



# **The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit and Its Impact on World History (Selections)**

by E. Michael Jones

Edited by Darrell Sean, culture warrior and part-time E. Michael  
Martyr

**E. Michael Jones, Ph.D.** is the Editor of *Culture Wars* magazine, as well as author of 11 books, including [The Angel and the Machine; Degenerate Moderns; Horror: A Biography; The Slaughter of Cities and Libido Dominandi.](#)

**The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit  
and Its Impact on World History**

**Hardcover: 1,200 pages**

**Cost: \$48.00 plus \$8.00 S&H**

**ISBN: 0-929891-07-4**

**Publisher: Fidelity Press**

**Order #: 574-289-9786**

<http://www.culturewars.com/>

## **CONTENTS**

- 1. The Revolutionary Jew and His Impact on World History**
- 2. Rabbi Dresner's Dilemma: Torah v. Ethnos [On Jews and Pornography]**
- 3. The Apology In Context: Fifty Years of Catholic-Jewish Kulturkampf**
- 4. Guilt by Association**
- 5. The Conversion of the Revolutionary Jew**
- 6. "The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit and Its Impact on World History":  
A Review By Robert A. Sungenis, Ph.D.**
- 7. An Interview with Dr. E. Michael Jones on *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit***

### **1. The Revolutionary Jew and His Impact on World History**

This article was published in the September, 2003 issue of Culture Wars magazine.

### **1648 Annus Mirabilis**

According to the Zohar, the year 1648 was to be the mystical year of resurrection, when the Jews could expect deliverance from their more than millennium long exile. Heinrich Graetz, a German Jew, a devotee of the Enlightenment and author of one of the most frequently cited

histories of the Jewish people, calls the Zohar that "lying book" and by extension impugns the entire Kabbalistic tradition. Since the Enlightenment was in many ways a direct result of the disappointment which followed from the failure of the Messianic expectations which reached their fever pitch and denouement in the second half of the 17th century, his skepticism is understandable, as is his scorn for the Kaballah, the mish-mash what he considered Gnostic and Talmudic mumbo-jumbo that had led to the rise and fall of Messianic hope in the first place. Graetz espoused a worldview which was the complete antithesis of the Messianic fever of the mid-17th century. He was so convinced in his opposition to the Kaballah because he had the benefit of historical hindsight and could see where its vaporous illusions were leading the Jewish people. Expectation of redemption fostered by widespread dissemination of Kabbalistic doctrine made the Jews, in Graetz's words, "more reckless and careless than was their custom at other times."

Just what Graetz meant by reckless can be derived from his analysis of Polish Jewry, which had become by the time of the period in question a hotbed of Kabbalistic thought. Beginning with the Statute of Kalisz in 1251, the Jews of Poland were granted rights like nowhere else in Europe. They were even granted their own autonomous legal system, known as the kahal, which allowed them to adjudicate intra-Jewish

disputes without recourse to the Polish Christian legal system. This autonomy, in turn, necessitated the intensive study of the Talmud, which, according to Graetz, led to the peculiar corruption of Polish Jews. The reliance on the Talmud as the basis of Jewish legal autonomy created a culture of "hair-splitting judgment" among the rabbis, according to Graetz, as well as "a love of twisting, distorting, ingenious quibbling, and a foregone antipathy to what did not lie within their field of vision," which in turn trickled down to find expression in the behavior of vulgar, who "found pleasure and a sort of triumphant delight in deception and cheating." Since by the end of the 18th century, the overwhelming majority of Jews lived in Poland, Jews in general earned, as a result, the reputation of being "a nation of deceivers," to give Immanuel Kant's formulation. "It does indeed seem strange," Kant, the quintessential Enlightenment philosopher, continued, "to conceive of a nation of deceivers, but it is also very strange to conceive of a nation of merchants, the majority of whom, bound by an ancient superstition accepted by the state they live in, do not seek any civil dignity, but prefer to make good this disadvantage with the benefits of trickery at the expense of the people who shelter them and at the expense of each other. In a nation of merchants, unproductive members of society . . . it cannot be otherwise"( Kant, Werke Bd. vii, p. 205-6). From his vantage point in Königsberg, the capital of what was then East Prussia, a country

which the Teutonic Knights wrested by force from the Slavic natives, all Jews were Polish Jews.

Graetz, the Enlightenment Jew and apostle of German culture and Jewish assimilation to it, echoes Kant but confines his censure to the Jews of Poland, who, according to his judgment, "acquired the quibbling method of the schools and employed it to outwit the less cunning." Piety and knowledge of the hair-splitting distinctions of the Talmud became one and the same thing for the Polish Jew, a combination which, when added to the dogmatism of the rabbis, "undermined their moral sense" and made them prone to "sophistry and boastfulness."

Largely as a result of the concessions of the Polish crown which began with the Statute of Kalisz, Poland became known throughout Europe as the "paradisus Judeorum," the paradise of the Jews. When persecutions would flare up in the traditionally Jewish sections of Europe, in the German principalities, particularly in the urban centers of the Rhein valley, as they frequently did throughout the middle ages, the Jews who wished to escape persecution inevitably headed east toward Poland, taking their language, "juedische Deutsch," or Yiddish with them. When Isaac Bashevis Singer won the Nobel Prize toward the end of the 20th century, he was designated a Pole by the selection committee, and yet in spite of that fact had to admit in a moment of candor that he

understood Polish only with difficulty, even though he lived his entire youth in Poland. Jews did not assimilate in Poland; most of them did not learn the language of the Christian Poles, because, other than rudimentary commerce and illicit sexual activity, the Jews had virtually no contact with the Poles even though they had lived in their country for centuries. The Jews established their own state within a state there; they established their own legal system and courts there as well, and, if demographic evidence is conclusive in matters like this, the Polish paradise was the most successful modus vivendi Jews ever found in the West.

### **Jewish Demographics**

A short summary of Jewish demographics gives some indication of how successful the Jews were in living under Polish rule. Between 1340 and 1772, when Poland was partitioned for the first time, the Jewish population of Poland increased 75-fold while, during the same period of time the Christian population only quintupled. The disparity in population increase is explainable in simple terms. Persecution in the west, largely during the period from the 11th to the 16th century, caused massive immigration. Jews moved to Polish territory during that period of time in unprecedented numbers. By the time Poland was partitioned for the third and final time in 1795, 80 percent of the world's Jews lived there.

This phenomenal expansion of the Jewish population in Poland was matched by a correspondingly rapid increase in wealth, and that, in turn, corresponded to a dramatic expansion of the territorial limits of Poland. The Golden Age of Polish Jews, according to Pogonowski, lasted from 1500 to 1648. By 1634, which is to say toward the closing years of this age, Poland had become the largest country in Europe. Its territory extended from the Baltic almost to the Black Sea and from Silesia in the west to what is now the heart of the Ukraine, two hundred kilometers east of the Dnieper River. As a result, by the middle of the 17th century, as much as 60 percent of Poland's population was not ethnically Polish, a situation which was bound to cause friction sooner or later, depending on how wisely the Polish rulers treated their alloethnic subjects.

Instead of wisdom, what followed was a classical case of cultural drift in which imperial expansion covered over internal decay until finally the contradictions and injustices which had become an integral part of the system became so insupportable that the bubble burst, and an orgy of violence followed, eventually dragging the Polish state into extinction. The story of Poland was in many ways the story of Imperial Rome writ small. Imperial expansion to the east into what is now the Ukraine, the Crimea and Belorus resulted in the creation of

huge estates, some the size of western European countries like Holland and Switzerland. The estates were called Latifundia, an ironic comment on the blindness of the Polish nobility, who failed to see the mischief which the Latifundia system had wrought in ancient Rome. The Polish Noble's republic was a classic oligarchy, as Plato defined the term in his Republic. As in ancient Greece, so in Poland; wealth concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, led to rebellion among the lower classes. As in ancient Rome, wealth concentrated in fewer and fewer hands fueled a system of imperialism in which the chief losers were the overwhelming majority of the Polish people, in particular, as in Rome, the citizen soldiers, who were driven to the wall by the monopoly conditions the Latifundia fostered. When the rebellion finally came, all Poles would be held responsible for the excesses of the magnates who created the system which had dispossessed the average Polish citizen in the first place.

As in ancient Rome, the citizen soldiers who had been the backbone of the republic's legions became the disenfranchised rural proletariat once wealth became concentrated in the hands of the magnates. "The citizen-soldiers who owned small and medium estates," according to Pogonowski, "suffered numerous bankruptcies and were becoming landless while still retaining their full civil rights and privileges." As a result, "many of them had to seek employment in the huge estates

called latifundia." This, of course, meant that more political power migrated to the land magnates, who were now the employers of the enfranchised. As a result, "the political machines of the owners of the latifundia enabled them to attain an oligarchic control of the politics of Poland. Their control of the national parliament was based on their grip on the provincial legislatures."

In 1633, the Sejm passed a law forbidding Poland's nobility from selling liquor or engaging in commercial activities. The Polish noble citizens—both the wealthy and the impoverished—, in other words, retained political control of the country, but lost economic control because they were forbidden to engage in commercial activity. Because the Polish magnates owned the land but were unable to engage in commerce, they were forced to hand over the job of income extraction to the nation's Jews, who would pay a set fee for a lease to raise the money the nobles needed. The system of pre-paid, short-term leases was known in Poland as "arenda." The connection between the arenda system of tax-farming and the Jews was so intimate that it eventually found expression in the Polish language. In legal contracts in the 17th and 18th century, the Polish word "arendarz" or tax-farmer and "Jew" are synonymous. According to Pogonowski, "15 percent of urban and 80 percent of rural Jewish heads of households were occupied within the arenda system."

The Jewish legal system, or kahal, brokered these licenses to well-to-do Jews, who in turn often subleased them to less well-to-do relatives. In Polish private law, *arenda* was defined as "the leasing of immovable property or rights. The subject of the lease might be a whole territory, held either in ownership or in pledge [or] the subject might be a tavern, mill or the right to collect various payments such as a bridge toll or a payment connected with a jurisdiction." A Jew, for example, might take out a short-term lease on a church, in defiance of church law. This meant that he was in sole possession of the key to the church door, which could only be opened for the performance of weddings or baptisms after payment of a fee, a practice which naturally led to resentment among Christians. Since the lease was of necessity a short-term lease, it was in the Jew's interest to charge as much money as he could to make back his investment and some profit, since the lease might not be renewed. Or, if it were, someone else might outbid him for it. There was, in other words, no financial incentive to create good will among the local population from which the *arendator* earned his living. The Jewish tax-farmers had the support of the state—Pogonowski estimates that 20 to 70 percent of the income of the large estates was generated by tax-farming leases held by Jews— but lacked the good will of the community which was the source of that livelihood. Since the Jew was

not a part of that community, and in fact had developed, as Graetz indicates, a whole culture of treating the goyim with contempt, he could exploit the situation well beyond what would have been considered tolerable had Catholic Poles been running the system:

Arenda-type short -term leases resulted in intensive exploitation of the leased estates, as the lessees tended to overwork the land, peasants and equipment without worrying about long-term effects. The peasants experienced additional hardships when Jewish arrendators obtained the right to collect and even impose taxes and fees for church services. The peasants and Cossacks in Kresy [the newly colonized lands of the east] bitterly resented having to pay Jews for the use of Eastern Orthodox and Greek-catholic churches for funerals, baptism, weddings and other similar occasions (Iwo Cyprian Pogonowski, *Jews in Poland: A Documentary History The Rise of Jews as a Nation from Congressus Judaicus in Poland to the Knesset in Israel* [New York: Hippocrene Books, Inc.1993], p. 68).

Because of the arenda system and the prohibition against distilling spirits which became legally binding in 1633, the Jews assumed total control of the liquor business, which meant that, on the one hand, they could manipulate the price of grain by diverting it to more profitable use as distilled spirits and that, on the other hand, it

was in their interest to engage in the intense promotion of alcohol consumption, to maximize profits during the short-term of the lease. This led to chronic drunkenness, decreased productivity, and, of course, increased resentment against Jews, as a group which was perceived as constantly seeking to exploit the weaknesses of the majority population as a way of enhancing their own wealth and power.

Graetz talks about the Jew experienced in financial matters as a salutary counterbalance to the impetuous, headstrong, and ultimately child-like Polish nobleman:

"The high nobility continued to be dependent on Jews, who in a measure counterbalanced the national defects. Polish flightiness, levity, unsteadiness, extravagance and recklessness were compensated for by Jewish prudence, sagacity, economy and cautiousness. The Jew was more than a financier to the Polish nobleman; he was his help in embarrassment, his prudent adviser, his all in all."

There are other ways of viewing the "unique utilitarian alliance [that] was formed between the huge landowners and the Jewish financial elite." Looked at one way, Jewish migration to Poland brought with it Jewish capital, and Jewish capital was soon put at the disposal of the Polish crown and the large landowning magnates, whose estates expanded

dramatically in size. The Polish magnates proceeded to use both the Jews and their money to expand the Polish empire into the fertile steppes of the Ukraine, Belorus and the northern shore of the Black Sea. Looked at in another way, this alliance concentrated the wealth into fewer and fewer hands, especially during the period of intense Jewish colonization in the Ukraine during the 80 year period between 1569 and 1648. Since the leases involved monopoly rights, the Jewish tax-farmers could increase the political power of their wealthy patrons, and their own wealth and influence as well, by driving the smaller independent landowners to the wall. Increasing their power in the short term, however, only increased the magnitude and violence of the reaction when it eventually came. It was during this Drang nach Osten, this expansion to the East, that troubles began to appear in the Jewish paradise. The success of the new system contained within in it the seeds of its own destruction.

### **Radical Disjunction**

The radical disjunction between political and economic power in Poland meant that the enfranchised noble citizens gradually lost control of their culture. The easy-going Polish oligarchs, wedded to an economic system that seemed so eminently successful in bringing new lands under the Polish crown, failed to understand that the control over those territories was being undermined from within by the very people they

relied on for its administration. This happened gradually, of course, and it began to manifest itself first in the area of religion. Flush with the short-term wealth which the *arenda* system created and the territorial expansion which it enabled, the Polish kings ignored the biggest cultural crisis of their day, the Protestant revolt against Catholic hegemony over Europe. There was no Inquisition in Poland. As a result, what might have happened in Spain did happen there. Poland became a model for tolerance, but in doing so paved the way for its own extinction at the end of the 18th century.

At a time when the Duke of Alba was battling Calvinists and Jews in the Netherlands and in effect setting up a barrier beyond which the Reformation would not pass, saving all of southern Europe beginning at Antwerp from the rebellion which had devastated England and the North, Sigismund August II, ruler of both Poland and Lithuania, surrounded himself with Jews and the Protestant revolutionaries the Poles called Demi-Jews. The "Reformers" in Poland were largely Unitarian and Socinian followers of Michael Servetus, who, in Graetz's words, "undermined the foundations of Christianity," by "rejecting the veneration of Jesus as a divine person."

Flush with the money they provided, King Sigismund indulged his disordered passions and handed the country over to his Jewish and

Demi-Jewish administrators for them to rule as they wished. As a result peasants everywhere groaned under the predations of the Jewish tax-farmers, who in turn lent money to the king at usurious rates of interest, thereby keeping him under their power as well. Rabbi Mendel Frank of Brest, according to Walsh, "was so influential that he was called the King's Officer." As in England at the same time, the Polish nobles were torn between religious principle and economic interest. As in England, economic considerations won out and "the nobility in most cases held its protecting hand over the Jews to whom it was tied by the community of economic interests." In other words, the Polish oligarchs "were either in debt to the Jews, or employed them to squeeze taxes from them out of the peasants, naturally at a good profit for the tax-farmers, who took their toll from dairies, mills, distilleries, farms." The Jews "were indispensable to the easy-going magnate, who was wont to let his estates take care of themselves and wile away his time at the capital, at the court, in merry amusements, or at the tumultuous sessions of the national and provincial assemblies, where politics was looked upon as a form of entertainment rather than as a serious pursuit. This Polish aristocracy put a check on the anti-Semitic endeavors of the clergy." The Jesuits warred with the Jews over the mind of the Polish oligarchs, but there was no Inquisition in Poland, and no Counter-Reformation. Calvinism was spreading among these nobles virtually unchecked by any official

Catholic resistance. As a result, Poland became, in Graetz's words, "a second Babylon for the Jews."

By the death of Sigismund II in 1572, the Jews had attained enough power to name his successor in collaboration with the Porte in Constantinople, the Huguenots in France, and the English Protestants. The man who brokered the deal was Solomon ben Nathan Ashkenazi, adviser to Grand Visier Mohammed Sokoli. Solomon Ashkenazi was a German Jew by birth who had migrated, as so many of his race had, to the paradise of the Jews, where he eventually became chief physician to King Sigismund. He then migrated by way of Venice to Constantinople, where he served the sultan as faithfully as he had served the Polish king. Solomon Ashkenazi had succeeded Joseph Nasi, also an adviser to the sultan, as "a sort of unofficial leader of world Jewry." Like Nasi, Ashkenazi orchestrated events following the death of Sigismund from behind the scenes. "Christian cabinets," Graetz informs us, "did not suspect that the course of events which compelled them to side with one party or the other was set in motion by a Jewish hand. This was especially so in the case of the election of the Polish king."

Locked into such a profitable alliance with the Jews, the Polish magnates saw little reason to change a system from which they profited

so effortlessly and enormously. As a result the exactions of the Jewish tax-farmers became onerous to the point of intolerable among the peasantry in general, but especially among the newly colonized Cossacks, who never felt themselves a part of the Polish nation or, as Orthodox, part of the Catholic culture of the west. The political crisis, which had been growing during the last 80 years of Polish imperial expansion, corresponded as well to the worst excesses of the *arendas* system. Reform of the system was urgently necessary; and a bill of reform eventually made its way to the Sejm.

In 1647, as one of the preconditions that prepared the way for a Polish crusade against the Ottoman empire, the Cossacks were promised full civil rights and enfranchisement over a period of time as Polish citizens. That meant that "the harsh exploitation by Jewish holders of short time leases was to be lessened by banning the collection of such payments as church fees for funerals, weddings, baptisms, etc." It also meant that disobedience to the tax-farmers was no longer to be considered a capital crime. It also meant that the Jesuits would no longer be assigned to Cossack territory in the Southern Ukraine, and that as a result they would no longer pressure Orthodox to submit to Rome's authority. Finally, it meant that the Jews were to be evicted from the southern Ukraine along with the Jesuits.

When the bill came to a vote in 1648, the Sejm, dominated by the alliance of huge landowners and their Jewish administrators, defeated the measure, providing a classic instance of how the concentration of wealth and power into a few hands can enable that group to pursue its own interests, with total disregard of the common good, over the brink of that self-interest into national disaster.

The situation in Poland during the first half of the 17th century was roughly analogous to the situation in Spain a century and a half earlier. Spain was the only other country in Europe with an equally influential Jewish population. As in Poland, many Sephardic Jews engaged in behavior that caused resentment among the lower classes. During the famine in Cuenca in 1326 Jewish usurers charged farmers 40 percent interest on the money they needed to borrow to buy grain for sowing. Blasphemy had become a Jewish custom in Spain. Moses, according to Walsh, "had condemned blasphemers to death. Yet it was a custom of many Jews to blaspheme the Prophet for whom Moses had warned them to prepare." The Jews, as a result, "were disliked not for practicing the things that Moses taught, but for doing the things he had forbidden. They had profited hugely on the sale of fellow-beings as slaves, and practiced usury as a matter of course, and flagrantly." Blasphemy went hand in hand with Jewish proselytizing, which often took place by compulsion. Jews would force Christian servants to get

circumcised as a condition of employment. They would encourage people to whom they had lent money to abjure Christ.

The Jews who defined themselves as the antithesis of Christianity had developed the habit of conspiring with Christendom's enemies. Although they flourished under Visigothic rule in Spain, they were not long thereafter found conspiring with the Arabs in Africa to overthrow the Visigothic monarchy. At the beginning of the 8th century they used their contacts with African Jews to prepare the invasion of the Mohammedan Berbers across the straits of Gibraltar. Once the Mohammedans conquered Spain, the Jews flourished under their rule, achieving as a result one of the most sophisticated cultures in Europe at the time. The Jews excelled in medicine and brought Aristotle to Europe. However, the flower of Sephardic culture drew its economic substance from unsavory roots. The Sephardic Jews grew rich on slaves and usury.

When the Spaniards began their reconquista, the Jews were not persecuted. According to Walsh,

"Saint Fernando, on taking Cordoba from the Saracens, turned over four mosques to the large Jewish population, to convert into synagogues, and gave them one of the most delightful parts of the city for their

homes, on two conditions: that they refrain from reviling the Christian religion, and from proselytizing among Christians. The Jews made both promises, and kept neither."

Resentment against usury combined with the suspicion that the Jews were using their influence to thwart the reconquista, or take control themselves of the already reconquered regions with the secret help of the Moors led to the riots of the late 14th century. If the monarchs did nothing to curb Jewish influence, the outraged citizens simply took the law into their own hands and widespread bloodshed was the result. Leniency only created more violence, as in the case of Pedro the Cruel, who was perceived as giving "his Jewish friends complete control of his government; a circumstance that led his enemies to call him a Jewish changeling, and contributed to his denunciation by a Pope as 'a facilitator of Jews and Moors, a propagator of infidelity, and a slayer of Christians.'" By the end of the 14th century, Spain's Christian population, convinced that the Jews were "planning to rule Spain, enslave the Christians, and establish a New Jerusalem in the West" began acting on their suspicions by taking the law into their own hands. Widespread bloodshed was one result. Widespread conversion, both sincere and forced, was another.

### **Rabbi Solomon Converts**

The similarities with Poland are obvious. The Sephardic Jews were, if anything, more a part of Spanish culture than the Ashkenazim were part of Polish culture. The differences, however, are even more striking than the similarities. Unlike the situation in Poland, many Spanish Jews became sincere converts to Christianity. Resentment against the Jews had led to widespread rioting in 1391, and that in turn riveted the attention of the church on the Jews. St. Vincent Ferrer, as a consequence, led crusades for the conversion of the Jews. In 1391 he achieved his most spectacular success when Rabbi Solomon ha-Levi converted to the Catholic faith and became Paul of Burgos or Paul de Santa Maria (1351-1435). Levi was thoroughly conversant with Talmudic literature and was acquainted with the leading Jewish scholars of his day as well. He embraced Christianity as a result of the efforts of St. Vincent Ferrer and reading the works of St. Thomas Aquinas. His conversion, however, only increased the general animus against the Jews by revealing the evidence of anti-Christian conspiracy from the inside, so to speak. There was evidence enough. The man formerly known as Rabbi Solomon ha-Levi was, after all, a Jewish insider if there ever was one, and he followed up on his conversion by implicating the Jews in a conspiracy to overthrow the Christian monarchs of the Iberian peninsula. After his conversion, Levi published "two dialogues in which he categorically declared that the Jews were bent upon ruling Spain."

Similarly, another Jewish convert Fray Alonso de Espina eventually became confessor to Henry IV and Rector of the University of Salamanca. In 1459 Espina wrote *Fortalitium Fidei*, one of the most bitterly anti-Jewish documents in history. In his diatribe against the Conversos, Espina "suggested that if an Inquisition were established in Castile, large numbers of them would be found to be only pretending Christians, engaged in judaizing and in undermining the Faith they professed."

