the universal enslavement of the Gentiles by means of "banking," "law," etc.; to culminate in a Jewish world government: Federal Union.

Yours faithfully,

BORGE JENSEN.