Not all of the conversions following the turmoil of 1391, as numerous Jewish converts themselves indicated, were sincere. The fear which the reprisals created led to an equally unfortunate spate of forced conversions, which only compounded the problem of subversion, which had led to the riots and forced conversions in the first place. Forced conversion is antithetical to the Christian faith. "The unwilling," Pope Gregory the Great wrote at the beginning of a tradition that would remain unchanged throughout the papacy, "are not to be compelled." Gregory is also responsible for the creation of the formula which would guide later popes in their dealings with the Jews, "Sicut Judaeis non," a formula which, according to Synan, was "destined to recur endlessly in papal documents concerning Jewish rights and disabilities throughout the Middle Ages":

"Just as license out not to be presumed for the Jews to do anything in their synagogues beyond what is permitted by law, so in those points conceded to them, they ought to suffer nothing prejudicial" (Edward A. Synan, *The Popes and the Jews in the Middle Ages* [New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965], p. 46.

Popes throughout the period in question walked a fine line between two extremes, symbolized in our account by Poland, which erred by allowing Jews to usurp Christian privilege and Spain, which erred by excessive rigor, especially by promoting the abuse of forced conversion. Popes protested both abuses, but, in the case of Spain, unscrupulous politicians, seeking in forced conversion a quick fix to a difficult problem, ignored the warnings and created a deeper, more intractable problem instead of solving the original problem. Many Jews accepted baptism as a way of retaining possession of their goods and their lives. "Given the forced nature of the mass conversions of 1391," Kamen writes, "it was obvious that many could not have been genuine Christians." The king of Aragon repudiated the concept of forced conversion and made it clear to the Jews there that they could return to their ancestral religion, but that was not the case in Barcelona, which, as a result, became a hotbed of subversive activity all the way up to the time of the Spanish Civil War.

## **Collaboration**

The rabbis collaborated with the unscrupulous Spanish politicians by allowing for conversion under duress. The early Church was split over whether Christians who renounced the faith during the Roman persecutions should be readmitted to the Church. The less rigorous debated which penances should be applied, but the Church never condoned renunciation of the faith, even if death were the consequence. Talmudic Judaism, however, came up with an accommodation of the practice of lying about conversion based on a distinction which would have consequences which were every bit as serious as those which followed from the forced conversions in the first place. In the fifteenth century, the Rabbis in North Africa distinguished between anusim or unwilling converts and meshumadim, those who converted voluntarily. As a result, the only sort of Jew who was ostracized by the synagogue was the sincere convert. The fact that the liar and dissembler was tacitly tolerated, in clear violation of the scriptural principle articulated in the Book of Maccabees was to have far-reaching consequences. One of the most obvious is that the rabbis and the unscrupulous anti-Semitic Christian politicians collaborated in creating an atmosphere where subversion flourished. Jews who had prospered by converting and thereby ignoring the tenets of their own religion could continue to prosper as Christians while retaining the

same opportunistic attitude toward Christianity. The Christians who were moved to violence against Jews now harbored the same animus, clouded by religious ambiguity, against the conversos, whom they now called Marranos, a derogatory term of dubious origin which means swine. Forced conversion, in other words, only strengthened the very suspicions it was supposed to allay. And the rabbis were instrumental in strengthening them. As a result, Jews were regarded as a fifth column within the state, and conversos were regarded, because of the very conversion that was forced on them, as an even more dangerous fifth column within the Church. Some conversos were precisely that. Fray Vicente de Rocamora, the confessor of Empress Maria, sister of Philip II, "threw off the mask of Catholicism and joined the Hebrew community at Amsterdam as Isaac of Rocamoro." The Jewish community at Amsterdam in the 17th century was made up almost exclusively of conversos who had thrown off the Catholic faith shortly after escaping from Spain and Portugal and arriving there. It was made up, in other words, of apostate Catholics who had lied about their faith.

The system of forced conversion was exploited by the cynical Jews who converted insincerely as a way of retaining power and wealth, and it punished those Jews whose conversions were sincere because they continued to suffer the rigors of anti-Semitism. Later Jewish apologists seem unaware of the complexity of the situation and the

implications which flow from it. Describing the aftermath of the forced conversions, Cecil Roth writes that

"within a generation or two, the Marranos became assimilated enough. Their worldly success was phenomenal. They almost controlled the economic life of the country. They made fabulous fortunes as bankers and merchants. They thronged the liberal professions. . . . Many of them attained high rank even in the Church. But with all their eminence, the vast majority (and those who had entered Holy Orders were no exception) remained faithful at heart to the religion of their fathers, which they handed on, despite unbelievable difficulties from generation to generation. Their Christianity was merely a mask.... They were Christians in nothing, and Jews in everything but name."

Roth's justification of false conversion lends credence to the claims of the anti-Semites in two ways. First of all, it ignores the fact that many conversions were sincere. Both Roth and the Spanish anti-Semites dismiss this possibility out of hand. Secondly, Roth's justification of duplicity condones subversion and in many ways makes it a Jewish characteristic. In this Roth is simply following the example of the rabbis of the time, who in contrast to the scriptural example of the Maccabees, accepted the idea of outward conversion as long as it was coupled with an inward denial of what was professed

outwardly. This rabbinic acceptance of duplicity would have far-reaching consequences for European Jewry. In the short term, it set the stage for the conversion of **Sabbetai Zevi, the Jewish Messiah**, to Islam in 1666. Because of the tradition established by the Sephardic rabbis, Zevi, the false Messiah, could claim, with some plausibility, that his conversion to Islam was only for show. He could claim that it was really an attempt to subvert the Turkish empire from within. Of course, he could also make similar claims to the sultan of Constantinople, claiming that his preaching in the synagogues of the Levant was really an attempt to convert Jews to Islam.

By condoning false conversion under duress, the rabbis created a nation of subversives. The net result was chaos and confusion so total, so demoralizing and so debilitating that medieval Judaism did not survive the crisis. Medieval Judaism, like medieval Islam, was ultimately incapable of negotiating a modus vivendi which accommodated both faith and reason. Medieval Judaism broke apart on the rock of false conversion, as manifested in the case of Sabbetai Zevi. European Jewry, which was virtually unanimous in accepting Zevi as the Messiah, attempted to repress any indication that Zevi had existed after his conversion to Islam, but the evidence of his existence was like the rock just beneath the surface which determines traffic on the river. The messianic fever which infected Europe beginning in 1648 reached

its peak and denouement when Zevi converted to Islam in 1666, another *Annus Mirabilis*. Thereafter, the ship of medieval Judaism foundered and eventually broke into two parts, corresponding to faith and reason respectively, since their union could find in Judaism no unifying force any more. On the one hand, reason found itself represented by Spinoza's rationalism, which led to the German Enlightenment Jew epitomized by Moses Mendelssohn, the man whom Lessing immortalized in German literature as Nathan der Weise. On the other hand, faith divorced from reason led to the Jewish form of quietism known as Hassidism, which continued to thrive in the shtetls of Poland and the Pale of the Settlement all the way up to the Nazi genocide.

As anyone with a rudimentary sense of the relationship between Christianity and culture could have anticipated, the regimen of false conversions in Spain did nothing but make a bad situation worse. The cynical Jewish converts continued to exploit the situation to their advantage under the protection of the Church, while at the same time the sincere Jewish converts were forced to live under constant and intolerable suspicion.

Spain's response to this intolerable situation was the Inquisition. By the 1470s, it was becoming increasingly clear that forced conversions had not solved Spain's Jewish problem. They had in fact made it worse

by making it more inaccessible. The longer the government did nothing, the more mob violence increased. Queen Isabella's predecessor is now known to history under the unfortunate name of Enrique el Impotente precisely because he was perceived as handing over to the unscrupulous insincere conversos the administration of both Church and state and doing nothing to curb the rioting and pillaging of the Jews and their possessions which followed in the wake of his inaction. When the civil disorder against the Jews became a serious threat to Spain's military campaign against the Moors, the Spanish crown, united now under Ferdinand and Isabella, imported the Inquisition, created by St. Dominic as a way of ridding Southern France of the Albigensian heretics, in order to bring legal order to resentments which were leading to the mob violence which threatened to engulf Spain. On September 27, 1480 a papal bull commissioned the Dominicans Juan de San Martin and Miguel de Morillo to begin inquiries into reports of subversion of the faith. The Spanish Inquisition had come into existence. Twelve years later, Ferdinand and Isabella, after expelling the Moors from Spain, expelled the Jews as well. In doing so, they saved Spain from the fate of Poland by exporting a problem they could not solve. Over the course of the 16th century, northern Europe inherited the problem which Spain could not solve and cities like Antwerp became, as a result, a hotbed of revolutionary activity.

## **Cultural Matrix**

The combination of the expulsion of the Jews and rabbinical justification for false conversion effectively established the cultural matrix from which the revolutionary Jew would emerge. If a Jew according to Talmudic teaching could profess what he claimed was an idolatrous false religion in public and still remain a Jew in good standing, then he simply could not be trusted, and the anti-Semites were right in viewing him as a fifth-column who threatened the existence of both Church and state. Forced conversion was wrong, but the acceptance of it on the part of the Jews was just as wrong as the imposition of it on them. Worse still, acceptance of insincere conversion enshrined the principle of deception and subversion as an acceptable part of Jewish life. The Jew, according to the principles established in the Old Testament from the time of Moses to the resistance which the Maccabees provided against the Hellenizers under King Antiochus, had a duty to resist what he perceived as idolatry and incorporation into idolatrous religions, and he was duty-bound to resist that incorporation to the point of death. The fact that Talmudic teaching condoned false conversion indicated a radical break in continuity between what they taught and what Moses taught. The Marranos, if by that term we mean insincere Jewish converts to Christianity, made subversion and deceit a way of life.

In this their behavior and world view was similar to other disaffected

Catholics from other parts of Europe. The German monks who violated their vows of celibacy with impunity led double lives as well. And living a lie helped create animosity toward the institution to whom they had made vows they would not fulfill. In this regard, the first Lutherans and the first Calvinists were virtually indistinguishable from each other and from the conversos, both in theology and practice. Both movements drew their leadership from the sexually corrupt lower Catholic clergy. Calvin's lieutenant, the erstwhile Catholic, Theodore Beza was, according to Walsh,

"a glaring example of the too-common corruption. Though not even a priest, he enjoys the incomes of two benefices, through political influence, lavishes the Church's money on his concubine, and generally leads a vicious and dissolute life. When the Church is under attack, he hastens to join the enemy. As Calvin's lieutenant, this righteous man thunders against the [corruption of the] Old Church, of which he was partly the cause."

Beza's example was not uncommon. The monasteries of Europe were full of monks leading double lives:

"There is no doubt about the laxity of the monasteries of Sevilla and Valladolid, whose members embraced Protestantism; nor of the degeneracy of the Augustinians in Saxony, who broke away from the Church almost en masse in 1521. In England it was the reformed Observatine Franciscans who withstood Henry VIII even to death, while

the relaxed Conventuals and other badly disciplined monks and priests formed the nucleus of the Church of England. The first Protestants, as a rule, were bad Catholics" (Walsh, Philip II, p. 252).

Once the Jews who were expelled from Spain began to regroup in the newly-Protestant regions of the North, their settlements began to draw Marranos like a magnet, and the disaffected Catholics who had once been living double lives as clerics with concubines in places like Saxony and Thuringia now began to make common cause with the Jews who had led double lives as well by converting to Catholicism simply to preserve their wealth. Revolution, which is to say, a pan-ethnic coordinated attack on the cultural hegemony of the Catholic Church over Europe, emerged as a force in world history when these two groups merged in places like Antwerp in the middle of the 16th century.

Revolution was, in other words, a Protestant-Jewish alliance from its inception. The Jews, as Newman shows so well, promoted every "reform" movement in Europe, from the Hussites to the Anabaptists, as a way of weakening the hegemony of the Catholic Church, reasoning—falsely in the case of Luther—that the enemy of their enemy was their friend. In places like Antwerp and Amsterdam, the Jews put their wealth as well as their considerable expertise in finance and publishing at the disposal of the libidinous German monks and their princely protectors as their way of waging cultural warfare against the Catholic Church

and Spain, its defender. When Johan Bokelzoon established his sexual liberationist communist dictatorship in Muenster in 1533, the native population was quickly overrun by libidinous nuns recently "liberated" from their convents by the Lutherans. (Martin Luther, in fact, got his wife, Catherine von Bora, from a Lutheran raid which liberated a convent in Saxony. He offered the youngest and prettiest of the ex-nuns to the Bishop of Mainz if that worthy agreed to convert to the Lutheran party.) The nuns under Bokelzoon's tutelage quickly adopted his sexual liberationist practices and began having visions of the coming of the new Jerusalem which caused them to practice glossolalia while rolling naked on the ground, frothing at the mouth. Liberation from the stress of living a double life as a faux Catholic was intoxicating, and the intensity of the intoxication was some indication of the stress that caused it.

The revolutionary link between Jews and Reformers was theoretical as well as practical. The "Reformers" for their part could justify their criminal behavior only by cloaking it in the imagery of the Old Testament. Regicide was the most heinous of crimes and viewed with revulsion by all of Christian Europe, and yet Cromwell justified his role in the murder of Charles I by appealing to the story of Phineas. "Be not offended at the manner," Cromwell wrote to Lord Wharton in January 1650,

"perhaps no other way was left. What if God accepted the zeal, as He did that of Phineas, whose reason might have called for a jury? What if the Lord have witnessed this approbation and acceptance to this also, not only by signal outward acts, but to the heart also? What if I fear my friend should withdraw his shoulder from the Lord's work . . . through scandals, though false, mistaken reasonings."

The subjunctive mood of Cromwell's self-justification gives some indication that not even the models he dragooned from the Old Testament could erase the guilt of regicide from his conscience, but even if they could not absolve him of his sin, they certainly acted as a palliative. Cromwell, according to one commentator,

"was making a startling reference to the biblical story of Phineas, who thrust a javelin through a sinfully copulating couple, thus saving the people of Israel from the wrath of God. In the end, only brutal summary justice against the King had served to complete God's work to save the nation from His wrath and to secure his continuing love."

By 1649, when Charles I went on trial, the tradition of Judaizing which had been extirpated from Spain had struck deep roots in England. The English judaizers were known as Puritans, and Cromwell as their

leader was as versed in using Biblical figures as a rationalization for his crimes as he was in using Jewish spies from Spain and Portugal as agents in his ongoing war with the Catholic powers of Europe. The Puritans in England could implement the idea of revolution so readily precisely because they were Judaizers, and that is so because revolution was at its root a Jewish idea. Based on Moses' deliverance of Israel as described in the book of Exodus, the revolutionary saw a small group of chosen "saints" leading a fallen world to liberation from political oppression. Revolution was nothing if not a secularization of ideas taken from the Bible, and as history progressed the secularization of the concept would progress as well. But the total secularization of the idea in the 17th century would have made the idea totally useless to the Puritan revolutionaries. Secularization in the 17th century was synonymous with Judaizing. It meant substituting the Old Testament for the New. The concept of revolution gained legitimacy in the eyes of the Puritans precisely because of its Jewish roots. Graetz sees the attraction which Jewish ideas held for English Puritans quite clearly. The Roundheads were not inspired by the example of the suffering Christ, nor were they inspired by the medieval saints who imitated him. They needed the example of the warriors of Israel to inspire them in their equally bellicose campaigns against the Irish and the Scotch, who became liable to extermination because the Puritans saw them as Canaanites.

Similarly, the King, who was an unworthy leader...

deserved to die at the hands of the righteous who [like Phineas] now acted without any external authority, but, as the Jews had, on direct orders from God. "The Christian Bible," Graetz tells us,

"with its monkish figures, its exorcists, its praying brethren, and pietistic saints, supplied no models for warriors contending with a faithless king, a false aristocracy and unholy priests. Only the great heroes of the Old Testament, with fear of God in their hearts and the sword in their hands, at once religious and national champions, could serve as models for the Puritans: the Judges, freeing the oppressed people from the yoke of foreign domination; Saul, David, and Joab routing the foes of their country; and Jehu, making an end of an idolatrous and blasphemous house—these were favorite characters with Puritan warriors. In every verse of the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, they saw their own condition reflected; every psalm seemed composed for them, to teach them that, though surrounded on every side by ungodly foes, they need not fear while they trusted in God. Oliver Cromwell compared himself to the judge Gideon, who first obeyed the voice of God hesitatingly, but afterwards courageously scattered the attacking heathens; or to Judas Maccabaeus, who out of a handful of martyrs formed a host of victorious warriors."

Graetz puts his finger on the heart of the issue when he identifies Puritan role models as "at once religious and national champions." Revolution as practiced by the Puritan Judaizers of England was a reversion to a more primitive, pre-Christian model. There was no separating the two swords of pope and emperor here—or, to use the terms of a later more secular era, no separation of church and state—instead, both pope and emperor were fused into one charismatic renevent of King David. Israel had become ethnic once again, except that now the real Jews were Englishmen, the visible elect on earth, and England (or New England) was the New Jerusalem.

When the Puritan poet and propagandist John Milton wanted, as a result of personal circumstances, to have the Puritan solons in Parliament legalize divorce in 1642, he attempted to help the divines overlook the inconvenient fact that Jesus Christ condemned the practice explicitly by appealing in general to Old Testament models and to Moses, "an author great beyond any exception," in particular. Milton then quickly gets to the Messianic politics that lies at the heart of Puritan-Jewish revolutionary thought. England's legalization of divorce will provide the world with a "magnanimous example" which "will easily spread far beyond the banks of Tweed and the Norman isles." England as the new Israel has a mission to save the world, a mission which was later adopted by equally messianic descendants of

Jews and Puritans in America. "It would not be the first or second time," the author of *Paradise Lost* continues,

"since our ancient druids, by whom this island was the cathedral of philosophy to France, left off their pagan rites, that England hath had this honor vouchsafed from heaven, to give out reformation to the world. Who was it but our English Constantine that baptized the Roman Empire? Who but the Northumbrian Willibrorde and Winifride of Devon, with their followers were the first apostles of Germany? Who but Alcuin and Wycliffe our countrymen, opened the eyes of Europe, the one in arts, the other in religion? Let not England forget her precedence of teaching nations how to live."

One can almost hear in Milton's tendentious pleading for the legalization of divorce, the devotees of Planned Parenthood arguing that the logical sequel to America's conquest of Afghanistan or Iraq should be contraception and abortion. Messianic politics and sexual liberation have gone hand in hand from the beginning, and they still do, now that America is the uncontested new Israel. Messianic politics cannot function without Old Testament models, as Milton's appeal to Moses on the issue of divorce makes clear.

Messianic politics lies at the heart of what the Jewish and Puritan

revolutionaries of the 16th century had in common, which is to say, both the Puritan and the Jew shared a desire to attain the spiritual goods promised in the Bible by secular means. Messianic politics was a form of magic, since the attainment of wealth and power by spiritual means had always been the goal of Simon Magus and his followers, and as such it had a powerful appeal to a group of people who were just discovering the natural sciences at the same time that they were full of revulsion at the cross of Christ and the ideal of suffering which it embodied. "It is better," St. Augustine wrote, summarizing the Catholic alternative to Simon Magus, "to love God and make use of money, than to love money and make use of God." The Puritan rejection of the medieval worldview of the Catholic Church (and its Anglican surrogates) was ultimately traceable to the Jewish rejection of the suffering Christ as an unworthy Messiah. "The chief priests," St. Matthew tells us, "with the scribes and elders mocked him in the same way. 'He saved others,' they said, 'he cannot save himself. He is the king of Israel; let him come down from the cross now, and we will believe in him.'"

### **The Jewish/Puritan Alliance**

The Jewish/Puritan alliance was born in a mutual rejection of the cross and all it stood for, and the substitution of King David or Simon bar Kokhba or Sabbetai Sevi or Oliver Cromwell or Napoleon

Bonaparte as an alternative to the suffering Christ. The Jews were so enamored of Cromwell as a potential Messiah that they sent a delegation to examine his baptismal records in Huntington, to see if he were descended from the lineage of King David. Cromwell, as Graetz points out, was driven to consummate this revolutionary alliance between Jews and Puritans on both the theoretical and the practical level:

"To bury oneself in the history, prophecy, and poetry of the Old Testament, to revere them as divine inspiration, to live in them with every emotion, yet not to consider the people who had originated all this glory and greatness as preferred and chosen was impossible. Among the Puritans, therefore, were many earnest admirers of "God's people" and Cromwell was one of them. . . ."

The consummation of this revolutionary alliance against the Catholic Church and Catholic countries like Spain involved, in other words, not only rummaging through the Bible for images that would justify regicide, it also entailed bringing Jews, so recently expelled from the Iberian peninsula, out of their temporary home in the low countries into the land now governed by the Puritan saints. According to Graetz:

"A desire was excited in the hearts of the Puritans to see this living wonder, the Jewish people, with their own eyes, to bring Jews to England, and, by making them part of the theocratic community about to be established, stamp it with the seal of completion. The sentiments of the Puritans towards the Jews were expressed in Oliver Cromwell's observation, "Great is my sympathy with this poor people, whom God chose and to whom He gave His law; it rejects Jesus because it does not recognize him as the Messiah." Cromwell dreamt of a reconciliation of the Old and New Testament, of an intimate connection between the Jewish people of God and the English Puritan theocracy. But other Puritans were so absorbed in the Old Testament, that the New Testament was of no importance. Especially the visionaries in Cromwell's army and among the members of Parliament, who were hoping for the Fifth Monarchy, or the reign of the saints, assigned to the Jewish people a glorious position in the expected millennium. A Puritan preacher, Nathaniel Holmes . . . wished . . . to become the servant of Israel and serve him on bended knees. The more the tension in Israel increased . . . the more public life and religious thought assumed Jewish coloring. The only thing wanting to make one thing [was the return of the Jews]."

Cromwell's followers felt that by readmitting the Jews to England they could bring about the second coming of Christ, the millennium, and the

fifth monarchy mentioned in the book of Daniel. In short, the middle of the 17th century was suffused with an apocalyptic vision of Christ's kingdom being actually established in the here and now.

Jewish refugees from Spain and English Ranters and Fifth Monarchy men were of one mind on this issue. The Kingdom of God was at hand.

Something like this had been held by Christians for over a millennium and a half, probably because its advent had been pronounced by Christ himself. What had changed, though, was the kind of kingdom Christ's followers were supposed to expect.

St. Augustine gave the definitive Catholic explication of The Book of Revelation in the City of God, where he explained that the millennium was supposed to be understood as a spiritual allegory concerning an essentially spiritual reality. The Millennium had begun with the death of Christ on the Cross, and the New Jerusalem was fully realized in the Catholic Church. Augustine's explanation became Church doctrine when it was adopted as the definitive explanation of the millennium by the Council of Ephesus in 431. From that time on, belief in the millennium as a worldly kingdom was dismissed generally as a superstitious aberration and particularly as "the error of the Jews."

As Archbishop Laud made clear in a sermon in 1621, it was precisely this "error of the Jews" that the Puritans were bent on resurrecting.

The Puritans, according to Laud, "Enclyne to Judaisme as the newe sect of the Thraskites and other opinionists concerninge the terrene Kingdome of the Jewes." Taking the Jews who had rejected Christ on the cross as their model, their Puritan revolutionary co-belligerents now announced the advent of the Kingdom of God on earth, or in Laud's terms, "the terrene Kingdome of the Jewes" in England. Heaven on earth was to be instituted by a government of English saints at some point in the decade following 1650. Since one of the inaugural events in the coming of this new kingdom was the murder of the English king, it promised to be a bloody kingdom for those with the eyes capable of seeing its true lineaments. But a kingdom nonetheless, and a worldly kingdom as well, in which sainthood was the first job requirement of every politician.

Since there had been no Jews in England since their expulsion in 1290, at least not officially, English philo-Semitism had a distinctly utopian cast to it. The English Judaizers tended to idealize Jews according to their own idiosyncratic reading of the Old Testament. They did not, as one has come to expect of the English, evaluate them according to empirical observation, at least not at the dawn of the Messianic era in 1648. If they had been less preoccupied with their own revolution at home, the English could have learned something about Christian-Jewish relations by observing the apocalypse that was

brewing in Poland at the very moment the English were debating the fate of their king. An objective study of what had happened in Spain might have been helpful as well, but an objective English study of anything Spanish is the historical equivalent of an oxymoron.

By 1540 the Converso issue was over in Spain. Figures from the tribunal of Toledo in the years from 1531 to 1560 suggest that only three percent of the cases which came before the Inquisition there dealt with Judaizers. Spain had saved itself from the fate of Poland first by importing the Inquisition from southern France, and then by exporting its problem to the north of Europe. For some indication of what might have happened in Spain if the situation created by the Jews there had gone unchecked, we need only look at the situation in Poland. Jewish influence over Polish political life not only continued in the century after it had abated in Spain; it increased in intensity as well, fueling Polish imperialism in the East. The same violence that appeared periodically in Spain beginning in the late 14th century was repressed in Poland where laws in effect codified Jewish hegemony over large areas of Polish cultural life. Since disobedience to the predations of the Jewish tax-farmers was a capital crime, there is some indication that 1) animosity against the Jews was widespread and 2) that it was severely repressed. The combination of those two factors made an explosion of violence all but certain, and the

explosion came when the Sejm, dominated by the Polish magnates and their Jewish administrators, rebuffed Cossack aspirations for political reform. Cultural drift in Poland under the self-serving hand of the oligarchs had led to an explosion of the sort that the Inquisition had prevented in Spain, and as a result of that explosion, the Polish nobles republic went into a state of terminal decline, only to expire altogether 147 years later.

The defeat of their cause in the Sejm turned the hopeful expectation of the Cossacks into equally vehement outrage. That outrage was mobilized by a Cossack leader by the name of Bogdan Chmielnicki. Chmielnicki, who was 53 years old when the Sejm voted against enfranchising the Cossacks, had a personal stake in the matter as well. A Jew by the name of Zachariah Sabilenki, according to Graetz,

"had played him a trick, by which he was robbed of his wife and property. Another had betrayed him when he had come to an understanding with the Tartars. Besides injuries which his race had sustained from Jewish tax farmers in the Ukraine, he, therefore, had personal wrongs to avenge."

Chmielnicki's claim that "The Poles have delivered us as slaves to the cursed breed of Jews" resonated among the Cossacks enough to bring

them into open revolt. When Chmielnicki and his Cossack and Tartar hordes defeated the Polish army on May 16, 1648, the way was open to widespread looting, pillaging and murder. It is estimated that 100,000 Jews perished in the ensuing mayhem. Some pretended to be Christians to escape the wrath of the Cossacks. Some, as in Spain a century and a half before, accepted baptism as the price of saving their lives.

Chmielnicki's pogroms became what the riots in Spain would have become without the benefit of the Inquisition. Resentment had built up for too long for this blaze to burn itself out quickly.

As Chmielnicki's comment to the Cossacks indicated, the Poles were held responsible for the behavior of the Jews, even if they suffered from the same system of financial exploitation that had enraged the Cossacks. Prince Vishnioviecki, the man Graetz calls, "the only heroic figure amongst the Poles at that time," did what he could to protect the Jews who came under his power, but that wasn't much given the magnitude of the forces which opposed him. In many towns, the Jews put aside their separatist instincts and allied themselves with the local Catholics in a pact of mutual defense against the bloodthirsty Cossacks. Sometimes that pact succeeded; sometimes it didn't. When Chmielnicki's Cossack hordes arrived at the gates of Lwow, he demanded that all the Jews within the city's walls be handed over to him as a condition of lifting the siege. The Poles refused, and many Jewish

lives were saved as a result. According to the Jewish historian Henryk Grynberg: "the Polish armies, who were at war with [the Cossacks] were the sole defenders of the Jews." Chmielnicki's animus was directed equally against the Catholic Church and the Jews. When he was sober enough to dictate the conditions of peace after an attack, those conditions invariably demanded the expulsion of both the Catholic Church and the Jews from the provinces controlled by the Cossacks.

Poland's neighbors exploited the situation to their own advantage, setting in motion a chain of events which would eventually lead to the partition of Poland at the end of the 18th century. Muscovy, Prussia, Sweden, Brandenburg and the Ottoman empire all began nibbling away at pieces of territory which Poland was now too weak to defend. In addition to losing territory, Poland lost 200,000 inhabitants, half of whom were Jews. The Uniates of the Ukraine were forcibly converted to Orthodoxy, diminishing the Catholic and Polish influence on the southern flank of Lithuania, which had converted to Catholicism largely as a result of Polish influence.

As some indication of the hold which the Kaballah exercised over the mind of Polish Jews, the Chmielnicki pogroms, occurring in what was supposed to be the Messianic year of redemption, only strengthened the faith of those Jews who felt that messianic deliverance, ushered in

perhaps by catastrophe, was closer than ever. The idea that the Messiah would hear and answer the prayers of his people in time of need became transmuted into a belief that dire need was a sign that the Messiah's arrival was imminent. The alembic which enabled this religious alchemy was Kabbalah, the very thing which had instilled the messianic expectation in the first place.

Scholem disagrees with those who see the Chmielnicki uprisings as the cause of the Messianic fever which swept European Jewry during the middle of the 17th century. "If the massacres of 1648 were in any sense its principal cause," Scholem argues, "why did the messiah not arise within Polish Jewry?" The source of messianic fervor, according to Scholem, was "none other than Lurianic kabbalism, that is that form of Kabbalah which had developed at Safed, in Galilee, during the sixteenth century and which dominated Jewish religiosity in the seventeenth century." According to the Kaballah, catastrophe and utopianism go hand in hand. The presence of a catastrophe like the Chmielnicki massacres and the ensuing predations of the Swedish army meant, therefore, that redemption was at hand.

### **Lurianism and Revolution**

Lurianic Kaballah not only prepared the way for the Chmielnicki catastrophe, it was also the result of the other great catastrophe of

Jewish life at the time, the expulsion of the Jews from Spain. Isaac Luria Ashkenazi was born in 1534. By the time of his death in Safed in Palestine in 1572, he had gathered around him a group of disciples who were bent on spreading his explanation of Jewish exile, of recent catastrophes like the expulsion from Spain and how these events fit into the plan of divine redemption. In order to do this Luria had recourse to the Gnostic mythology which had been circulating in the Mediterranean world since the time of the first heresies of the Christian era. God or En-Sof had created bowls to contain the light of his understanding. The bowls, however, proved incapable of containing that light and broke scattering the light throughout creation where it remained imprisoned in matter. The purpose of man's existence on earth became, as a result, tiqqun or healing, or restoring the lights to their original place in the universe before the breaking of the vessels had released the forces of sin and evil into the world. After the fall of Adam and Eve, each Jew had as his purpose in life the great process of re-integrating the sparks into their original place in the universe. The Diaspora of the Jews was now readily explainable. They had been dispersed over the face of the earth so as to be better able to discover the holy sparks, extract them from the matter they had become enmired in, and then return them to their rightful place in the universe. When this was accomplished, the Messiah could come, and redemption would be complete. Redemption, according to the Lurianic

doctrine, was equally bound up with man's efforts and the process of history, a combination which was incorporated, via Hegel, into Karl Marx's revolutionary theory three hundred years later. The realm of qelippah, where the sparks are held in bondage, is a distinctly political realm, which is "represented on the terrestrial and historical plane by tyranny and oppression." The role of the Jew is to bring about redemption, which is not something that descends suddenly, "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye" from on high but rather appears as the logical and necessary fruition of Jewish history. Israel's labors of tiqqun are, by definition, of a messianic character. Final redemption is therefore no longer dissociated from the historical process that preceded it: "The redemption of Israel takes place by degrees, one purifying after another, one refining after another." The messianic king, far from bringing about the tiqqun, is himself brought about by it: he appears after the tiqqun has been achieved. The cosmic redemption of the raising of the sparks merges with the national redemption of Israel, and the symbol of the "ingathering of the exiles" comprises both.

The political implications of the Lurianic Kaballah seem clear enough. The Messiah must now wait upon man's efforts. He can only come once the process of tiqqun or purification and healing has been accomplished by man, i.e., by the Jews here on earth, who act as the

vanguard of redemption much as the communist party at a later date would function as the vanguard of the proletariat. Without tiqqun, "it is impossible that the messianic king come." From here it is but a short leap of thought to the conclusion that Israel had become its own Messiah, or as Scholem says, "By transferring to Israel, the historical nation, much of the redemptive task formerly considered as the messiah's, many of his distinctive personal traits, as drawn in apocalyptic literature, were now obliterated."

Horowitz sees much the same political meaning emanating from the Lurianic revision of the meaning of exile. Once the meaning of exile had been transformed by its incorporation into the Gnostic creed of Luria's Kaballah, "redemption is no longer a divine release from the punishment of exile, but a humanly inspired transformation of creation itself." What is true of Israel's exile is a fortiori true of mankind's exile in the qelipth or husks of matter. Luria's essentially Gnostic thought projects evil away from the heart of man into structures outside of himself, which is to say, political structures, which can be changed by human effort. Now instead of evil emanating from the heart, evil emanates from evil things in an evil universe, which is begging to be changed by those who know its secrets, i.e., the kabbalists. "Practical" Kaballah, according to Scholem, "is synonymous with magic." Some of Luria's followers felt

that they could "force the end" by an act of "practical Kabbalah," which is to say by invoking holy names and Kabbalistic formulae." Since the sparks have been "tricked" into being enmired in matter, it might even be able to trick them out again by the use of what Hyim Vital termed "holy fraud." Like the concept of insincere conversion, the concept of "holy fraud" would find its most immediate embodiment in the apostate Messiah Sabbetai Zevi, but it would perdure long after Sevi's demise in a tendency toward subversion which would find expression in Jewish revolutionary activity in the Pale of the Settlement in Russia in the 19th century and elsewhere. The kabbalists will lead the world to redemption through magic (or applied science and technology) and trickery but not by leading good lives while waiting patiently for the redeemer to come, because "in the Gnostic view, the evil that men do emanates not from their own flawed natures, but is the result of a flaw in the cosmos they inhabit, which they can repair." As a result of the Gnostic transformation of Jewish thought that Luria accomplished, "Man" becomes "his own redeemer" (Horowitz, p. 131). Exile of the sort suffered by Jews for over a millennium and most recently in exile from Spain is, according to Luria,

"no longer a punishment, but a mission; no longer a reflection of who we are, but a mark of our destiny to become agents of salvation. In this Gnostic vision, Israel is dispersed among the nations in order

that the light of the whole world may be liberated. In the words of the Kabbalist Hayim Vital: "This is the secret why Israel is fated to be enslaved by all the Gentiles of the world: In order that it may uplift those sparks of the Divine Light which have also fallen among them. . . . And therefore it was necessary that Israel should be scattered to the four winds in order to lift everything up." The Israelites are the first revolutionary internationalists."

The Lurianic Kaballah was a reaction to the Inquisition. By the time of the Chmielnicki massacres, the other great catastrophe for Jews at the dawn of the modern era, it had spread to all parts of the Diaspora. "Wherever Lurianism came," Scholem writes, "it produced messianic tension." It produced expectation of redemption. But now, as Scholem points out, "redemption meant a revolution in history." Since Lurianism created the Messianic fervor of the mid-16th century, it is not an exaggeration to say that it created the revolutionary mindset which characterized the modern world as well. The modern world emerged when medieval Judaism, having fostered northern Europe's rebellion against Rome, cracked open and fell apart itself when Lurianism found its fulfillment in Sabbetai Zevi, the false Messiah. Jewish Gnostic messianism, with the help of English puritan revolutionaries, was released from the ghetto into the nascent modern world, the world which succeeded the medieval world and was its antithesis. The

Messianic age of the mid-17th century "was an age characterized by rebellion against the Catholic Church and the order which the Church had imposed on Europe since the fall of the Roman Empire. A millennium of Catholic culture was threatened by the resurgence of an old idea."

The old idea was the notion that the millennium meant the restoration of the "terrene Kingdome of the Jewes," the idea which had been condemned, but not destroyed, by the Council of Ephesus in 431. The new name for that old idea was revolution. When the ghetto was cracked open, but not destroyed, by the subsequent blows inflicted on it—by the Inquisition, the Chmielnicki pogroms, and, most devastating of all, the disillusionment which followed on the heels of the False Messiah's conversion to Islam—the concept of revolution escaped through those cracks in the ghetto walls into European culture at large, where it was implemented at first by Judiaizers like the English Puritans and finally by the revolutionary Jew in propria persona, at the helm of his own political movement to produce via socialism, Marxism, Zionism, sexual liberation, or neoconservatism "the terrene Kingdome of the Jewes" or heaven on earth.

The most immediate consequence of the Chmielnicki uprising was a massive exodus from the Jewish paradise in the east. Penniless Jewish refugees began streaming west. It was at this moment that the legend

of the wandering Jew was born. A race whose scriptures begins with a description of paradise and whose formative moment was escape from bondage in Egypt could not get the idea of escape into another paradise out of its head, and so having heard stories of how the displaced Sephardim were now prospering, their impoverished Ashkenazic cousins began streaming toward places like Hamburg, but more importantly, toward Amsterdam, which by the mid-17th century had achieved the reputation of being the Dutch Jerusalem. Amsterdam, as a result, became a crucial staging area for the ongoing experimentation in revolution which was the modern world. With the two main branches of Judaism converging there in a land recently ripped by force from the Spanish empire by the Demi-Jews known as Dutch Calvinists and their English fellow travelers, the Pilgrims and the Traskites, a new modus vivendi was inevitable. It was the revolutionary idea, promoted by Jews (most of whom were baptized Catholics) full of outrage at the Inquisition and by German-speaking Catholics full of revulsion at the order which the Church had imposed on European culture.

On January 30, 1649, eight months after Bogdan Chmielnicki had defeated the Polish army, while the slaughter of Jews was in full swing, the Puritan Demi-Jews presided over the execution of the English king. His death warrant was signed by 59 "saints"; Cromwell's name was third on the list. One commentator claimed that the execution

of the king was "an earth-shattering event." He would have done better to call the regicide world-shattering instead, because it shattered a number of worlds, all of them medieval. Both the Jew and the Demi-Jew presided at the birth of a new age, an age seen by Jews and Demi-Jews alike, as the dawn of redemption. That new age and the Jewish/Puritan alliance at its heart is with us still, driving American foreign policy, to give a recent example of its activity, into a war with Iraq. Like all of the wars it spawned, that new age would turn out to be every bit as bloody as the events which inaugurated it.

The triumph of Bolshevism in the revolution of 1917 increased the fear and the animus against the Jews once again. And once again it was the most visible Jews, which is to say the ethnic, religious Jews who bore the brunt of that animus when the reaction came. "The Trotskys make the revolution, but the Bronsteins pay for it," is how one Jew formulated the phenomenon. Hitler, far from being *sui generis*, was simply a manifestation of the same sort of anti-Semitism which followed the assassination of the Czar in Russia in the 1880s. Those who felt that Jews were in the forefront of revolutionary activity then felt confirmed by subsequent events, by the triumph of Bolshevism not only in Russia but in Germany and throughout eastern Europe in the chaotic years following the end of World War I. The fears of Bolshevism combined with traditional animus against Jews helped to create a reaction that brought Hitler to power and would have terrible consequences

for Jews, especially for religious Jews, who were least responsible for the revolutionary excesses of people like Trotsky, ne "Bronstein," who in addition to changing their names didn't consider themselves Jews.

The widely publicized case of Grigorii Goldenberg only fueled the fires of anti-Semitism and confirmed the average Russian in his belief that a Jew was behind every terrorist plot. After plotting the assassination of the Czar and being convicted of actually assassinating the Governor General of Kharkov, Goldenberg turned state's evidence and revealed in writing up his terrorist connections, a list full of Jewish names, which "confirmed the government's suspicions that the Jews were the principal agents of terrorism." Looking at the Jews from a position outside their group, the average Russian failed to see the ideological fissures dividing Jews. Since they saw Jews as possessing "complete unity and solidarity," they held the Jewish community responsible for the actions of Jewish terrorists claiming that its leaders "willingly if not purposefully, failed to exercise their authority over Jews who conspired against the state." As a result, the myth of a Jewish revolutionary conspiracy against 'Holy Russia' was readily available as a new weapon in the arsenal of Russian anti-Semitism. (p. 665).

By rejecting their Jewish heritage, Bolsheviks like Trotsky felt that they had become models for the Jew of the future. They felt that their fellow Jews should emulate them by becoming "Jews by family origin only" and as a result should feel "no special ties to other Jews or any interest in specific Jewish problems." According to this view, anti-Semitism was "a disease of

capitalism which would disappear with the destruction of capitalism.”

Solzheynitsyn, however, claims that Trotsky became an idol to the American Jews “not for no reason but precisely because he was a Jew.” Trotsky was “the Prometheus of October” not because he belonged “as such” but because “he was a child of this promethean people, who could have done much more for humanity if he hadn’t been chained to the rock of stupid evil.” Trotsky’s Jewishness brings up the issue of collective responsibility. If Jews can disclaim responsibility for communism by claiming that Trotsky wasn’t a “real Jew,” can’t the Germans do the same thing, by disowning Hitler? Hitler, after all, had been born in Austria, not Germany. Couldn’t the Germans just as easily say, “these weren’t real Germans, they were just the scum.” (p. 735).

Now watch here as Jones pulls the cover off of the anti-Catholic Jewish author, Daniel

Goldhagen, the author who insists that Pius XII was an anti-semite:

Frustrated by his inability to make his case, Goldhagen thus makes up in invective and innuendo what he lacks in documentation. But in doing this, he unwittingly leads the reader to truth. “Implicit in Pacelli’s letter,” Goldhagen continues, “is the notion of Judeo-Bolshevism—the virtually axiomatic conviction among Nazis, modern anti-Semites in general and within the Church itself that Jews were the principle bearers and even the authors of Bolshevism.” Behind the equivalence between Nazism and Catholicism which Goldhagen tries to prove, another equivalence suddenly emerges, namely, the relationship between Jews and Bolshevism. In the heat of his passion to

convict Pius XII, Goldhagen inadvertently introduces the issue that contextualizes Pacelli's letter in precisely the way Goldhagen does not want to contextualize it. As more than one commentator has noted, the main reason people were concerned about Jews during the 1920s is because they saw them, rightly or wrongly, as the forefront of the communist menace threatening Europe. Writing in Outlook, Mordecai Briemberg notes "numerous historians ... have been struck by the fact that hatred of Jews is almost always coupled with hatred of communism."<sup>18</sup> Hitler realized early on that attacks on Jews alone reaped him no political benefits. The Jews had to be linked to Bolshevism precisely because German Jews had been so successful in assimilating.

The perception that they were assimilated Germans meant they would only be perceived as a threat if they were linked with a menacing foreign ideology and a menacing foreign power, something like Russian Communism. By mentioning Bolshevism Goldhagen undermines his argument. Anti-Semitism during the 1920s in Europe was not directed against the existence of the Jews but rather against the behavior of Jews, who were widely seen as the force behind Bolshevism. Ignoring this, Goldhagen turns his guns on the Catholic Church, claiming, "For centuries the Catholic Church ... harbored anti-Semitism at its core, as an integral part of its doctrine, its theology and its liturgy." In other words, responsibility for the Holocaust is to be laid ultimately, not at the feet of the Bolsheviks and not even at the feet of the Nazis, but at the feet of the Catholic Church that supposedly made the Nazis

possible. Goldhagen made similar claims in *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, which he later contradicted in *A Moral Reckoning*. Both subtly exculpate the Nazis as the perpetrators of Jewish genocide and propose other candidates for that role—in the first instance, “ordinary Germans,” in the second, “ordinary Catholics,” but Pius XII in particular. Were the Jews murdered by “ordinary Germans” because they were German or by “ordinary Catholics” because they were Catholic? He can't have it both ways. Goldhagen is trapped by the extreme nature of his thesis in *Hitler's Willing Executioners* and put into a bind whereby he must repudiate the thesis of his first book in order to propose the thesis of his second book.

There are other problems. If Germans qua Germans were responsible for the Holocaust, Goldhagen has no way to explain why so many non-Germans in eastern Europe joined avidly in the killing of Jews once the Germans occupied their territory. Ruth Birn mentions the Araj commandos in Latvia as one example of a local, non-German ethnic group that was more avid to kill Jews than the Nazis who ostensibly commanded them. If ordinary Catholics qua Catholics were responsible for the Holocaust, Goldhagen has no way to explain why Hitler persecuted Catholics, in particular Catholic clergy, from the moment he took power. The concentration camp at Dachau was full of German Catholic clergy, so much so that it evolved its own liturgical life, which, since bishops were interned there, included the ordination to the priesthood of Karl Leisner. (p. 742).

[Jones continues to show the contradictions in Goldhagen's revisionist approach to

Jewish history. Of course, these historical realities don't matter to a biased Neo-con like Mark Shea because, as much as Shea and his cronies like to label any objection to their Jewish idealism as anti-semitic, they have clearly shown themselves to be anti-history. They don't care what history has to say about the Jews, no matter how sordid it is. All they care about is that the Jew is exonerated from any wrongdoing and that the world subsequently pay homage to them *via* the holocaust.]

Goldhagen first indicates anti-Semitism has nothing to do with Jewish behavior. Then he says Pius XII was an anti-Semite because he drew a connection between Jews and Bolshevism, which is to say he was upset by the connection between Jewish behavior and Communist behavior. But Goldhagen never says whether Jews were, in fact, involved in Bolshevism, much less whether they played "a disproportionate role" in its history. We thus arrive at the heart of the political role the Holocaust plays in contemporary discourse. The Holocaust was a unique historical event—so unique, according to Goldhagen's *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, that it was "a radical break with everything known in human history ... completely at odds with the intellectual foundations of modern western civilization ... as well as the ... ethical and behavioral norms that had governed modern western societies." Since the Holocaust had no prior history, the behavior of Jews could have no connection to the way Jews were perceived in Europe during the '20s or at any other time. So, nothing Jews do or don't do can cause people to either like or dislike them. Their behavior has no effect on other people's behavior because the fundamental fact of life is irrational anti-Semitism based on "a millennium old urge that powerfully infected and shaped European history," to give Charles Krauthammer's formulation. So,

Palestinian animus toward Jews has nothing to do with how the Israelis have treated them for five decades. And the pogroms in Russia in the 1880s following the assassination of the czar had nothing to do with the perception that Jews were in the forefront of revolutionary terrorism there. And the specter of Bolshevism that haunted Europe during the '20 had nothing to do with Hitler's rise to power, because nothing causes anti-Semitism. It just is. The historical record tells a different story. The feeling that Bolshevism was a Jewish phenomenon was hardly confined to German anti-Semites. Bolshevism was a major concern in Europe, and Jews were seen, rightly or wrongly, as the driving force behind it.... (pp. 742-743).

## **2. Rabbi Dresner's Dilemma: Torah v. Ethnos**

### **[On Jews and Pornography]**

*by E. Michael Jones*

This article was published in the May, 2003 issue of *Culture Wars* magazine.

(Warning: Contains Explicit Language)

I never liked the title of Rabbi Dresner's book. It was called *Can Families Survive in Pagan America?* and was published in 1995 by Huntington House out of Lafayette, Louisiana. I got a copy just as I was starting *Culture Wars*, a magazine that ran concurrently with *Fidelity* and eventually superseded it. I liked Dresner's book because it fit in perfectly with the idea of *Culture Wars* at the time. Both the magazine and the book were meditations on the moral basis for America, which as anyone who is familiar with American history knows, is the only basis for America. Rabbi Dresner's take on the American experiment in ordered liberty was essentially the same as that of

John Adams, Alexis de Tocqueville, and John Courtney Murray. We, John Adams wrote concerning the citizens of the nation he had been instrumental in bringing into being, have no constitution that functions in the absence of a moral people. According to Dresner's reading of the American experiment in ordered liberty:

The founding fathers of America, taking the biblical record as their model, knew that political democracy could only flourish if established on the dual foundations of faith and family. Our contemporary malaise is the consequence of abandoning that ideal in favor of a society that is largely secular, hedonistic and atomistic. Judaism, by advocating a God-centered family-based society, established by the covenant and governed by the Torah can play a key role in recalling America to its origins (*Families*, p. 77).

As a result of the decadence which has dominated American cultural life since the 60s, sexually degenerate America needed, in Dresner's view, a new coalition, a union of Jews and Gentiles with a common commitment to civilization and a common abhorrence of social and moral chaos.

*Families* was an American book, but it was different than the plethora of jeremiads about the moral decline of America in the Bill Bennett mode. Dresner's book was about something else. It had a subtext that escaped its title. *Families* was really about American Jews, or, better, the effect that America had had on the Jews who came here largely in the aftermath of the Russian pogroms of the 1880s. *Families* was about how many modern Jews, in their search for passion and pleasure and power, have lost themselves in the kingdom of Caesar. It was about the ironies which abounded when one compared the strictures of the Torah and the mores of contemporary American Jews. Is it not ironic, Dresner asked rhetorically, that the descendants of the those who wrote the Psalms and offered prayer to the world became, according to all accountings, the least worshipful?

Like *Culture Wars*, *Can Families Survive in Pagan America?* was a deliberate attempt to step outside the normal ethnic and religious boundaries; but like *Fidelity* magazine, which preceded and eventually morphed into *Culture Wars*, it could not do this without addressing the intra-ethnic situation, which is to say, in this instance the state of American Jews. In addition to being

about morals, Families was about ethnicity and its antinomy, assimilation, and Rabbi Dresner was, by and large, not happy with the American Jewish experience. The Jews had prospered in America, but they paid a price for their prosperity. The chosen people seemed to flatten into normality, according to Dresner's pessimistic view, becoming what the prophets had warned against: like the nations. They had succeeded beyond their wildest dreams in assimilating and achieving success. They even succeeded in remaking American culture in the course of the 20th century in their image, but in doing that they also discovered that they were in some very real sense of the word, a sense which Dresner explored in detail, no longer Jews. Jews, according to Dresner, have tried all things. In the process they have exhausted modernity; and discovered to their chagrin, the puzzling truth that

No license has replaced the Law; no symphony, the Psalms, no chandelier, the Sabbath candles; no opera, Yom Kippur; not country club, the synagogue; no mansion, the home; no Jaguar, a child; no mistress, a wife; no banquet, the Passover seder; not towering metropolis, Jerusalem; no impulse, the joy of doing a mitzvah; no man, God. (p. 329).

Dresner carried the hope that American Jews would seek the recovery of the sacred to his grave when he died three years ago.

Samuel H. Dresner was born into an assimilationist-minded Jewish family in Chicago in 1923. He grew up in the Uptown section of Chicago and attended Senn high school where he lettered in track and gymnastics. In an obituary he wrote for *The National Jewish Post and Opinion*, Rabbi Elliott Gertel, who met Dresner as a boy at the congregation Dresner pastored in Springfield, Massachusetts in the 60s, described King Kong Dresner; as he was known in high school at the time, as obsessed with sports and girls.

Before long those obsessions were replaced by a loftier obsession. At the age of 15, Dresner became acutely and painfully aware of suffering in the world around him. He recounted being on North Sheridan Road at twilight during the late 1930s and suddenly having he sense that he was being pursued by some greater power. The more the track star ran away from that power, the more closely he felt he was being pursued. As a result of his vision, he turned down what would have been a lucrative career in his uncle's dress

manufacturing business and decided to become a rabbi.

Dresner did not speak Yiddish. He was not a Polish Jew. His wife Ruth comes from a family of Orthodox German Jews. You would, however, not get this impression by reading *Families*, which is in many ways one long invidious comparison between the Jews of America and the Jews of Eastern Europe, in general, and of Poland in particular. He got his attitude toward *Ostjuden* from Abraham Heschel. Dresner met Heschel as a student in the '40s while attending the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York. Dresner considered Heschel, who grew up in Warsaw, attended the Yiddish Real Gymnasium in Vilna, one of the great centers of *Yiddishkayt*, and the university in Frankfurt, 'the greatest Jew of his time.' Dresner wrote his doctoral dissertation on the Hasidim and would go on to become Abraham Heschel's closest disciple. He would go on to translate much of Heschel's writings on the Hasidim and eventually collaborated with Edward Kaplan of Brandeis University in writing the first volume of Heschel's biography.

### **Jewish Funerals**

Dresner, according to Gertel, 'was the outstanding pulpit communicator of Jewish spirituality' and much of what he communicated caused consternation among American Jews. In the early '60s he was denounced as a Communist for criticizing overly elaborate Jewish funerals. According to Gertel, he also

provoked the ire of the founders of Brandeis University when he warned them that a college concocted by Jews to advance the banner of 'non-sectarianism' would not be able to deal with the identity conflicts of Jewish students or provide guidance to America in the face of challenges to traditional sexual mores. He was among the first to spot trends destructive of Judaism in literature, film and radical feminism.

To be honest with you, I still don't know how I met Sam Dresner. Pat Riley, who studied journalism at Columbia and later edited *The National Catholic Register*, knew him better than I did. Dresner, according to Riley, praised my writing and then upbraided Riley for not subscribing to *Culture Wars*. After I wrote the review of *Families*, it was obvious that we shared the same view of America as a nation that could only exist if it were based on moral

consensus, even if we shared it from two very different ethnic perspectives. I remember asking him what he thought of a piece I did on Jewish/Catholic *Kulturkampf*, which ended with an analysis of Alan Dershowitz's *The Vanishing American Jew*. My point was that the Jews were putting themselves out of business by espousing sexual liberation. Dresner agreed with what I had to say, but added that Jews didn't like to hear others (i.e., the *goyim*) say it. It was an honest response, and I valued his honesty. In another conversation, he complained about me writing about 'Jewish villains' and so in response I sent him a copy of the then just released book *The Medjugorje Deception* with an inscription to the effect that there were no Jewish villains in it.

In another conversation, Dresner upbraided me for my attitude toward Leo Pfeffer. He was, according to Dresner's account, a pious Jew living on Long Island at the time. Maybe he was talking about another Leo Pfeffer than the one I had in mind. Or maybe Pfeffer had changed and decided to use his old age as an opportunity to repent for the sins of his youth and middle age. The Leo Pfeffer who came to Philadelphia in 1976 to give a lecture on the triumph of secular humanism was the antithesis of Sam Dresner. He was in my opinion a certifiable Jewish villain. In 1976, which is to say the same year that Pfeffer traveled to Philadelphia to gloat over 'the triumph of secular humanism' and the defeat of his Catholic opponents in the culture wars of the '60s, Dresner took a very different approach, attacking the same secularism that Pfeffer praised in an article which appeared in the Spring-Summer 1976 issue of *United Synagogue Review*. The thing which Dresner found 'most disturbing,' according to Gertel, was 'secularism,' the thing whose triumph Pfeffer praised. Pfeffer was an ardent opponent of the Legion of Decency and the Hollywood production code (as well as the architect of the legal strategies which drove prayer from the public schools and which deprived Catholic grade schools of government aid). Dresner complained about the evaporation of Christian faith and morals in America. Dresner felt that the fact that America was becoming more pagan was having an adverse effect on American Jews. Perhaps more than any other one person, Leo Pfeffer was responsible for that evaporation of faith and morals from the public square in America. Unlike Leo Pfeffer, who had good things to say about just about every aspect of cultural and moral subversion, Dresner saw the consequences that Jews like Pfeffer were creating and wondered 'what

would happen throughout America if Jews would begin to say: I will not produce this film, or show this movie, or publish this book, or write this magazine article because it is perverse and destructive of human values. I will not sell this item because it is shoddy and will not last.'

Dresner felt that Jews were better off, spiritually at least, in the ghettos of Eastern Europe. Now that they had arrived in just about every sense of the word in America, he was afraid that they had become 'messengers who forget the message':

For centuries the Jews, shut up in their ghettos, perfected their souls before God and had something to say to mankind. But no one listened. Now, Jews have the ears of non-Jews on every level of society. What a tragedy if now that the gentiles are listening, the Jews have nothing to say.

When *Families* appeared, this gentile was listening, because he felt that this Jew had something to say. Not everyone felt that way about *Families*. His daughters wondered why he had written such a 'harsh and graphic and judgmental book? Why not write a nice and uplifting book, like the ones you used to write?' Their judgment is understandable. *Families* is harsh in its judgment of American Jews and their cultural heroes. Dresner singles out Isaac Bashevis Singer and Woody Allen for particular condemnation because of their contemptuous attitude toward things Jewish. In wondering why Singer is so popular among American Jews and why his portrayal of Polish Jews as sexual degenerates had evoked no protest, Dresner levels a jeremiad of biblical proportions against American Jews, a group which he feels,

have made a caricature out of Judaism, not only by the vulgarism and crass commercialism that pervades their communal life, but, more to the point, by too often abdicating the intellectual life of the faith of Israel to the fads of the time. The true creed of many American Jews, especially the intellectuals, has become whatever happens at the moment to be 'in' -- Marxism, deconstruction, consciousness-raising, permissiveness, liberation, cults, sexual experimentation, etc. (pp. 190-1).

If 'the traditional family is under siege' in America, it is largely because of the influence of what Dresner calls 'the Hollywood crowd,' a group of people who praise 'rebellion, self-fulfillment, and promiscuity' and a 'debased view

of the human body and spirit' which finds acceptance by 'none of the great religions of the world -- and certainly not Judaism.' The Hollywood film, according to Dresner, has become a 'school from which one neither graduates nor needs to leave home to attend.' That school had a profound effect on American attitudes and behavior in the second half of the 20th century. According to Dresner, any study of the films which got produced from 1945 to 1985 would reveal 'a radical shift in values,' one which turned the world upside down. 'Hollywood came to adopt a permissive, value-free attitude in the course of a few decades,' and when it went down the drain, it dragged the rest of America with it. 'The underground has taken over. . . . the avant-garde has become the man on the street. Bohemia is Broadway. The filthy jokes formerly restricted to burlesque houses and certain nightclubs' are now available on 'films and TV for the millions. Las Vegas is no longer a city but a condition' (pp. 316-7). Hollywood, in short, got corrupted around 1945 and is now responsible for the moral decline of American culture.

Dresner's critique of Hollywood, however, is not as pointed as it needs to be. To say that 'the Hollywood elite' came to adopt 'a permissive, value-free attitude in the course of a few decades' from 1945 to 1985 is not only not true, it misses certain salient points. First of all, the Hollywood elite was then and is now overwhelmingly Jewish. Secondly, the Jews who ran Hollywood always had this 'permissive, value-free attitude' when it came to matters venereal. Beginning in the '20s, the outcry against Hollywood's subversion of morals was so great that various forms of legislation -- federal, state and local -- were proposed as an antidote. As a way of heading off this legislation, Hollywood's Jews in 1934 entered into a voluntary agreement with the Legion of Decency, a Catholic operation. That agreement was known as the Production Code. The Catholics forced the issue by organizing boycotts at a time when the film industry was reeling from the effects of the stock market crash and their heavy indebtedness to the nation's banks.

The most memorable and most effective boycott was organized by Cardinal Dougherty of Philadelphia, who forbade that city's Catholics from watching movies in the city's movie houses, which at the time were largely owned by Warner Brothers. His efforts created a situation in which Warner Brothers was losing \$175,000 a week at the height of the depression. At a meeting of Hollywood moguls called to discuss it, the Philadelphia boycott had reduced

the normally pugnacious Harry Warner, to 'standing up at the top of the table, shedding tears the size of horse turds, and pleading for someone to get him off the hook. And well he should, for you could fire a cannon down the center aisle of any theater in Philadelphia, without danger of hitting anyone! And there was Barney Balaban (of Paramount Theaters), watching him in terror wondering if he was going to be next in Chicago.'

The man who described Harry Warner's plight at that meeting and the man who ran the Production Code office for the next 20 years was a Catholic by the name of Joseph I. Breen, a man who had no illusions about the attitudes of the Hollywood elite during the early '30s:

They are simply a rotten bunch of vile people with no respect for anything beyond the making of money. . . . Here [in Hollywood] we have Paganism rampant and in its most virulent form. Drunkenness and debauchery are commonplace. Sexual perversion is rampant . . . any number of our directors and stars are perverts. . . . These Jews seem to think of nothing but moneymaking and sexual indulgence. The vilest kind of sin is a common indulgence hereabouts and the men and women who engage in this sort of business are the men and women who decide what the film fare of the nation is to be. They and they alone make the decision. Ninety-five percent of these folks are Jews of an Eastern European lineage. They are, probably, the scum of the earth (Black, *Hollywood Censored*, p. 70).

Virtually all the historians of Breen's tenure as head of the Production Code condemn Breen as an anti-Semite. Virtually all of the same historians can only bring themselves to use the word 'moral' in quotation marks, giving some indication that they have internalized the standards of the victors in this cultural conflict. The fact that Breen went on to work with 'these folks' for the next 20 years proves -- to Mark Viera, at least -- that Breen was not an anti-Semite:

Joe Breen, who had railed against the immorality of the Hollywood Jews, had learned from them, and they from him. They would not have asked him to run RKO Pictures if he had been truly anti-Semitic. They would not have flown him here and there. They would not have invited him into their homes. And they certainly would not have given him an Academy Award. He had

convictions. He was a fighter, but he didn't hate.

What was true then is *a fortiori* true today. Jews dominate Hollywood and always have. The immigrant Jews who created Hollywood's major studios were followed by another generation of Jews who founded the nation's major TV networks -- William Paley's CBS, David Sarnoff's NBC and Leonard Goldenson's ABC.

Today about two-thirds of leading TV and movie producers are Jewish. Four of the five companies that dominate American entertainment are run by Jews (Gerald Levin, who once considered a rabbinic career, runs Time Warner, Michael Eisner runs Disney, Mel Karmazin and Sumner Redstone run Viacom-CBS, and the Bronfmans run Universal).

This fact is rarely discussed in the mainstream media because Jews control that as well. When British journalist William Cash wrote about Jewish control of Hollywood in the October 1994 issue of the *Spectator*, Hollywood and its academic support troops reacted with rage verging on hysteria. In the November 13, 1994 issue of the *Los Angeles Times*, Neal Gabler attacked Cash's article as 'an anti-Semitic bleat from a reactionary crackpot' which could have been dismissed out of hand 'if it didn't have a respectable platform in the *Spectator* and didn't play to a pre-existing prejudice -- that Jews control the U.S. media.' Neal Gabler, it should be noted, is the author of *An Empire of their Own: How Jews Created Hollywood*. Gabler, in other words was attacking Cash, for saying what Gabler had said in his own book. According to Cash,

That every major studio head is Jewish today is no different from 60 years ago. 'Of 85 names engaged in production, 53 are Jews,' a 1936 survey noted. And the Jewish advantage holds in prestige as well as numbers. In a recent *Premiere* magazine 'Special Power Issue' -- ranking the 100 most powerful people in the 'Industry' -- the top 12 were Jewish. There were no black or British industry executives ranked.

Jewish domination of Hollywood, however, cannot be limited to numbers. The numbers simply give a pale approximation of the extent to which Jews determine the cultural matrix out of which the nation's films get made. Cash cites an instance of the 'extreme measures' non-Jews engage in to succeed in

Hollywood:

Bill Stadiem, a former Harvard educated Wall Street lawyer who is now a screenwriter in LA, told me that he recently came across an old WASP friend in an LA restaurant who had been president of the Porcellian at Harvard -- the most exclusive undergraduate dining-club. His friend -- a would-be producer -- was dressed in a black nylon tracksuit and had gold chains on his wrist; dangling around his neck was a chunky Star of David. Stadiem asked: 'Why the hell are you dressed like that?' The WASP replied: 'I'm trying to look Jewish.'

One need only think back to Jay Gatsby's attempts to pass as a WASP in F. Scott Fitzgerald's novel, *The Great Gatsby*, to see how the cultural equation changed over the course of the 20th century. As media and entertainment came to dominate the political and cultural landscape, the Jew eventually succeeded the WASP as the country's culturally dominant ethnic group, the group which set the styles for the rest of the nation.

But here as elsewhere the term Jew has to be defined. 'Jews in Hollywood,' according to one commentator 'like most Jews in the media, academia and pornography, tend to be radical and alienated Jews, rooted neither in Judaism nor in the majority Christian culture. They tend to be rootless and politically left of center, seeking to create a rootless cosmopolitan society to reflect their own non-Judaic traditionless values.' They don't cease being Jews because of that fact, however, nor do they cease to act like Jews, as Cash's article makes clear. Cash describes then 81-year-old Lew Wasserman as at the top of Hollywood's 'feudal power structure.' When Stephen Spielberg, David Geffen and Jeffrey Katzenberg decided to form their own production studio, they first gathered at Wasserman's estate to gain his 'rabbinical blessing,' after which they spoke in 'hushed, reverential tones about the industry potentate,' and how he 'spun stories about the history of Hollywood and showed them artifacts.'

Wasserman had been Stephen Spielberg's mentor for over almost 30 years. Jews, according to Cash, govern the New Establishment, but they govern it like rootless and alienated Jews, which is to say, according to no Torah but the one of their own making. That means the application of traditional

Jewish prejudice against majority culture with none of the restraint imposed by rabbinical interpretation of moral norms. That means, in short, moral subversion of the sort which Hollywood promulgated during the cultural revolution of the '60s, complicated by the fact that anyone who objects or even describes the situation, as the reaction to Cash's article showed, gets demonized as an anti-Semite.

'Few in Hollywood (can) recall such an anti-Semitic article in a mainstream publication,' wrote Bernard Weinraub, the *New York Times'* Hollywood correspondent in response to Cash's article. Hollywood in general concurred, filling the letters columns of local papers with one horrified reaction after another. One letter to the editor, whose list of prominent signatories included Kevin Costner, Sidney Poitier, and Tom Cruise worried that a new Holocaust and Spanish Inquisition could not be far behind.

### **The Battle over the Sexualization of America**

William Cash's and Joe Breen's candor about Hollywood fills in what Sam Dresner's account leaves out. It shows that the battle over the sexualization of American culture was largely if not exclusively a battle between America's Jews and Catholics. From 1934 to 1965, Hollywood's Jews were forced to repress their 'permissive, value-free attitude' in matters sexual, or at least they were prevented from expressing that attitude in the films that they made. The golden age of Hollywood which Dresner indirectly praises was a collaborative effort; it was Catholics saving Hollywood's Jews from their own worst instincts. The Catholics eventually lost that battle, with dire consequences for the entire nation. Indeed, Rabbi Dresner's book is one of those consequences. His book is also an indication that the history of American Culture in the 20th century is in many respects a history of the sexual degeneration of the American Jew. That means the decline of the Rabbi Dresner Jew and the Rise of the Woody Allen Jew in his place as an icon for the entire culture. The Catholics lost the culture wars because they internalized Woody Allen Jewish values on sexuality, just as much as they adopted WASP values on birth control.

That, of course, leads to a dilemma for Rabbi Dresner. If we're talking about Boston's Puritans as the first and foremost influence in America, America

was founded by a group of Judaizers, who followed a distinctly Old Testament version of Christianity, making America one of the most 'Jewish' of all of the 'Christian' nations. The Enlightenment, which was the intellectual matrix out of which the United States grew, abstracted Jewish morals from their religious context and made them the basis for a multi-ethnic 'nation.' America's Jewish roots, in other words, go deep, but they also lead us to Rabbi Dresner's dilemma. On the one hand, adherence to the Torah's teaching on the family can save America from moral decline. On the other hand, the moral decline that Dresner complains about was in no small amount attributable to the cultural influence of American Jews, something he adverts to time and time again in his book. 'Jews,' he tells us, 'have played a less than admirable role in the sexual revolution' (p. 155). 'Many liberal rabbis,' he continues, 'are in the forefront of the proabortion movement. In fact, surveys indicate that Jewish women are among the most likely of all groups to support 'abortion on demand' (p. 39). Dresner goes on to cite 'a recent Gallup poll and a suppressed B'nai B'rith survey,' which indicates that American Jews are more likely to be divorced and less likely to be married than the average American; that '91 percent of Jewish women agree that every woman who wants an abortion should be able to have one'; that '50 percent of Jewish women signaled a high degree of affinity for feminism compared to only 16 percent among non-Jewish women,' and that Jews favor homosexual rights more than the general population. Yet Dresner tells us that the Jewish religion says that 'homosexuality is a violation of the order of creation' and that the family is 'divinely ordained' by that same order of creation. As a result, Dresner tells us that Jews, if they want to participate in a family coalition, 'need to put their own house in order' not only because they have abandoned traditional values, like other Americans, but because they 'are more likely to live in urban areas in the forefront of social change.'

Dresner never wrote from a deracinated, anti-ethnic perspective. He was an American worried about moral decline, but he was also a Jew concerned about the state of American Jews. Part of the pathos of his book stems from the anguish he feels when viewing the moral decline of American Jews, something he sees as quintessentially anti-Jewish, because Jews, according to his view, either stand for the moral law, as introduced by Moses into human history, or they stand for nothing. The cultural prominence of Jews like Woody Allen was especially painful for Dresner because they had

become cultural icons by promoting sexual deviance. They had also promoted many of the standard anti-Semitic stereotypes. 'For the Gentile,' Dresner writes, 'Allen's depiction of religious Jews as pious frauds, and worse, can only confirm ancient Christian canards of the Jew as hypocrite, devil, despoiler of morality, and corrupter of culture' (p. 238). Why, Dresner wonders giving voice to that anguish, should American Jews rush to accept Woody Allen's categorization of them as 'despoilers of morality'? It's a question which Dresner addresses but cannot answer. 'Why Jews want to demean themselves is a question that Hollywood 'theologians' have yet to address.' But the fact remains. The rootless Jews who dominate Hollywood and, as a result, American culture as a whole, have defined themselves as, in Dresner's words, 'despoilers of morality and corrupters of culture.'

Dresner is concerned that others have noticed the same thing. He cites a letter to the California Lawyer which claims that 'the progressive deterioration of morality can be directly attributable to the growing predominance of Jews in our national life.' Dresner is, of course, appalled, but his book is saying essentially the same thing. Is Rabbi Dresner, then, an anti-Semite? Given the canons of contemporary discourse, it depends on how we define the term. Israel Shamir, writing in the Israeli newspaper *H'aaretz*, recently said that anyone who objected to American global cultural imperialism could now safely be termed an anti-Semite. Unless, of course, he is Jewish, in that instance he is referred to as a 'self-hating Jew,' a term which can be defined as referring to anyone who disagrees with the party line as articulated by Abe Foxman, the Bronfmans, the ADL, the AJC and all of the other leaders and organizations that have tried to turn Jews into the avant garde of the Cultural Revolution.

How then can Rabbi Dresner claim that Jews can bring about a reform of family life and morals when he's saying that Jews are responsible for that moral decline in the first place? The answer lies in defining the word 'Jew,' and that means distinguishing between the Rabbi Dresner Jew and the Woody Allen Jew. 'Jews,' Dresner tells us in a passage I have already cited, 'have . . . played a less than admirable role in the sexual revolution. That, however does not mean that they speak for Judaism, any more than antifamily Jewish feminists do.' The issue, in other words, revolves around the question, 'who speaks for the Jews?' Rabbi Dresner is a conservative, for

whom the Torah is normative. That means that 'homosexuality is a violation of the order of creation' (p. 81). That, in turn, means that, on the issue of homosexuality, Rabbi Dresner is at odds with the majority of American Jews. That, in turn, leads to a paradox: America has become more Jewish over the course of the 20th century, but Jews have become less Jewish at the same time, if we define the Jew the way Dresner does, as a follower of the Torah. The Jew has become an American Cultural Hero, but he has become that largely by espousing sexual degeneracy. As a result, America is becoming simultaneously more Jewish, but less representative of what Rabbi Dresner believes. 'Twenty years ago,' Dresner writes,

Time magazine ran an article claiming that 'the United States is becoming more Jewish . . . Among American intellectuals the Jew has even become a culture hero.' It went on to quote poet Robert Lowell, who declared that 'Jewishness is the center of today's literature much as the West was in the '30s.' Twenty years later (26 February 1990), Time repeated the same theme, informing us that 'Jews are news. It is an axiom of journalism. An indispensable one, too, because it is otherwise impossible to explain why the deeds and misdeeds of a dot-on-the-map Israel get an absurdly disproportionate amount of news coverage around the world.' (p. 275).

The unanswered question in the midst of all this breathless journalism is the meaning of the word Jew. Which is another way of saying, who speaks for the American Jew? Rabbi Dresner or Woody Allen? If numbers determine the truth, then the answer is clearly Woody Allen. But that raises other issues. If, as Dresner notes, 'American Jews accept the categorization of themselves as advocates of Woody Allen,' then Judaism is another word for 'sexual permissiveness and even perversity,' a doctrine which Dresner finds clearly unacceptable. Dresner takes his rule of thumb from Susan Handleman: 'The lifestyles of Jews should not determine the Jewish style of life.' The former, according to Dresner, 'should not be determined by the latter, even if the latter should become a majority in the Jewish community.' If American Jews were to become 'advocates of Woody Allen,' that would mean 'not only a betrayal of Jewish values but a betrayal of the Jewish people, for no one more than [Woody] Allen has enabled so many to view the Jew, especially the religious Jew, in so corrupt a manner' (p. 223).

It should be obvious by now that Dresner does not like Woody Allen, the classic example of how America has become more Jewish while at the same time 'American Jews are becoming less Jewish.' Because of his popularity and because the mainline Jewish organizations -- which, Dresner notes, spend millions to ferret out anti-Semitism -- leave his attacks on Jewish tradition unmentioned, Woody Allen has become a paradigm for the majority of American Jews. But in order to understand what that means, we first have to understand what Woody Allen symbolizes to the majority of American Jews.

Dresner's book is helpful in this regard. Woody Allen, according to Dresner, has had a 'persistent fascination' with incest. He has also been in psychoanalysis for over 30 years, which means that this fascination with incest, whether expressed in his writing ('It's a whole new ball game,' she said, pressing close to me. 'Marrying Mom has made you my father.') or his seduction of his and Mia Farrow's adopted daughter Soon Yi Previn is best explained by an analysis of Freud. Freud, too, was obsessed with incest. In his book *Moses and Monotheism*, Freud makes clear that, as in the case of the Pharaohs of Egypt, incest confers god-like status on its perpetrators. In the same book, Freud also claims that Moses was an Egyptian, in an attempt to de-legitimatize the man who gave the law to Israel. David Bakan has written a book commenting on these passages in which he claims that Freud was a follower of the Jewish false Messiah Shabbetai Zevi and that his attack on Moses was really an attempt to abolish the law in the same way that Zevi did, which is to say through ritual impurity. Jews who promote sexual revolution are following in this tradition: 'They,' Dresner tells us, 'conjure up painful memories of the infamous seventeenth century false messiah Sabbatai Tzvi or his successor, Jacob Frank. Their coming was to mark a new age when the rule of Torah was to be superseded -- 'What was forbidden is now permitted' -- and transgressions would become a mitzvot' (p. 160).

'For those who seek the forbidden in Jewish guise,' Dresner continues, 'Sabbatianism points the way.' This is so because it gets to the very heart of Judaism, a religion according to Dresner, which was forged in opposition to the fertility cults of Canaan and the rest of the ancient middle east. 'In biblical times,' Dresner continues, 'Judaism waged a battle against sexual

excess not unlike the struggle now in progress -- and in those earlier times, Mosaic law was victorious. *Unbridled sexuality lay at the heart of ancient pagan religion*' (p. 66, my emphasis). In Dresner's view, Jewish history is one long battle against sexual deviance. 'The early biblical narratives can be read as a continuous attack on the widespread sexual deviance that challenged and often seduced the Israelites, whose fallings away Scripture scrupulously records' (p. 82). What crime was so great that it provoked God to destroy mankind, except for Noah and his family, with a flood? 'According to the most ancient understanding of the biblical story found in rabbinic sources, it was the violation of the natural order of sexual life' (p. 83). 'God,' Dresner says at another point, 'is long-suffering of all manner of crime, save sexual immorality' (p. 85).

Even if Judaism was forged in opposition to pagan fertility cults (Rabbi Judah said in the name of Rav: 'The Israelites knew there was no substance to pagan idolatry. They took it up only to engage more freely in forbidden sexual practices.' ), Israel's 'victory over pagan idolatry was never complete. . . . The Book of Kings . . . demonstrates how closely Israel came to being swallowed up by the powerful cults' (p. 140).

That battle has continued to the present day. In fact, the impression that one gets by reading Dresner's book is that over the course of the twentieth century in America the Jews have suffered one of the greatest defeats in their history. Dresner blames this defeat on assimilation, but the irony is that the Jews were corrupting America's morals at the same time that they were undergoing moral corruption themselves by assimilating so successfully in America. Assimilation means the adoption of pagan sexual mores of the sort that nearly destroyed the Israelites at the time of the Book of Kings. But America in the late 19th and early 20th centuries was no Canaan. It was known for its moral rectitude if not its 'Puritanism,' as anyone who has read the novels of Henry James could attest. The Jews who came to America did not come as Joshua came to Canaan. The Jews who arrived from the Polish shtetl arrived to find a ruling class more interested in Darwin than Christ. They adopted the worst aspects of modernity and became both corrupted and, because of their influence in the media, corrupter simultaneously. Just what was Jay Gatsby supposed to learn from Tom Buchanan, other than what clothes he was supposed to wear? The fact that the white race was

being corrupted, according to Goddard's (i.e. Lothrop Stoddard's) book? The success Jews have achieved in media, publishing, academe, etc. over the course of the 20th century, only magnified the corrupting influence which modernity inflicted on them and which they would in turn inflict on their host culture as well, as the letter to the California Lawyer which Dresner found so disturbing indicated. Dresner's antipathy toward both Woody Allen and Isaac Bashevis Singer stems from the fact that he is both an American and a Jew and from the fact that Woody Allen and Singer can be seen as corrupting influences from both perspectives. Dresner's anger is based on the fact that he sees American Jews succumbing to the perennial temptation of sexual idolatry by following their influence.

The connection between Singer and Shabbetai Zevi is nothing if not explicit. Dresner notes his early 'fascination with Sabbatianism.' 'I read whatever I could,' Singer writes, 'about the era of Sabbatai Zevi, in whose footsteps Jacob Frank had followed . . . In these works I found everything I had been pondering, hysteria, sex, fanaticism, superstition' (p. 184).

Dresner mentions Shabbetai Zevi and his successor Jacob Frank in connection with the sexual corruption of contemporary Jews. Not only have America's Jews been corrupted by Sabbatianism, the Sabbatian infection has become the majority position: the lifestyle of Jews has trumped the Jewish style of life based on the Torah as the Jewish norm.

To cloak perversion with piety has a frightening ring, conjuring up memories of the Asherah in the temple and the antics of Jacob Frank, precisely because it blurs the distinctions between the Jewish style of life and the lifestyle of Jews, between what Judaism prescribes and what some Jews regrettably choose to do. It tends to validate the position that whatever Jews say or do can be identified as Judaism. It cripples the ability of Judaism to address the doings and sayings of Jews. How can a religion that is based four-square on marriage and the home countenance the revival of the sexual lifestyle of ancient (and modern) idolatry (p. 155)?

### **A New and Frightening Drama**

Dresner is in many ways more upset about Singer's popularity than he is about Woody Allen's. 'Are Singer's writings "true" '? he wonders. 'The

corruption, the adultery, the demonic, the philandering, the decay, the perversion that pervade Singer's picture of Polish Jewry -- is it all true? And if it is not "true", then why has someone not said so?' (p. 177). The silence of American Jews over Singer and Allen indicates ambivalence, which is to say, 'their secret desire to repudiate the moral direction of three thousand years of Jewish history in favor of the worship of sensuality and fear of the demonic, . . . finding meaning in their animal nature instead of in the power of man to transcend himself.' American Jews have embraced Singer's writings, 'because they express what Jews secretly desire.' And what is that? Sexual liberation in Jewish garb, which is to say, Sabbatianism, which is, according to Dresner, 'the one movement in Jewish history that not only broke the moral yoke of Sinai but provided a theological justification for it: 'in the transgression of the mitzvah."

The fact that Singer has declared his Sabbatian sympathies publicly coupled with the fact that he has become so popular with American Jews indicates that the curtain may be going up 'on a new and frightening drama in Jewish life.' That means that the modern Jew (especially in America) is now the devotee of 'an alternate faith.' Jewish silence on Singer 'may be a sign of a sickness so severe we do not perceive its symptoms.' Dresner, as well as Heschel and a number of other Yiddish writers familiar with the situation in Poland before World War II, considered Singers' writings one long calumny of eastern European Jews. If this is so, why are American Jews so interested in promoting the calumny? Because if eastern European Jewry is what Singer says it was, then, according to Dresner, American Jews 'need feel no guilt; they can go about their way, not much different from other Americans, philandering, corrupting, and making of their faith a sham in the comforting belief that it was, after all, always like that. That's what the Jews of Eastern Europe were -- philanderers, adulterers and corrupters: why should American Jews be better?'

The conclusion which Dresner draws is inescapable. If Woody Allen speaks for the majority of American Jews, then American Jews have been corrupted; they are now no longer followers of Moses but rather followers of Shabbetai Zevi. In the process of succumbing to that corruption, they have played a major role in the corruption of American morals and culture. American cultural life in the last half of the 20th century, in other words, has

been dominated by Jewish rebellion against the Torah and the adoption of the sexual practices and worldview of Shabbetai Zevi. The overwhelming majority of American Jews -- as evidenced by the surveys Dresner cites -- have defined themselves as sexual revolutionaries, and because of the disproportionate role which Jews play in publishing and the media, they have, in effect, established Sabbatian sexual degeneracy as the American cultural norm. According to Dresner, Judaism is about nothing 'if not the centrality of virtue.' 'How,' he wonders, 'can a Jew maintain any other position?' And as if he has already learned the answer by reading his own book, he replies with some understatement, 'Nevertheless, some do.' Judaism, according to Dresner, 'stands as inexorably against the new paganism as it did against the old. And so should the Jew,' but at the same time that the American Jew was reaching cultural prominence, he was also converting to Sabbatianism, 'an alternate faith.' As a result, 'Jewish rebellion has broken out on several levels,' one being 'the prominent role of Jews as advocates to sexual experimentation.'

Dresner again adverts to 'significant elements of America's cultural elite,' which 'by its example, desensitizes this nation morally.' By stating the case this way, he moves into another area, namely, the problem which this group of Jews has created for America and the fact that their Jewishness has in effect, prohibited others from addressing the problem. Again he deals with the issue indirectly. 'How could so many American Jewish leaders,' he wonders, 'have been taken in by Allen?' Dresner has the cart before the horse here. Those Jewish leaders have used Allen as a way of redefining the American Jew in their image. They have used Allen to define the Jew as a sexually deviant cultural bolshevist. As a result, anyone who objects to sexual deviance or Hollywood's promotion of it gets defined as an anti-Semite. The equation is very simple. Since Hollywood is run by Jews, being anti-Hollywood means being an anti-Semite. Dresner cites Richard Goldstein, writing in the liberal *Village Voice* as an example of this sort of thinking. According to Goldstein, 'the Republican attack on Hollywood and the 'media elite,' is a code for anti-Semitism, because 'these are words that since the '50s connote Jewishness to people. The Republicans can't attack Jews directly, so they use codes. The notion of Woody as a kind of Jewish icon lends itself to the ideas of Jews subverting the Christian family, an idea which is very old and very dark.'

Yes, it is a very dark idea. But who's promoting it? The Woody Allen Jews, as if to provoke the very anti-Semitism which will vindicate them in their own eyes and at the same time justify the descent into sexual degeneracy which their consciences must find troubling from time to time. The Woody Allen Jew is, in other words, engaged in *Kulturkampf* not only with the 'Christian' culture which he wants to destroy but with the Sam Dresner Jews who would define the Torah as normative. Since Woody Allen is a cultural icon for most Jews, most Jews have defined themselves as sexual degenerates. Dresner quotes a columnist in the *Village Voice*, who writes:

There are two kinds of people in the world: those who think Woody Allen is the genius spokesman of our collective angst and those how think he's a filthy Jewish liberal . . . elitist Communist madman. Another name for those two groups are Democrats and Republicans.

That a Jew can write this way is some indication to Dresner that 'the underground has taken over.' The world, he says, at another point, has been turned upside-down. Judaism has been redefined by the country's 'cultural elite,' which is to say it has been redefined by American Jews. Hollywood has triumphed in promulgating its values, and one major part of that triumph has been the redefinition of the Jew from someone who believed in the centrality of virtue into someone who is a promoter of sexual deviance. Jews, in other words, are responsible for America's moral decline not just because they dominate the media but also because of how they have redefined themselves, something which emerged in a recent discussion of Jewish participation in the pornography 'industry' on the Internet.

### **Luke Ford**

Luke Ford was raised as a Seventh Day Adventist in Australia. He came to Los Angeles to study and after coming down with chronic fatigue syndrome, spent his time in convalescence listening to Dennis Prager's radio program. As a result of listening to Prager, he converted to orthodox Judaism. Since Los Angeles is the center of the pornography industry and since Ford was also interested in pornography, he noticed that Jews dominate the porn industry in Hollywood and decided to discuss the issue on his website, [lukeford.com](http://lukeford.com) (Since this discussion -- and perhaps because of it --

[lukeford.com](http://lukeford.com) has been taken over by the porn industry. Luke Ford's lucubrations on things Jewish, things pornographic, and things in general are now available only at [lukeford.net](http://lukeford.net)). Luke Ford noticed that 'secular Jews play a disproportionate role throughout the sex industry':

Leading modern Jewish pornographers include Ron Braverman, John Bone, Wesley Emerson, Paul Fishbein, Herbert Feinberg AKA Mickey Fine, Hank Weinstein, Lenny Friedlander, Bobby Hollander, Rubin Gottesman, Fred Hirsch and his children Steve and Marci, Paul 'Norman' Apstein, Steve Orenstein, Jack Richmond (Legend CEO), Theodore Rothstein, Reuben and David Sturman, Ron Sullivan, Jerome Tanner, Armand Weston, Sam and Mitch Weston (Spinelli).

Jews accounted for most of the leading male performers of the 1970s and '80s. Hebrew studs include Buck Adams, Bobby Astyr, (Bobby Charles) R. Bolla (Robert Kerman), Jerry Butler (Paul Siderman), Seymore Butts (Adam Glasser), Roger Caine (Al Levitsky), David Christopher (Bernie Cohen), Steve Drake, Jesse Eastern, Jamie Gillis (Jamie Gurman), Ron Jeremy (Hyatt), Michael Knight, William Margold, Ashley Moore (Steve Tucker), David Morris, George Payne, Ed Powers (Mark Arnold aka Mark Krinski), Harry Reems (Herbert Streicher), Dave Ruby, Herschel Savage (Harvey Cowen), Carter Stevens (Mal Warub), Marc Stevens, Paul Thomas (Phil Tobias), Marc Wallace (Marc Goldberg), Randy West (Andy Abrams) and Jack Wrangler.

Jewish female performers include Avalon, Jenny Baxter (Jenny Wexler), Busty Belle (Tracy Praeger), Chelsea Blake, Tiffany Blake, Bunny Bleu (Kim Warner), J.R. Carrington, Lee Carroll (Leslie Barris), Blair Castle/Brooke Fields (Allison Shandibal), Courtney/Natasha/Eden (Natasha Zimmerman), Daphne (Daphne Franks), Barbara Dare (Stacy Mitnick), April Diamond, Jeanna Fine, Alexis Gold, Terri Hall, Heather Hart, Nina Hartley (Hartman), C.J. Laing (Wendy Miller), Frankie Leigh (Cynthia Hope Geller), Gloria Leonard, Traci Lords (Nora Louise Kuzma), Amber Lynn, Tonisha Mills, Melissa Monet, Susan Nero, Scarlett O. (Catherine Goldberg), Tawny Pearl (Susan Pearlman), Nina Preta, Tracey Prince, Raylene, Janey Robbins (Robin Lieberman), Mila Shegol, Alexandra Silk, Susan Sloan, Annie Sprinkle (Ellen Steinberg), Karen Summer (Dana

Alper), Cindy West, Zara Whites (Amy Kooiman) and Ona Zee (Ona Simms). (This citation, as well as all of the subsequent citations have been taken from the discussion of Jews and pornography at the lukeford.com website, all of which have been removed by the cite's new owners.)

If, as Ford notes, 'the Torah [Pentateuch] commands Jews 'to be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation,' and Judaism strongly opposes porn, why do Jews dominate porn?' Is the ethnic connection purely fortuitous? Is it like the fact that many policemen in New York are Irish? Is there an ethnic connection between being Irish and law enforcement? Perhaps all of the Irish who got arrested in New York in the nineteenth and early twentieth century for drunken brawling were impressed with how policemen handled themselves. In other words, probably not. Is there some necessary ethnic connection between being Irish and putting out fires? Probably not.

Is there a connection between being a Jew and being involved in pornography? That question is more difficult to answer. One Jewish male porn star responded to the question, 'Why are most of the men that do porno Jewish?' with a simple answer, 'Jewish mothers!' Jewish men, in other words, are involved in porn because they 'are taught to respect women and help them. They also are nonthreatening to most women. Let's face it, Ron Jeremy is not exactly Mike Tyson... You'll usually find that the real mean bastards (physically violent) in the industry are not Jewish (that includes, producers, directors, boyfriends, agents, etc). Jewish guys are more manipulative....' Again, it's hard to tell whether this answer is motivated by a desire for self-exculpation or a desire to promote anti-Semitic stereotypes.

### **Outraged Response**

When William Cash wrote his already cited article in the British magazine *The Spectator* discussing Jewish dominance in Hollywood and, therefore, the pornography industry, the discussion prompted an outraged response from Abraham H. Foxman, head of the Anti-Defamation League. To raise the issue meant that one was guilty of propagating an anti-Semitic canard, even though, in the case of Luke Ford, it was a Jew who raised the issue. 'Those Jews who enter the pornography industry,' Foxman opined, 'have done so as individuals pursuing the American dream, not as representatives of their

religious group. Moreover, anti-Semites never seem to take note of the fact that the most prominent pornographers in America are Hugh Hefner and Larry Flynt, neither of whom is the least bit Jewish. Finally, though individual Jews may play a role in pornography, Jewishness does not.'

Foxman then fell back on the same justification for obscenity that Irving Thalberg used in his fight with the Legion of Decency. Pornography is controlled by 'consumers,' most of whom are Gentiles. Therefore, Gentiles are ultimately responsible for pornography. According to Foxman, even if Jews dominate a particular field, as is the case with both Hollywood and the related pornography industry, that bears no relationship to the fact that they are Jews, no matter how one defines the term. To say otherwise is to be an anti-Semite.

Foxman is being more than a little disingenuous here. In mentioning Larry Flynt and Hugh Hefner as the paradigmatic Gentile pornographers, he failed to point out that 1) that Hugh Hefner would object to being called a pornographer and 2) that Larry Flynt is a significant contributor to the ADL. He also failed to mention, as Rabbi Dresner points out in his book, that Hugh Hefner received the ADL's freedom award in 1980. Taking a less partisan view of the question, Dresner feels that

The religion of impulse likewise found significant Jewish involvement. An unusually high percentage of the material on sexual liberation was written by Jews, as well as among its advocates. On a more commercial level, for example, Jews have been strongly represented in the Playboy enterprises. B'nai Brith's Anti-Defamation League had no problem, for example, when some years back they presented their American Freedom Award at a fashionable black-tie dinner-dance to Hugh Hefner. . . . About the honoree, the ADL says, with an apparent straight face, that the empire he founded has had a far-reaching impact, not only on the publishing industry, but on the mores of American society as well.

In other words, the ADL was rewarding Hefner for the role he played in bringing about widespread moral corruption and the spread of sexual deviance in America. The question remains, why would the Jews at the ADL be interested in rewarding this sort of behavior? Why, as Dresner asks in his

book, did American Jewry remain silent when the ADL conferred its freedom award. 'Both the Jewish establishment and nonestablishment observers,' Dresner laments, 'took it in stride, raising not a finger of protest. It was Catholic William Buckley of *National Review* who pointed to the Jewish issue.'

And what exactly is the 'Jewish issue' here? The answer depends a lot on how the term Jew gets defined, especially by the Jews themselves. Ford claims that the Jews who dominate pornography are what Rabbi Dresner would call 'advocates of Woody Allen,' which is to say, Sabbatian in their orientation. It's, in other words, not a coincidence that they are Jewish and involved in pornography. Their involvement in pornography flows naturally from the way they define themselves as Jews. Luke Ford, according to one report, 'insists that pornography constitutes a deliberate attempt by 'non-Jewish Jews,' alienated from normative Judaism and Christian mores, to undermine Western civilization.'

According to Luke Ford's discussion, the animus of the Jewish Cultural Revolutionary is historical and ethnic. Pornography is just one weapon in a panoply of cultural warfare which gets waged half in self-defense, half in residual animus against traditional majority Christian cultures, even when, as is the case of the United States, the original prescription no longer fits the actual situation. According to Ford,

that is their aim because they are Jews, and they are reaching for even more control than they already have. This is the historic *modus operandi* of the Jews. They are outsiders everywhere except in Israel, and when they first appear in any Gentile society and begin reaching for power they are resisted. The society treats the Jews as outsiders, as aliens, and attempts to keep them from gaining control. The Jewish method of countering this opposition is to work quietly to accumulate as much wealth as possible. At the same time they work to corrupt the society's leaders with money and to sow dissension among the masses, to set one social class against another, to break up the society's solidarity and its cohesiveness, so that there will be less resistance to their penetration of the society.

During the latter half of the 19th century and the first part of the 20th

century fomenting class warfare has been their most successful technique in Europe. In Russia, for example, they would have had difficulty in corrupting the enormously wealthy aristocracy with bribes, but their technique of fomenting class warfare succeeded in destroying Russian society and letting the Jews seize control through their Marxist movement. In the United States, on the other hand, where the political leaders are essentially hucksters and lawyers and the working class is relatively well off compared to Russia, the Jews have had much more success with corruption than with their attempts to foment class warfare. . . . and in the last half of the 20th century their principal weapon for this purpose, more important than corruption or class warfare, has been their control of the mass media of news and entertainment.

Jewish involvement in pornography, in other words, goes deeper both commercially and philosophically than Abe Foxman is willing to admit. Once the majority of American Jews defined themselves as sexually deviant, pornography, along with homosexual rights, feminism, and New Age goddess worship, would become a natural expression of their worldview, and since they controlled Hollywood, they were in the position to make their worldview normative for the culture at large. The traditional animus against majority culture combined with a decline in moral scruple would naturally lead 'the advocates of Woody Allen' to become involved in pornography as a form of cultural warfare.

The most significant thinker in this regard is Wilhelm Reich, a Jew from Galicia who was a student of both Sigmund Freud (quite literally) and Karl Marx and a man who tried to create an intellectual marriage between their two quintessentially revolutionary ideologies. Reich wrote the book on sexual revolution and many Jewish porn stars have read it. Richard Pacheco is one.

'Five years before I got my first part in an adult film,' Pacheco explained, 'I went down to an audition for an X-rated film with my hair down to my ass, a copy of Wilhelm Reich's Sexual Revolution under my arm and yelling about work, love and sex, which were Reich's three principles. These things have got to be in balance or your life is going to get fucked.' Pacheco didn't get the job, but he didn't stop auditioning either. Nor did he stop using his Jewishness as the rationalization for his participation in pornography. 'Five

years later,' Pacheco continued, 'I auditioned for another X-rated film. That very day, I also interviewed at Hebrew Union Seminary to do rabbinical study. I made the choice that the kind of rabbi I would be, if I became one, was one that could have been performing in sex films as part of his experience.'

### **Jewish Porn Star**

Nina Hartley (nee Hartman) also sees a connection between being Jewish and being a porn star. As Rabbi Dresner might have noted, it's a long way from the Torah to *Debbie Duz Dishes*, in which she plays 'a sexually insatiable Jewish housewife who enjoys sex with anyone who rings the doorbell.' *Debbie Duz Dishes* is Hartley's biggest selling, Jewish themed porn video. Hartley tried to articulate the connection between being Jewish and being a porn star in an interview with Jewish pornographer Sheldon Ranz in the Spring 1989 edition of the left-wing Jewish journal *Shmate*. She begins by making the sort of morphological distinction that Rabbi Dresner made in his book. She begins by explaining that she is 'Jewish culturally but not religiously.' That means that being Jewish gets defined in an essentially negative sense. Being Jewish means being anti-Christian. That means that 'I'm generally less subservient than a typical WASP female. And I've discovered certain gender interactions are different between Jewish and non-Jewish couples.' Hartley was born in 1956 and grew up in Berkeley, 'which is heavily influenced by [secular] Jewish culture. It's an intellectual town. A lot of the people who set the political agenda are Jewish.' Hartley, in other words, can see pornography as the fulfillment of 'Jewish values' because those values reflect not the Torah but rather the mores of secular Jews living in Berkeley in the '60s, a time of social upheaval. That means that 'there are things that you learn and ways that you think that you don't understand are more Jewish than not until you go into mainstream America and realize that other people don't think this way.'

Jews, in other words, are different than 'mainstream America,' something she defines as vaguely Christian. Since Jews like Hartley are not Christians, they define themselves as the opposite of Christianity. Forgetting that Christianity and Judaism both view the Torah and the moral code it expresses as canonical, Hartley then goes on to define the Jew as someone who opposes

morals as the Bible defines them. Once again she makes a stab at justifying pornography as something essentially compatible with being Jewish. She can only do this, of course, by taking as normative not the Torah but rather the history of Jews as she has lived that history by coming of age in Berkeley during the '60s, which means, of course, accepting the history of Jewish secularization in the wake of the Enlightenment, and that means, of course, taking into account the influence that communism had on her parents' generation.

'I'm proud,' Hartley continues, 'of my heritage's intellectual history and its empathy with the persecuted. But I'm no Zionist. Politically, I'm left-wing. I want everyone to have a job, everyone to have food, clothing, shelter, medical care and education. Utopia might be communist but in the meantime we have to have socialism. I want everyone to have a piece.'

At some point, the baby boomer Jewish revolutionaries redefined the revolution. Unlike their communist parents, who saw the revolution as revolving around economic issues, the baby boomer Jewish revolutionaries saw the essential issues as sexual. Like Richard Pacheco, they took Wilhelm Reich as their guide, instead of Trotsky or Lenin, the quintessential revolutionary figures for their parents' generation. As Igor Shafarevich noted, socialism at its most basic has always had a sexual component. It has always meant the communality of wives as well as the communality of property. So the idea of 'democratic' sex has been part of the socialist tradition from the beginning. But the idea of sexual liberation has also been refined in the course of history as well, and the Jewish porn stars who see pornography as an expression of their Jewishness are aware of those refinements as well. In fact it was the earlier Jewish infatuation with socialism which made the Jewish justification of pornography possible. Hartley 'descends ideologically from the Marxist Jewish philosopher Herbert Marcuse who prophesied that a socialist utopia would free individuals to achieve sexual satisfaction. Nina descends literally from a line of radical Jews. Her grandfather (a physics professor) and her father (a radio announcer) belonged to the Communist party.' One of Hartley's brothers is an Orthodox Jew who is not pleased with her vocation as porn star. As a result, they don't speak to each other. Rather than leave it at that, Hartley goes out of her way to portray him as the black sheep of the family. Ranz

echoes her animus: 'I don't understand how a family where the parents have a Communist background can raise a kid who grows up to be an Orthodox Jew. How did that happen?'

It is a classic instance of the transvaluation of values that is part of contemporary Jewish identity. Who gets to excommunicate whom? The Sabbatian Jews will naturally try to excommunicate the Orthodox as deviant. The fact that they outnumber the Orthodox so considerably makes their attempt less laughable than it might otherwise seem. The connection between Jews and pornography is like the connection between Jews and Bolshevism. Both are forms of revolutionary activity, ultimately traceable to Jewish concepts that have been secularized. Jews become involved in pornography for reasons similar to why they become involved in Communism, which is to say, not just because they happened to be Jews but because being Jewish as they and Sabbatai Zevi and Wilhelm Reich defined it found logical expression in producing pornography as a form of cultural warfare through moral subversion. Ultimately, the relationship between Jews and pornography is similar to how Marx described the relationship between the communist party and the proletariat. Just as the Jews were the vanguard of revolutionary activity in Russia, so they are in the vanguard of sexual revolution in the United States. The Jewish concept of the chosen people naturally transformed itself into the concept of the revolutionary vanguard as soon as the Torah evaporated as the core of Jewish identity. Messianic politics replaced waiting for the Messiah.

In *The Politics of Bad Faith*, David Horowitz described how a religious paradigm, the Exodus, became a political paradigm, in other words, how the eschaton got immanentized and transformed into a Messianic political movement. Dresner sees much the same thing. In becoming, in Dresner's words, 'the chief advocates of modernity,' Jews have dedicated themselves to Communism with a messianic fervor:

They became, for example, disciples of the new politics of communism. Some 30 percent of the early leaders of the revolution were estimated to have been Jewish. Emancipated from their ancient faith by the onslaught of modern thought, which the antiquated Judaism of the time was ill-prepared to refute, they transferred their yet unexpended messianic fervor into the

new religion of Marx. (p. 325).

And when the attraction of communism began to pale they dedicated themselves just as fervently to sexual liberation. It would be naive, or as Haberer says, 'shortsighted' to claim in light of the overwhelming amount of evidence that Jews just happened to be revolutionaries just as Abe Foxman at a later date would claim that Jews just happened to be involved in pornography. Both communism and pornography are forms of revolutionary activity, and Jews were drawn to both precisely because of the hold that both Messianic Socialism and Sabbatianism acquired over them once this group of Jews abandoned traditional religious practice, something which happened to large numbers of them after they arrived in America. Nathan Glazer describes the process:

Judaism is even more vulnerable to the unsettling influence of modernity than is Christianity. Judaism emphasizes acts, rituals, habits a way of life . . . . Once one had found -- as so many immigrants did -- that it was more convenient to work on Saturdays or to shave or to abandon traditional dress, one had no body of doctrine to fall back upon that could explain what remained really important in Judaism -- indeed, the question was whether anything was really more important than the rituals established by God's word. Under these circumstances, an entire way of life disintegrated.

'Jews who came to America,' Elliott Abrams writes, 'were usually. . . not the most devout people in their communities' anyway. The decline in faith and morals, however, did not mean that they stopped defining themselves as Jews. Socialism and sexual liberation simply filled up the religious vessels from which the Torah had evaporated. Revolution, in other words, was another way of being a Jew, a secular humanist Jew of the sort Leo Pfeffer praised.

Irving Kristol, in his youth a follower of Trotsky and now a neoconservative, gives expression to the Messianic, universalist vision that both neoconservatism and Trotskyism have in common. The Jewish revolutionaries, according to Kristol:

did not forsake their Jewish heritage to replace it with another form of cultural identity or ethnic belonging. What they sought can best be described

as an abstract and futuristic idealism of assimilation *qua* emancipation in a denationalized and secularized democratic society, ideally of universal scope. Leaving the world of their childhood did not necessarily imply its total abandonment in one act of irreversible forgetfulness. For many this departure under the sacred halo of socialism was the next best solution to their own existential problems -- a solution that was enormously attractive since it also held out the utopian promise of the 'genuine emancipation' of all Jews in a socialist republic of universal brotherhood devoid of national, religious, and social discrimination or even distinctions.

As Irving Kristol, and other Jews have made clear, Secular Humanism is the continuation of revolutionary thought in a America. Just as socialism was attractive to significant numbers of Jews in Russia during the 19th century, Secular Humanism has a certain attraction among Jews now -- indeed, if Kristol is right, among most Jews. Kristol's description of Secular Humanism highlights the similarities it shares with Jewish revolutionary thought in Russia:

where emancipation unleashed within the Jewish community latent messianic passions that pointed to a new era of fraternal 'universalism' of belief for mankind. What is now called 'prophetic Judaism' gradually edged out 'rabbinic Judaism' - the distinction itself being a derivative of the secular-humanist impulse. By the time the mass of Jews, mostly Central and East European, came to the United States, they were already secular-humanist in their politics, i.e., somewhere Left of Center-if not in other respects (Irving Kristol, *Neoconservatism: The Autobiography of an Idea* [New York: The Free Press, 1995], p. 448.

Secular Humanism, no matter how corrosive it is of faith and morals and a health social order is, as Kristol puts it, 'good for Jews,' because

it . . . permits individual Jews a civic equality and equality of opportunity dreamed of by previous Jewish generations. It is natural, therefore for American Jews to be, not only accepting of secular-humanist doctrines, but enthusiastic exponents. That explains why American Jews [like Leo Pfeffer] are so vigilant about removing all the signs and symbols of traditional religions from 'the public square,' so insistent that religion be merely a

'private affair,' so determined that separation of church and state be interpreted to mean the separation of all institutions from any signs of a connection with traditional religions. The spread of secular humanism throughout American life has been 'good for Jews,' no question about it. So the more, the better (p. 449).

In her recent memoir, *An Old Wife's Tale*, Midge Decter notices the same phenomenon, but with a little more Angst. 'It is no secret,' she writes:

that some significant part in the emptying of the [moral-religious] public square had been played by Jewish liberals. It was understandable to me why this was so, because their long history had left many Jews with an atavistic fear of Christian authority -- so the more public life could be kept strictly secular the safer they felt. But understand it or not, I believe that the religion-free public condition to which they have made such a vital contribution had left American society, and particularly American culture, vulnerable to pernicious influences.

Influences like pornography? Suddenly Nina Hartley's description of herself as 'the blonde Jew' porn star from 'a long line of radical Jews,' who 'wants everyone to have a piece - a piece of sex, a piece of the means of production, a piece of a warm communist community' and 'a piece of the promised Messianic Age -- now' doesn't seem as far-fetched as it does on first reading. The link between the Torah and pornography -- in other words between the Jewish law and its antithesis -- is Russian Jewish Bolshevism -- with a big assist from Wilhelm Reich -- and its American legacy, brought here by the refugees from the pogroms which the revolutionaries set in motion when they killed the Czar. Daniel Goldhagen's demonization of Pius XII is part of that ongoing struggle between the Jewish revolutionary mind and its main counter-revolutionary opponent, the Catholic Church. Then as now, the same dynamic applies. The revolutionaries by their actions generate animus against all Jews. When someone has the temerity to criticize the excesses of people like Goldhagen, the Jewish organizations like the ADL turn what is an issue of scholarship and truth into a an ethnic/religious issue, thereby creating the very thing they purport to oppose, namely ethnic animus.

Pornography is, in other words, one of the weapons which 'Jews with an

atavistic fear of Christian authority' have turned to to weaken the dominant culture in a country and, thereby, assure that the Jews, always a minority, will go unmolested by their 'Christian' neighbors.

The Israelis have recently shown themselves well-versed in what one could call the military use of pornography. At 4:30 PM on March 30, 2002, Israeli military forces took over Palestinian TV stations when they occupied Ramallah in the West Bank, immediately shutting them down. What followed was a little more unusual. Shortly after occupying the Al-Watan TV station, the Israeli forces began broadcasting pornography over its transmitter. Eventually, according to a report from *The Advertiser*, an Australian newspaper, the Israelis expanded their cultural offensive against the Palestinian people by broadcasting pornography over two other Palestinian stations, the Ammwaj and Al-Sharaq channels. One 52-year-old Palestinian mother of three children, according to the report in the *The Advertiser*, complained about 'the deliberate psychological damage caused by these broadcasts.' The only Palestinian station not taken over by the Israelis ran a written message at the bottom of its screen claiming that 'Anything currently shown on Al-Watan and other local TV channels has nothing to do with Palestinian programs but is being broadcast by the Israeli occupation forces. We urge parents to take precautions.'

In addition to being outraged, the Palestinians were bewildered. 'Why in the world,' one correspondent to Omanforum.com wondered, 'should one do such a thing?' If we turn to the dominant culture for an answer, we can only become more confused because according to dominant culture's explanation, pornography means freedom.

So making use of the hermeneutic provided by the dominant culture in films like *Boogie Nights* and *The People vs. Larry Flynt*, Israeli troops began broadcasting pornography over captured Palestinian TV stations because they wanted to spread freedom among the Palestinian people.

Somehow that doesn't sound right. The simple fact of the matter is that this incident simply cannot be explained according to the principles available in contemporary American culture. In order to understand the disparity between the official explanation of pornography and what might be termed

its military use, we have to go back to the ancients.

The story of Samson and Delilah might be a good place to start. Israel was invincible militarily then too -- at least that part hasn't changed -- so the Philistines decided that they had to get at the Israelite leader by other than military means. Unable to defeat him in battle, they decided to seduce him sexually. Once Samson succumbed to Delilah's wiles, he lost his power, and Israel lost its leader. They could find him then not on the field of battle, but rather to use Milton's phrase 'eyeless in Gaza, grinding at the mill with slaves.'

The story of the Palestinian TV stations broadcasting pornography has a curiously Biblical ring to it. Having learned their lesson, the Israelis decided to turn the tables on their opponents, because they knew that a blind opponent is no opponent at all, and because they knew -- as the ancient Greeks knew -- that lust makes a man blind. St. Thomas Aquinas, giving voice to that same tradition over a millennium later said that lust 'darkens the mind.' Suddenly, Israel's use of pornography in their battle against the Palestinians isn't so inexplicable anymore because a blind opponent is a weak opponent. A blind opponent is no opponent at all.

Luke Ford makes a similar point in his discussion of Jewish involvement in pornography. 'Why does porn attract so many non-Jewish [i.e., Sabbatian] Jews?' Because 'even when Jews live in a society that welcomes them instead of harassing them, many Jews hate the majority culture.' Pornography is a way of weakening the majority culture by moral subversion. Hence, Jewish involvement in pornography. Jews often lead the way in the application of new technology. That meant using high resolution photography, the VCR and the Internet as delivery systems for pornography just as it meant dynamite, forgery and smuggling in bringing down the Czar in Russia. English professor Jay Gertzman, whose father and uncle were arrested on obscenity charges in Philadelphia in the '50s, writes about the disproportionate influence of Jews in the sex book trade in his 2000 book *Bookleggers and Smuthounds: The Trade In Erotica 1920-1940*: 'The ethnic flavor of prewar erotica distribution is still with us, although, except for extreme right-wing hate groups, critics of sexual explicitness do not overtly exploit the fact' (p. 289). Take note, Abe Foxman.

'While few Jews are radical, many radicals (and pornographers) are Jews. Writes non-Jew Ernest van den Haag in his book *The Jewish Mystique*, 'Out of one hundred Jews, five may be radicals, but out of ten radicals, five are likely to be Jewish.'" Like Sam Dresner, Luke Ford feels that

Virtually all movements to change the world come from the Jews -- Christianity, secular humanism, Marxism, Socialism and Communism, feminism, and the labor movement. That's part of the reason that Jews are hated. The world doesn't want to be changed.

Rooted in nothing, radical Jews frequently seek to make others equally rootless by tearing down their religious, national, communal and traditional allegiances. Such Jews carry on the traditional Jewish hatred of false gods but without offering anything to replace the scorned allegiances. . . . Rather, the most important result of the domination of non-Jewish Jews in these fields is their war on traditional values. Porn is just one expression of this rebellion against standards, against the disciplined life of obedience to Torah that marks a Jew living Judaism.

Pornography, as a result, becomes a Jewish fantasy. Even when Catholics are involved, they are generally involved on Jewish terms. According to one industry insider, 'the leading male performers through the 1980s came from secular Jewish upbringings and the females from Roman Catholic day schools.' The standard porn scenario became as a result a Polish Jewish fantasy, the horny Jew schtupping the Catholic shiksa. Nina Hartley, the already mentioned Jewish porn star tends to agree, 'I have not yet met a Jewish guy who wasn't a horny rabbit,' she says explaining Jewish male involvement in pornography in her 1989 interview in the Jewish magazine *Schmate*. 'Plus, they get to have sex with all these beautiful blonde women... Where else are you going to get a succession of shiksas [non- Jewish women] to bed you down?'

What Miss Hartley leaves out of her description is the cultural dimension. Pornography becomes a way of defiling Christian women, which, as Eldridge Cleaver pointed out in another context, is another way of defiling Christianity and all that it stands for. 'Rape,' according to Cleaver, 'was an insurrectionary act.' By defiling the white woman, Cleaver 'was defying and

trampling upon the white man's law, upon his system of values,' something Cleaver found 'most satisfying' (*Soul on Ice*, p. 14).

The same thing could be said of Jewish involvement in pornography. When Luke Ford asked Al Goldstein, the publisher of *Screw*, why so many Jews were involved in pornography, Goldstein, unlike Abe Foxman, did not say the connection was fortuitous. He instead got to what one might call the theological heart of the matter. 'The only reason that Jews are in pornography,' Goldstein responded, 'is that we think that Christ sucks. Catholicism sucks. We don't believe in authoritarianism.'

Goldstein's response is worth pondering. Being Jewish provides Goldstein with a rationalization for being in an unsavory business. The fact that Abe Foxman refuses to disagree with Goldstein over what it means to be a Jew only strengthens Goldstein's position, just as it weakens the position of people like Sam Dresner, who feel that being a Jew involves adherence to the Torah and, therefore, the moral law. Goldstein can hide behind centuries-old Jewish antipathy to Christianity as the justification for what he is doing. Jews like Goldstein have become so habituated to defining themselves as the antithesis of things Christian that they start to define themselves in opposition to things which both Judaism and Christianity hold in common as well, namely, the moral law in general and sexual prohibitions in particular.

### **'I'm God'**

Luke Ford interviewed Goldstein during the University of California Northridge's first annual pornography conference. The conversation began with Bruce David of Larry Flynt Publications urging Ford to explain his theory on why so many Jews are involved in pornography, which prompted Goldstein to opine that Jews were in pornography because 'Christ sucks.' After that opening gambit, the conversation got progressively more theological, at least in the Goldstein mode. In response to Ford's question, 'Do you believe in God?' Goldstein answered, 'I believe in me. I'm God. Fuck God. God is your need to believe in some super being. I am the super being. I am your God, admit it. We're random. We're the flea on the ass of the dog.'

The interview continued in that vein:

Luke: 'What does being Jewish mean to you?'

Al: 'It doesn't mean shit. It means that I'm called a kike. Rose is more of a Jew than I am. She speaks Hebrew.'

Goldstein here is referring to his companion, who, unlike Goldstein was raised a religious Jew. At this point, Ford turns to Rose and asks her the same question he just asked Goldstein.

'What does being Jewish mean to you?'

Rose: 'I feel like I am part of a worldwide spiritual community.'

Al: 'Jews and blacks are together. Us kikes and coons ... Like a chocolate mouse [sic].'

Luke: 'What attracts you to Al?'

Rose hesitates, giving Goldstein his opening.

Al: 'It's my big Jewish dick. My circumcision.'

Rose ended the conversation by changing the subject.

'Who do you write for?' she asked Ford.

It's a long stretch to get from the Torah to pornography, and the only way to understand how some people can see some compatibility between being Jewish and a porn star is to understand the historical genesis of their group, which is to say, the historical genesis of the secular, revolutionary Jew. Ever since the Enlightenment, but certainly since Marx, a certain group of Jews have defined being Jewish as being revolutionary. The terms of the revolution have changed over the years, but the revolutionary identity of this group of people has remained constant. Being Jewish, to this group, means being a revolutionary. Revolution is the fulfillment of the biblical promise of deliverance from bondage for people who have given up on waiting for the Messiah. Like David Horowitz, Midge Decter, Irving Kristol, and many other commentators, Rabbi Dresner noticed that the Enlightenment had a powerful effect on Europe's Jews, who were incapable of abandoning the paradigms they learned from the Bible. Instead they secularized them when

the Revolutionary Spirit in the form of Napoleon came and knocked down the walls of the ghetto. World Jewry, 80 percent of whom lived in Poland in 1791 when the French Revolution emancipated the Jews, split in two when the Enlightenment came to the shtetl. The result of that intellectual fission can be likened to the splitting of the atom, with the release of an equivalent amount of energy and destruction.

As a result of the Enlightenment, the Jewish community was split into Halachic and Maskilic Jews. The Halachic or ethnic or religious Jews may have been aggressively anti-Christian, but they defined themselves in terms of religious observance and traditions, and they lived in ethnic communities, and their animus was confined within those bounds. Once the Maskilic or secular Enlightenment Jews had given up the Torah as normative, their animus toward Christianity did not cease. They were now able to act on that animus unencumbered by moral considerations. They were also especially vulnerable to Messianic, revolutionary ideologies like communism and sexual liberation. Liberated from the Law, the Revolutionary Jew now had no scruples about things like mass murder or using pornography as an instrument of pan-cultural moral subversion. Everything was permitted as long as it brought about the universal community in which nationhood and ethnicity wither away to be replaced by universal brotherhood and some form of heaven on earth. Because it has abandoned its religious roots, this group tends in practice to define itself in a purely negative terms, i.e. as not Christian, as Alan Dershowitz does in his book *The Vanishing American Jew*. According to this view, Sigmund Freud, an atheist who thought that Moses was an Egyptian, is a Jew; whereas Edith Stein, born of a Jewish mother, intent on worshipping the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was not because she became a Christian.

Since the fall of communism, pornography, by way of the theories of sexual revolution articulated by Wilhelm Reich, is the remaining form of revolutionary hope for the latter group of Jews. When Luke Ford received a letter from a German Turkish girl who wanted to come to Hollywood to become a porn star, he shared it with his website readers, one of whom advised him 'not to put her in gangbang scenes as soon as she steps off the plane at LAX.' This does not mean that he advises her to stay home and not become involved in pornography, only that Ford should introduce her to the

porn scene gradually. He feels this way for basically religious reasons because he sees putting her in porn films as an example of 'tikkun olam' (healing the world).

## **Tikkun**

Whether the term is intended as ironic or not, the fact that it cropped up in the conversation at all is what motivated Ford to look into the connection between Jews and pornography in the first place. If Ford were more knowledgeable about Jewish history in general and the story of Shabbetai Zevi in particular, he might have understood that the connection between pornography and 'tikkun olam' is not as far-fetched as it seems on first reading. In a paper presented at a conference sponsored by The Institute on East Central Europe and The Center for Israel and Jewish Studies at Columbia University in 1983, Jacob Allerhand claims that 'according to Sabbatian teachings,' Sabbatai Zevi's drunken orgies, 'represented erotic mysteries that were supposed to make a way through the 'gate of lechery' into the hall of eternity.' In other words, those Jews who were influenced by the Kabbalah -- Jews like Nathan of Gaza and his protege Shabbetai Zevi -- could posit 'a connection between the Original Sin, with the origin of shame, and the *tikkun* (repair of the blemish) as the elimination of shame under the new messianic order.'

Pornography, in other words, is the latest form of revolutionary hope for anti-Zionist, non-neoconservative Jews. The neoconservatives, more like Trotsky than Wilhelm Reich, have invested their hope in the American empire. A large chunk of recent history has been shaped, in Rabbi Dresner's words, by 'mesmerized Jews' who made modernity their project with a vengeance:

Caged within ghetto bars for centuries, the Jews emerged into the freedom of Western society, where they drank in its culture, tasted its pleasure and enjoyed its power. They demanded citizenship and were so eager to be accepted by the majority that they often offered themselves, sacrificed their history, faith and way of life, their 'identity,' in order that the stigma of their difference might be obliterated. (p. 234).

Dresner, like Nathan Glazer, sees the Enlightenment, as encountered by Jews

emigrating to America, as precipitating a conflict between faith and reason which has yet to be resolved:

In fashioning modern man's society, where the idols of politics, culture, and impulse are worshipped, Jews have played a major role. That is so, in part, because in the world's largest Jewish community of Eastern Europe, the Middle Ages did not gradually give way, as in the West, to the influences of the Enlightenment's gifts of science and reason. For most of East European Jewry, the Middle Ages extended down to the nineteenth century and even beyond. Many of the grandparents of present-day American Jews emerged overnight, it seemed from benighted, poverty-stricken villages, little touched by the secular worlds of culture, into the bright lights of modernity with its abundance of new knowledge and undreamt-of opportunity. It should come as no surprise then, that Jews, mesmerized as they must have been by what they saw and read and heard, should have been among the chief advocates of modernity . . . (p. 324).

Stephen Steinlight, in a study he did on immigration he did for the American Jewish Committee, indicates that Jewish political power, following hard on the heels of disastrous Jewish demographics, is on the wane. Perhaps this explains the desperation behind Goldhagen's attack on Pius XII. What's needed at this point is not more libel, not more anti-Christian animus, but more accountability. If, as Steinlight says, 'Television is the Jewish industry par excellence,' then can we hold the Jews accountable for its current parlous state? For its prurience? For its constant warmongering?

The corrosive effects of Sabbetai Zevi's ecstatic sexual messianism are with us today in the porn industry and in Wilhelm Reich's philosophy of control through sexual demoralization. They are still being promoted by Jews as a form of political control and as a way of weakening the power of the non-Jewish majority, as their takeover of Palestinian TV stations and subsequent porn broadcasts during their latest incursion into the West Bank showed.

If television is 'the Jewish industry par excellence,' are the Jews who control television responsible for its content and the effect of that content on the moral and social order? It's long since past time when someone asked those questions. It's now time that someone answered them.

### **3. The Apology In Context:**

## **Fifty Years of Catholic-Jewish Kulturkampf**

by E. Michael Jones

This article was published in the May, 2000 issue of Culture Wars magazine.

"When the people-Israel was locked in its ghettos and the Torah was its life and holiness its way, they had something to say to the world. But the world did not ask them. Now the world is asking. And the question is: does Israel still have the power to speak?" - Samuel F. Dresner

"I look forward to saying "Shalom" to you on the information superhighway!" - Alan Dershowitz

That Sam Shapiro would call was not unusual. He calls frequently. Unusual was the fact that he could not tell me why he called over the phone. "Read the paper," he kept saying. It was as if the announcement of a cataclysm of such unimaginable magnitude could only take place in person. So, after we had returned from Mass that first Sunday in Lent, he arrived at the door with the paper in hand which he promptly threw down on the coffee table as if playing the

trump card in a long-running high-stakes game.

"What do you say to that?" he asked.

The that in question was a article by Knight-Ridder reporter, David O'Reilly entitled, "Pope will apologize for Catholics' sins." The future tense in the title was significant even if its significance was overlooked by Sam in his eagerness to get a reaction from me.

"Kneeling before the altar of St. Peter's Basilica in the Vatican at a special 'Day of Pardon Mass,'" O'Reilly wrote that the pope was "expected to read a prayer acknowledging the role of Catholics in such horrific episodes as the Inquisition and the Holocaust, and for such religious wars as the Crusades, and the conquest of the Americas." In addition to all that, the Church was also expected to apologize for the "suppression of scientific knowledge including Gallieo's observation that the Earth revolves around the sun."

Rounding out the Enlightenment's wish list of mea culpas, O'Reilly asked what Marianne Duddy, executive director of Dignity, the lobby for Catholic homosexuals, would like to see on the list, and she responded by opining that the pope "should apologize 'for the terrible sense of shame and alienation' it induced in homosexuals 'by naming them as sinners.'"

"What do you say to that?" he said again. And then sensing some hesitation on my part, assuming that not knowing where to begin meant not knowing what to say, he added, "You have the right to

remain silent."

So I was on trial, and I was on trial because the Church was on trial, or, more accurately, I was on trial because the Church was involved in plea bargaining in the court of public opinion where it had admitted, according to news reports, that it was guilty, as charged of crimes against humanity. The infamy was hoping to get by perhaps with a lighter sentence before she was finally crushed in the court of public opinion by the Enlightenment press, which functioned in this instance as judge, jury and executioner.

The apology, as one has come to expect in such matters, turned out to be dramatically different than what got reported in advance in the papers. Neither the Inquisition nor the Crusades was mentioned by name, contrary to what O'Reilly had predicted. Instead, Cardinal Ratzinger apologized for the "sins committed in the service of the truth" in the following words:

Let us pray that each one of us, looking to the Lord Jesus, meek and humble of heart, will recognize that even men of the Church, in the name of faith and morals, have sometimes used methods not in keeping with the Gospel in the solemn duty of defending the truth

The pope responded by asking God to "accept our resolve to seek and promote truth in the gentleness of charity, in the firm knowledge that truth can prevail only in virtue of truth itself."

In a statement released around the same time the apology got made,

Cardinal Ratzinger attempted to defuse some of the criticism the apology was causing in the press and to clarify some of the confusion the document was causing among the faithful by claiming that the apology grew out of the liturgical life of the Church. "The newspapers speak, and with reason," he said, "of the 'mea culpa' of the Pope on behalf of the Church, but this is already done in the prayer that introduces the celebration of the liturgy every day. The priest, the Pope and the laity, all... confess before God and in the presence of brothers and sisters that they have sinned."

Then all but admitting that he knew that the apology would be used by the enemies of the Church to claim that they had been right all along, Ratzinger tried to put the apology in its historical context beginning with the Protestant revolt and the accusations it leveled against the Church and proceeding up to the Enlightenment, "from Voltaire to Nietzsche, which sees in the Church the great evil of humanity that carries all the fault that destroys progress."

Even granting all that, Ratzinger felt that "we are in a new situation, in which the Church can confess its sins again with greater liberty, and thus invite others to confession and to profound reconciliation. This gives a new humility and new confidence to confess sins and recognize salvation as a gift of the

Lord."

Although the reports in the Catholic Press made clear that the "document said the church was holy and cannot sin, but that its members have sinned through the ages," that distinction was largely lost on the columnists who wrote about it and saw in the apology a vindication of their view of the Church as the root of all evil in an otherwise progressive world.

The document which inspired the liturgical apology, *Memory and Reconciliation: the Church and the Faults of the Past*, admitted in its introductory remarks that "admission of faults committed by the sons and daughters of the Church may look like acquiescence in the face of accusations made by those who are prejudicially hostile to the Church." One priest in Rome expressed similar misgivings giving his reading of the reaction of the curia to the apology:

Most of the priests I've spoken to here don't have strong opinions on the pope's apologies. Most of them concede that a pontiff has the right to pontificate; and he at least asked forgiveness for the Church's failures in standing up for life in the womb. What rankled more were the genuflections by Cardinals Mahony and Law, which reinforced the widely held idea that the only way you can sin is to act against the liberal agenda. They both had laundry lists of political correctitude: women, homosexuals, Indians, utility infielders, etc. Donna Shalala or Hillary could have written it for

them.

"Los Angeles Cardinal Roger M. Mahony," according to a Catholic News Service report of the penance service held in his archdiocese, "asked forgiveness for any of his own actions or those of the archdiocese and its Catholics that have offended or hurt others. He made specific apologies to Jews, Muslims, women, ethnic and cultural minorities, organized labor, victims of clergy sex abuse, divorced and remarried Catholics and women religious. To gay and lesbian Catholics he apologized for 'when the Church has appeared to be non-supportive of their struggles.'"

Although Ratzinger's mea culpa was clear enough, the response by the pope— asking God to "accept our resolve to seek and promote truth in the gentleness of charity, in the firm knowledge that truth can prevail only in virtue of truth itself"—was unsettling in its ambiguity. Just what does it mean to say that the truth can prevail only in virtue of truth itself? Since there are no footnotes in liturgies, the serious observer would have to read the apology's preliminary document by the International Theological Commission, *Memory and Reconciliation: The Church and the Faults of the Past* to learn that the statement about the truth defending the truth was taken from *Dignitatis Humanae*, the Vatican II document on religious liberty. Reading through *Memory and Reconciliation*, however, especially section 5.3 on "The use of Force in the Service of the

Truth," only adds to the confusion. "“Another sad chapter,” we read there,

of the history to which the sons and daughters of the Church must return with a spirit of repentance is that of the acquiescence given, especially in certain centuries to intolerance and even the use of force in the service of the truth." This refers to all forms of evangelization that employed improper means to announce the revealed truth or did not include an evangelical discernment suited to the cultural values of peoples or did not respect the consciences of the persons to whom the faith was presented, as well as all forms of force used in the repression and correction of errors.

According to footnote 78, the internal quotes in the above quote refer to section 35 of Tertio Millennio Adveniente, but when we turn to the official Vatican translation of that document, it condemns not force in service of the truth, but rather "violence in the service of the truth," a crucial distinction in the realm of moral theology, since it is clearly licit to use force to defend the truth. By using the word force instead of violence, Memory and Reconciliation involves itself in an internal contradiction as well because in the next section, the one on Christians and Jews, it goes on to ask forgiveness for Christians who did nothing to stop the murder of the Jews during World War II. "Did Christians," it asks, "give every possible assistance to those being persecuted, and in

particular to the persecuted Jews." If it is wrong to use force in defense of the truth, then Christians can't be criticized for doing nothing to save the Jews, because that would have necessarily required the use of force.

The ambiguous use of "force in defense of the truth" is finally only resolved by a close reading of *Dignitatis Humanae*, from which the quote "that the truth can prevail only in virtue of the truth itself" is taken. *Dignitatis Humanae* makes perfectly clear that this statement refers only to religious worship and not to either the civil order or the moral order, both of which demand that force be used to defend the truth. The context in *Dignitatis Humanae* makes this clear:

Truth can impose itself on the mind of man only in virtue of its own truth, which wins over the mind with both gentleness and power. So while the religious freedom which men demand in fulfilling her obligations to worship God has to do with freedom from coercion in civil society, it leaves intact the traditional Catholic teaching on the moral duty of individuals and societies toward the true religion and the one Church of Christ.

If, in other words, the civil authority "presumes to control or restrict religious activity it must be said to have exceeded the limits of its power." That use of force would automatically become a form of violence, which is never licit. That being said, however,

the state "has the right to protect itself against possible abuses committed in the name of religious freedom" as well as "the responsibility of providing such protections . . . for the necessary protection of public morality. All these matters are basic to the common good and belong to what is called public order" (#7). If that is the case, the state would have the right to repulse forced conversions, which means in a historical context that Christian states would have the right to prevent Christian from being subjected to forced conversions to Islam, which would mean, in theory at least, that the Crusades were justified because their purpose was to prevent religious coercion.

"It has always remained the teaching of the Church that no one is to be coerced into believing," *Dignitatis Humanae* correctly states, but it has never been the teaching of the Church that "all forms of force used in the repression and correction of errors" is wrong, especially since the state, and this means Christians states as well as the Papal States, had to use force to preserve both the civil order and the moral order upon which it is based. To say that the truth has no need of force to defend it is to deny the reality of sin in history and to collaborate in the persecution of virtue by sins of omission. It is also a radically anti-cultural statement because the purpose of culture is to make the choice of sin difficult and virtue relatively easy. If the Church were ever to

abandon force in defense of the truth, she would effectively abandon public life to the libido dominandi of the powerful and unscrupulous. By eschewing force in defense of the truth, the Church would collaborate in the exploitation of the weak, whether they be Jews in Nazi Germany or the unborn in, say, the United States. Taken at face value, the apology for force in defense of the truth as stated in *Memory and Reconciliation*, involves the document in self-contradiction when it criticizes Christians for not helping Jews.

The liturgical "Confession of Sins against the People of Israel" is relatively unambiguous, when compared to the apology on sins committed in service of the truth but all the more misinterpreted. In it Cardinal Cassidy prayed that "Christians will acknowledge the sins committed by not a few of their number against the people of the Covenant." The nuance which distinguishes between the Church which cannot sin and the people in the Church who sin on a regular basis was lost on Sidney Zion, who nonetheless praised the pope in his column for New York Daily News. "The pope," according to Zion, "asked God to forgive the sins of his church against the Jews."

This, of course, is precisely what the pope did not do. Zion's column which went out of its way to praise Pope John Paul II for the apology and Pius XII for saving the lives of 860,000 Jews, stopped short of the reconciliation which Ratzinger had hoped the apology

would inspire. "The only Jews," Zion wrote, "who could possibly forgive the Church are dead. Some of them have been dead for 2000 years. It would be chutzpah for Jews today to forgive the killers, whether they be early Christians or recent Nazis."

So if Cardinal Ratzinger were expecting the Jews to reciprocate by apologizing for, say, Arnold Rothstein's role in fixing the 1919 World Series, he was in for a disappointment. The apology was simply used as one more occasion for scoring points in the ongoing Jewish-Catholic culture wars of the past 40 years.

"The issue," according to Rabbi James Rudin, ecumenical officer for the American Jewish Committee "is not what the pope is going to say, but what its impact will be in, say, Philadelphia: in the parishes, in seminary training, in the schools, the hymns, the scriptural readings and homiletics and Good Friday Services." Like David O'Reilly, who is quoting him, Rabbi Rudin had not read the papal apology at the time he made his comments, but that, of course, did not prevent him from commenting because the agenda he wanted the apology to foster was already in existence. In fact, as the revealing reference to Philadelphia indicates, it has been in existence since the Cultural Revolution of the '60s, when the Jews teamed up with the Protestant establishment to make war on the demographically potent but politically vulnerable Catholics. The AJC was one of the prime revolutionary organizations during the Cultural

Revolution of the 1960s, and Rudin's comments give some indication that that agenda is still in operation against, say, Philadelphia and Catholic enclaves throughout the rest of the country, a battle which I documented in *John Cardinal Krol and the Cultural Revolution*.

No one states this more frankly than Leo Pfeffer, who was a lawyer for a whole host of cultural revolutionary groups including Rabbi Rudin's AJC. Pfeffer described the Cultural Revolution of the '60s as a conflict between the Catholic Church and the Enlightenment. According to Pfeffer, the Catholics "hope for an America in which, if not all will be Catholics, all will adhere to Catholic values," values which include opposition to the sexual revolution which was the heart of the Cultural Revolution: i.e., "no divorce, no contraception, no abortion, no obscene books or pictures, no homosexuality, everybody worshipping God in his own way, government solicitous of and helpful to religion, and children and adults equally obedient to their parents and lawful authority" (*God, Caesar*, p. 20). The other side, "liberal Protestants, liberal Jews, and deists [i.e., secular humanists] ,"hoped for a different America: one in which individuals enjoy maximum freedom of thought and expression, contraception is used and encouraged to control population and avoid the birth of babies that are unwanted or cannot adequately be cared for, women's right to control their

own bodies is recognized and respected, the sexual practices of adults, whether of the same or of different sexes, are of no concern to anyone but themselves, governmental institutions avoid manifestations of religiosity, public schools are free of sectarianism, and citizens are not forced to fight in a war they deem immoral or in any war. (*God, Caesar*, p. 20-1)

With the candor of a victor who had nothing more to fear from his opponents, Pfeffer was never vague about who it was he was fighting for all those years. For Pfeffer, the enemy was, quite simply, the Catholic Church. In a memoir which appeared in the mid-'70s (published with mordant irony in the liberal Catholic magazine *Commonweal*), Pfeffer went to some length to explain his animus against the Catholic Church. "I did not like it," Pfeffer wrote, "because it was monolithic and authoritarian and big and frighteningly powerful. I was repelled by the idea that any human being could claim infallibility in any area, much less in the universe of faith and morals, and repelled even more by the arrogance of condemning to eternal damnation those who did not believe it." (Leo Pfeffer, "The 'Catholic' Catholic Problem," *Commonweal*, August 1975, pp 302-305.)

The Church which Pfeffer grew up hating (if that is not too strong a word) was the Church he got to know as a Jewish immigrant in New York City. During the time Pfeffer was growing up and getting

started in the legal profession, the Catholic Church was, in his opinion, "one if not the single most powerful political force in the nation." It was a time, when, to use his own words, "Pius XI and Pius XII reigned over the Catholic world and Cardinal Spellman ruled in the United States. It was the pre-John XXIII-Vatican II era, and it was during this period that my feelings towards the Catholic Church were formed."

In the *Commonweal* memoir, Pfeffer refers to his daughter's threat when she didn't get her way to "marry a Catholic army officer from Alabama," because that particular configuration of Catholicism, the military and the South embodied all that Pfeffer did not like about America. At another point Pfeffer talked about the impression Catholic schools made on him as a young man:

"I often saw children lined up in separate classes as they marched in. All the children were white; each group was monosexual; all the boys wore dark blue trousers and white shirts, all the girls dark blue jumpers and white blouses; all the teachers were white and wore the same nuns' habits."

Once Pfeffer gets started, the reasons for his animus against the Catholic Church start to pour forth in an increasingly frank as well as an increasingly hostile litany of offenses against the liberal *Weltanschauung*. Pfeffer did not like the fact that the Church opposed the Equal Rights Amendment; he is annoyed that "among the

children outside the parochial school on the way to my office there are only a sprinkling of black faces"; he does not like the fact that the Vatican still defends papal infallibility and *Humanae Vitae*, the 1968 encyclical banning the use of contraceptives; he even opposes the practice of having first confession before first communion. ("I know it's none of my business," he adds as if realizing that his animus is getting out of control even by his own standards, "but you asked didn't you?") Pfeffer disliked the Church because of its size and because of its unity and because of its internal coherence and because of its universality, all of which contributed to its political power. He disliked it as well because it was, in his words, "monolithic," because with "monolithity," he tells us, "goes authoritarianism."

Pfeffer's animus toward the Church never really changed, but it did abate somewhat, primarily because the Church's influence in society had diminished and because the confusion in its own ranks increased—in no small measure because of Pfeffer's activities. "What do I think about the Church today?" Pfeffer asked rhetorically in the mid '70s, "In short, I still do not like it, but I do not like it less than I did not like during that period, and the reason is that, while it is still what it was before, it is considerably less so, if you can make out what I mean."

We know what you mean, Leo. Pfeffer had beaten the Church in the

cultural revolution of the '60s to the point where it was a shadow of its former self in terms of political power. The history of the last 40 years has been the history of increasing Jewish animus against Catholics, during which the Catholics have taken a beating defending the moral order. This battle stretches from the Catholic defeat in defending the Hollywood production code through the Ginsberg obscenity decision, wherein Philadelphia handed the pornography industry a defeat it never forgot, through *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, all the way to *Hitler's Pope* and the most recent academy awards ceremony with teary-eyed tributes to abortion propaganda and Billy Crystal making jokes about the pope. All of these battles have one thing in common, they were part of a struggle between Jews and Catholics over control of the culture which Catholics have lost on a consistent basis for going on 40 years now.

Rabbi Samuel Dresner has taken note of this cultural struggle from the vantage point of a Jew who is outside of the mainstream of Jewish life, which is to say, from the point of view of a Jew who still believes in the Torah and the God who is its author. The results, according to Dresner, have been catastrophic in terms of the morals of the country. Jews, because they have been in the forefront of this revolutionary movement, have suffered disproportional damage to their own family and morals, to the point where they are now threatened with extinction by the policies they

have foisted on the nation as a whole. In seeing the moral dimension of the cultural revolution, Dresner differs from a mainstream Jew like Alan Dershowitz, who according to his own account, goes to synagogue on the high holydays but can't make up his mind whether God exists. Dershowitz, who is also worried that Jews will shrink to a minuscule and insignificant segment of the American population by 2076, promotes the big tent theory of Judaism as a way of maximizing its power, something which causes him problems of definition. A Jew, according to Dershowitz, is not someone who believes in God; he doesn't necessarily follow the law in any consistent fashion. He does not accept the testimony of the prophets. Because he wants to maximize the number Jews, Dershowitz even rejects the racial definition of Jew as one born of a Jewish mother. According to

Dershowitz: "In America, and in other nations that separate church from state,

one's Jewishness is a matter of self-definition and anyone who wants to be considered a Jew or a half Jew, or a partial Jew or a person of Jewish heritage has a right to be so considered" (Alan M.

Dershowitz, *The Vanishing American Jew: In Search of Jewish Identity for the Next Century*, p. 324).

So, this means that anyone who defines himself as a Jew is a Jew, right? Wrong. Lest anyone slip into this view Dershowitz quickly draws the line: "I do not mean to include former Jews who practice

Christianity," he adds in a footnote. So according to this view, which was essentially Hitler's view, a Jew is essentially an anti-Christian who has no core of beliefs of his own. Sigmund Freud was a Jew in spite of the fact that he was an atheist, and Edith Stein was not a Jew in spite of the fact that her mother was a Jew and she worshipped the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and died in a concentration camp with people who were there because they, like she, were considered Jews. Dershowitz is clearly uncomfortable with his position even in the act of stating it because it reduces Judaism to nothing more than an anti-Christian ideology:

Indeed, for many Jews the only factor that distinguishes Judaism from Christianity is a negative one: We reject Jesus as the Messiah. That is why we are so appalled by "Jews for Jesus." In addition to the often misleading proselytization, they also shove in our faces the uncomfortable fact that it is only the rejection of Jesus as Christ that really distinguished most Jews from mainline Christians.

. . . Indeed it is fair to say that most American Jews, outside of the Orthodox, seem to have more in common even religiously with mainline Protestants than they do with the ultra-orthodox Hasidim.

(Dershowitz, *The Vanishing American Jew*, p. 195).

If, as Dershowitz says, "God is not central to my particular brand of Jewishness" (p. 180), then what he calls Judaism is really an ideology whose main tenet is hatred of Jesus Christ. That Protestant

denominations pose no threat to people like Dershowitz (*vide supra*) means that his enemy, like Leo Pfeffer's, will be first and foremost the Catholic Church. Since Jews like Dershowitz do not believe in God, he does not ipso facto believe in the Mosaic law as authored by God and therefore sacred and binding, and since he does not believe in the law, his ideology will not be plagued by scruples about how to deal with his enemies. He will be, for lack of a better word, a revolutionary, and in Dershowitz's definition of Judaism as anti-Christian animus we see the basis for all modern revolutionary groups, something which Rabbi Dresner has noted.

"American Jews," according to Dresner, "by and large, have made a caricature out of Judaism, not only by the vulgarism and crass commercialism that pervade their communal life, but, more to the point, by too often abdicating the intellectual life of the faith of Israel to the fads of the time." (Dresner, *Can Families Survive in Pagan America?* pp. 190-91). Dresner includes among these fads "the new politics of communism" just one of the ideologies which has made Jews "among the chief advocates of modernity."

Emancipated from their ancient faith by the onslaught of modern thought, which the antiquated Judaism of the time was ill-prepared to refute, they transferred their yet unexpended messianic fervor into the new religion of Marx (Dresner, p. 325).

As the attraction of political revolution faded with things like

Stalin's pact with Hitler, the Jews transmuted their revolutionary fervor into sexual liberation.

An unusually high percentage of the material on sexual liberation was written by Jews, as well as significant representation among its advocates. On a more commercial level, for example, Jews have been strongly represented in Playboy enterprises. B'nai Brith's Anti-Defamation League had no problem, for example, when some years back they presented their American Freedom Award at a fashionable black-tie dinner-dance to Hugh Hefner. (Dresner p. 325).

Dresner notes that the ADL honored Hefner for "a philosophy of social change." The fact is noteworthy when it comes to defining mainstream American Jews of the sort Alan Dershowitz represents, a group whose identity is religious in only the negative sense, i.e., by rejection of Jesus Christ. Given this *raison d'être*, any "philosophy of social change" a group like this would espouse would be ipso facto revolutionary. It would necessarily espouse the overturn of morals as a way of destabilizing the civil order, as a way of taking political control. This theory of sexual politics, as espoused by Wilhelm Reich, another secular Jew, is precisely what Hefner embodied in Playboy magazine, and it is precisely for embodying it that the ADL honored him.

Sam Shapiro bobs around on this troubled sea of Kulturkampf like a cork at the Battle of Jutland. Sam was born in 1927 to a couple

which ran a grocery store in the West Bronx and effectively turned Sam over to his Polish Grandmother to be raised. Since his grandmother never really mastered English, Sam's first language was Yiddish, something which Sam mastered by reading Der Vorwartz, especially the advice column known as "the Bintel Brief," which would comment on concerns of the first and second generation of Jewish immigrants, things like "My son is dating a shiksah. What should I do?" As the first generation died off, the paper's circulation declined. Sam tells the story of a funeral passing the Vorwartz office in lower Manhattan. After watching it pass by the window, one of the reporters turned to the printer and said "Cut the printing by one!"

Sam eventually got a Ph.D. in history but by the early '60s his career had stalled. He had been denied tenure at three universities and after coming back from a year in Castro's Cuba and was faced with the prospect of accepting a one-year appointment or working as a teacher for the Marxist government of British Guyana, when he got word that Notre Dame was looking for someone in history. Having already been turned down by three universities because of their policy of not hiring Jews, Sam went to the interview at Notre Dame with some trepidation, wondering why a Catholic college would be interested in a Jewish history professor. He soon found out. After

being feted for his entire stay, he suddenly realized at the elaborate dinner they had for him that he was leaving soon and no one had interviewed him.

"Don't worry, Sam," the department chairman told him. "Father Hesburgh told us to hire you."

Just why Hesburgh wanted to hire Sam became clear when he was sent almost immediately after arriving as a lowly assistant professor to the Rockefeller foundation to ask for money. Notre Dame wanted to show its liberal bona fides by sending a Jew as its representative. Accompanying Sam was Julian Samora, a recently minted Ph.D. in Sociology, who got his degree only on the third try after flunking his prelims twice and only over the protests of the professors who thought he had flunked them the third time as well. Notre Dame was heavily into affirmative action, which was in reality a form of ethnic politics. By sending a Jew to represent them, they were telling the Rockefellers that they could be trusted to use their money in a way that would not jeopardize the interests of the WASP ruling class.

Sam had re-entered my life about a year or so before the pope's apology via another phonecall, which came as out of the blue as the one this Sunday morning. In the course that conversation, he announced that when he looked in the mirror he saw "the face of a dying animal." Sam was 71 years old at the time; he was being tested

for cancer. He thought he was dying. Thoughts of that sort, as they often do, led to thoughts about the next life. which led to a contemplation of the four last things: death, judgment, heaven, hell. Hell was a topic he found especially intriguing. Sam couldn't believe in the existence of an actual hell where people suffered the pains of everlasting fire, but he couldn't reject the idea out of hand either. He was swept first one way and then another depending on his mood or his blood sugar levels or what he perceived as the nearness of eternity. Since he was a retired Notre Dame professor, he had developed the unfortunate habit over the years of consulting the Notre Dame theology department whenever he had a question about the Catholic faith. In the matter of hell, they assured him that "no one" believed that stuff about "everlasting fire" anymore, just as years earlier a priest assured him that Jews didn't need to convert. After taking the priest's advice, Sam then noticed that the priest left the Church to get married. The simplest solution in this instance would be to accept Judaism, but Sam couldn't do that either. At one point, he took me to the local synagogue's Bible study class where, to the embarrassment of most people there, he kept turning the discussion of Deuteronomy into a discussion of Jesus Christ. At another point Sam, who was a chess champion in his younger years, volunteered to teach chess to the children who belonged to the synagogue, only to have the Rabbi forbid the lesson

because the children were using pencils to write down the chess moves, something which constituted work on the Sabbath. Sam couldn't see the point and bid the Rabbi farewell, but he couldn't bring himself to convert to Catholicism either, although he offered to take instruction on a number of occasions.

The prospect of Imminent death has a way of clearing the mind. Our disposition toward the four last things follows from the decisions we have made in this life. But all of the moral decisions we make are contextualized by one larger decision about our relationship to God and the Christ. The question Christ asked of Peter is the one he asks of us, "Who do you say that I am?" At the beginning of the third millennium, it is safe to say that no one gets out of this life without answering that question. Similarly, no one answers that question with his feet on some unshakable ground. Everyone attempts to answer that question while adrift in storms of passion, which find their source in our own corrupt desires and the devil's encouragement. So if Peter could negate his answer with a denial then it's not surprising that Sam would be swept to and fro on seas of doubt and passion as well. Once it became apparent that he was not going to die (at least not within the next few months), his attitude toward Christ changed. The healthier he got, the more he talked about evolution. At one typical meeting: he would place a rock on the table in front of me as if he had just trumped my ace in

a high stakes game and ask, "What is your explanation?"

Needless to say, I have no explanation of rocks. If it wasn't a rock from Cincinnati, it was the rings around Saturn. "I guess the heavens proclaim the glory of God," I said. But that is the wrong answer. The right answer is that evolution makes God an unnecessary hypothesis. If it wasn't rock from Cincinnati, it was a copy of Hitler's Pope. If it wasn't a copy of Hitler's Pope, it was the pope's apology. What do these things have in common? One thing: if the church is wrong, Sam is right. Sam doesn't have to repent. Sam will tell God a few jokes when he dies, and he will be admitted into the place where Paul Kurtz and his followers go after they die. At some point after the discussion about "everlasting fire," Sam resolved to enter the Church through the door known as baptism after considering Pascal's wager.

Then he changed his mind. It turns out that he got his prostate test back, and it turned out that he didn't have cancer after all. And with that the stakes in the game of salvation decreased significantly. From being convinced that Pascal's wager wasn't such a bad risk, he went on to being convinced that he had another 20 years to live. That conviction, strengthened by attendance at a cheerleading session on atheism led by the folks at Free Inquiry convinced Sam that religion was an opiate which he had kicked. The pope's apology coming when it did simply confirmed Sam in feeling

that he had made the right decision in rejecting the Church. After all, why should a Jew join an anti-Semitic organization? What followed was the same old assault. On a daily basis, I would have deposited on my desk, more articles on evolution and more rocks from suburban Cincinnati. Their common denominator was that the Church was wrong. Coming on the heels of his class in geology, the apology made Sam feel that he had just sold his stock before the market crashed.

When I mentioned the fact that the latest version of the missing link, a creature with a lizard's tail and a bird's wings— now known as "Piltdown Chicken" after National Geographic admitted that it had been concocted by an enterprising Chinaman— had been exposed as a fraud, it made no impression on Sam. Hope springs eternal for those who believe in evolution. Such faith, Christ might exclaim, have I not found in all of Israel! Ironies, of course, abound here.

Evolution was ultimately used by the WASP establishment as the justification to erect the immigration laws that kept Jews out of the country in the period following 1921. Evolution broke the hold that Christianity had over the mind of the WASP establishment. It shattered their belief that all men had descended from Adam and were, therefore, brothers and erected in its place the idea that the newly expelled Russian Jews were some inferior form of life, an idea which Hitler acted on in an especially dramatic way after he picked

it up from Madison Grant. That we now have Jews like Sam promoting evolution is a tribute to our educational system's ability to socially engineer the people it has under its control.

The deal Sam cut at Notre Dame was emblematic in many ways of the deal Jews made with the WASP establishment in this country. The arrangement is fairly straight forward and sketched out in rough form in Digby Baltzell's 1964 book *The Protestant Establishment*, the point of which is to urge fellow WASPs to admit Jews to their exclusive clubs. According to Baltzell, a crisis in moral authority has developed in modern America largely because of the White-Anglo-Saxon-Protestant establishment's unwillingness, or inability to share and improve its upper-class traditions by continuously absorbing talented and distinguished members of minority groups into its privileged ranks. . . . I have focused on the problem of anti-Semitism largely because the present position of the Jews in this country best illustrates the nature of the conflict between the forces of caste and aristocracy, which is my central theme (p. x).

Baltzell prefers aristocracy, which is based on merit, over caste, which is another word for ethnicity, which he associates with obscurantism, convinced as he is that "these [i.e., Whig] traditions are being threatened in our time by the divisive forces of racial and ethnic prejudice." In *The Protestant Establishment*, Baltzell

describes a schism in the WASP ruling class according to which the good guys are represented by Harvard and the bad guys by exclusive clubs like Union League and the Links. The good guys, according to Baltzell, are

a small but growing minority of old stock aristocrats, following the Whig tradition in England, were willing to share their privileges with distinguished members of minority groups in order to maintain their traditional power and authority within the ranks of some sort of new and heterogeneous establishment; they first became Progressives under Theodore Roosevelt, eventually supported Woodrow Wilson and finally joined and often led the Democratic Party during the Great Depression, and many of their sons were inspired by the aristocratic style of the New Frontier (p. xii).

There is, of course, a downside flowing from this strategy, especially if it is viewed from the point of view of the ethnic groups that are getting colonized by it. In *Das Kapital*, Karl Marx wrote (and Baltzell quotes him) that "the more a ruling class is able to assimilate the most prominent men of the dominated classes, the more stable and dangerous its rule." Following the same line of thought Paul M. Sweezy, himself a Harvard grad, criticizes Harvard's strategy "as recruiters for the ruling class, sucking upwards the ablest elements of the lower classes and thus performing the double function of infusing new brains into the ruling class and weakening

the political leadership of the working class" (Baltzell, p. 344). This, of course, is precisely the strategy which Baltzell is urging the WASP establishment to adopt vis a vis the Jews. "Today," Baltzell writes, "when our steadily expanding postwar economy is demanding more and more leaders of ability and education , regardless of ethnic origins, an upper class which is still based on the caste criteria of old-stock Protestant origins is simply an unrepresentative anachronism. (The Protestant Establishment, p. 19). But even in urging it, Baltzell really never gets around to explaining the real downside of the Whig assimilationist paradigm. The real downside is that assimilation means extinction because the price of admission into the WASP ruling class is the adoption of WASP sexual mores, which means the use of contraception and abortion on their own offspring by the people who wish to assimilate. Baltzell never mentions the moral degeneracy of the WASP ruling class in his book, but that and the resultant lack of offspring is why they had to close this deal with the Jews in the first place. There simply weren't enough Protestants around to staff the establishment they had created. In order to keep the empire running, the ruling class in the United States, like the ruling class in England a century before, had to turn to the Jews to run it with them and eventually for them. But in order to be admitted to the ruling class, the Jews had to assimilate, which meant that they had

to adopt the sexual practices of their betters, which meant in the long run that their short-term success guaranteed their long-term extinction.

Alan Dershowitz is very aware of the fact that the Jews are threatened with extinction. His book *The Vanishing American Jew* deals precisely with this topic, specifically with the threat that Our numbers may soon be reduced to the point where our impact on American life will necessarily become marginalized. One Harvard study predicts that if current demographic trends continue, the American Jewish community is likely to number less than 1 million and conceivably as few as 10,000 by the time the United States celebrates its tercentennial in 2076 (*The Vanishing American Jew*, p. 2).

Unfortunately Dershowitz can no more look the real cause of decline in the face than Baltzell can. Dershowitz can't bring himself to look at the cause because that would call into question his political identity as a liberal, an ideology which is based on sexual liberation. So instead of facing the real issue, Dershowitz tries to find scapegoats—things like alleged proselytism of the Religious right—anything it would seem other than the fact that the Jews contracepted and aborted themselves out of existence in the interest of short term political power and wealth. At one point Dershowitz says that "where the Nazis failed in their nightmarish

plan to eliminate Jews as a potent force in the world, we ourselves may succeed" (p. 24), but he never gets around to mentioning, much less condemning, the means that made that "success" possible.

Dresner does not mention contraception in his book, but he does mention the threat which "pagan" sexual mores pose to the continued existence of Israel:

Caged within ghetto bars for centuries, the Jews emerged into the freedom of Western society where they drank in its culture, tasted its pleasure, and enjoyed its power. They demanded citizenship and were so eager to be accepted by the majority that they often offered themselves, sacrificed their history, faith and way of life, their "identity," in order that the stigma of their difference might be obliterated. The roads they traveled, the difficulties they met along the way to achieve this goal have been described in countless records and are embedded in the memory of almost every Jewish family in the twentieth century (Dresner, p. 234).

Dresner mentions Woody Allen's film *Zelig* as "a satire on the absurdity of the lengths to which Jews have gone to assimilate," but Dresner's solution means a return to the Mosaic law and belief in God, something which Dershowitz is unwilling to accept. "They," Dresner writes of people like Dershowitz, "want their children to retain the essence of Judaism, without necessarily living under its constraints and burdens" (Dresner, p. 56). Dershowitz at one point

cites historian Geoffrey Barraclough's claim that "demography is destiny" (Dershowitz, p. 50) but is unable to draw the obvious conclusion from that remark, namely, that contraception precipitated the demographic crisis in the WASP ruling class which brought the Jews to power, and that in order to get to power they had to adopt the mores which begat that very crisis.

This is a truth which is now slowly dawning on Sam Shapiro.

"Neither of [my] children," he wrote in an e-mail message which he circulated to friends, "— through no fault of their own — is married, and it seems that the long, long, long line of Shapiros and Kaufmans may come to an end with us. Rather sad. My Catholic editor neighbor friend around the corner is reading Allen Dershowitz' book on The Vanishing Jews [sic]. Dershowitz says my case is symptomatic, that higher education, late marriage, birth control, and intermarriage, will reduce the number of Jews in

America to less than a million with consequent loss of cultural and political importance. Well - Gloria and I won't live to see that

Sam may not see that, but there is every indication that his children's generation is upset by the prospect and acting in a manner different than their parents. The generational split in the Podhoretz and Kristol clans over support of John McCain is one indication that the older generation's understanding of itself as a permanent minority is not shared by the younger generation, which

tries to manipulate the media which the Jews dominate to maximum political effect, with sometimes disastrous consequences, as McCain's neocon inspired attack on Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson showed.

"Many postmodern Jews," Dresner wrote referring to precisely this generation heading, however in another direction, "have discovered a puzzling truth: No license has replaced the Law . . . no Jaguar, a child" (p. 329). America's Jews of the modern generation, for the most part, took the Jaguar instead of the child. The thought occurred to me when Sam arrived at my office once again, this time to wave his pay stub from TIAA-CReff. The stock market had made him a millionaire, but he still didn't have any grandchildren, and, given the ages of his children, is unlikely ever to get any. When I asked Sam if he were planning to take it with him, he replied, "Of course. If I can't, I'm not going to go."

Since demography is destiny, the Jews who made that choice are now faced with the consequences of their actions, and as a result, many of them are not happy. In Alan Dershowitz we see the Jewish version of Madison Grant, the man whom Digby Baltzell as the "ideal defender of a vanishing America." Just as Grant's 1916 magnum opus *The Passing of the Great Race in America*, touches on WASP fear about the differential fertility resulting from the use of contraception which will eventually lead to the demise of WASP political hegemony in the

United States, so Dershowitz touches on Jewish fears of the same thing. Both men also attempt to turn what is essentially a moral problem into a racial problem. Both WASP racism and Jewish racism have as their unacknowledged common denominator the deliberate repression of the basic moral truth that both ethnic groups were responsible for their own demise because of the widespread adoption of contraception. The same thing can be seen in Malcolm X's systematic demonization of the white race. In each instance the charismatic ethnic leader engages in projection of guilt rather than looking the truth in the face. Instead of acknowledging the moral flaw that lies at the heart of the demographic problem, Grant and Dershowitz create racial demons which are to act as scapegoats for the unacknowledged sexual sins of the ethnic group which brought about its own demographic demise by sexual degeneracy. Racism is invariably a sign of sexual decadence and demographic decline. In both Grant and Dershowitz, what claims to be concern over the survival of a favored ethnic group is in reality the ruling class lamenting its coming loss of power because of its failure to reproduce. Instead of confronting the source of this problem in sexual degeneracy, demagogues like Grant and Dershowitz and Malcolm X rely on appeals to racial fantasies because they know that telling the truth would make them unpopular. Alan Dershowitz applies the same sort of demonization to the Christian right that Grant applied

to the Russian Jews who were Dershowitz's forbears for precisely the same reason. They can't face the fact that "demography is destiny" and that their coming loss of political power is based on their own degenerate sexual practices.

Sam Shapiro and his wife bought into the same deal, although he did not recognize it as such when it was made. At that point, all he knew was that his second wife wanted to become a professor and that that would be hard to do while raising a large family. Although they didn't see it at the time, the price which was exacted for assimilation was lasting political power, and that is so because offspring are the basis of political power. Assimilation means that the Jew wins over the short term, but loses over the long term because he sacrifices his children for success. Alan Dershowitz and Rabbi Sam Dresner have little in common politically, but both are Jews and both are aware of the deal that Jews have cut to be accepted. If you contracept we'll let you into our club. If you contracept we'll give you a Jaguar. The Jews took the Jaguar instead of the child. Sam Shapiro has two children, ages 37 and 39 and no grandchildren, nor does it seem likely that he will have any.

Father Hesburgh tried to do the same deal for Catholics by taking Rockefeller's money and working to change the teaching of the Catholic Church on contraception. For his pains, he was recently given the Congressional Medal of Honor, but he didn't succeed, as

evidenced by the fact that there are 60 million Catholics in the United States and 1 billion worldwide. But what proved to be a disaster politically for the Catholics turned out to be a disaster demographically for the Jews. They were not numerous to begin with. Now their numbers are decreasing dramatically as part of the deal they cut with the WASP establishment. Which may explain their resentment against the Republican Party and the WASP establishment as evidenced by the recent McCain candidacy.

In spite of his name, John McCain was the Jewish candidate for the Republican presidential nomination. Marvin Olasky, himself a Jew (although not the kind Dershowitz would accept) was attacked as an anti-Semite when he defended George Bush in a by now famous article in the February 16 issue of the Austin American-Statesman against what he called "the Party of Zeus," an oblique reference to the anti-Christian bias of the neocon Jews who were backing McCain. "Jewish neoconservatives," Franklin Froer announced in the New Republic in an article that defended him in much the same way that the Atlantic defended Dan Quayle in his fight with Murphy Brown, "have fallen hard for John McCain. . . . McCain has also won over such leading neocon lights as David Brooks, the entire Podhoretz family, the Wall Street Journal's Dorothy Rabinowitz and columnist Charles Krauthammer , who declared in a most un-Semitic flourish, 'He suffered for our sins.'"

The McCain candidacy took off when George Bush, the WASP candidate, announced that his favorite philosopher was Jesus Christ. Once Bush mentioned Jesus Christ, the media began its attack in earnest. What looked like bi-partisan disapproval—Frank Rich was a liberal and Bill Kristol was a conservative, after all—turned out to be upon closer inspection Jewish disapproval. Jews did not like to hear presidential candidates mention Jesus Christ. Jews do not like George Bush. McCain had been primed to respond to this challenge to secular hegemony over public utterance by his adviser, Marshall Wittmann, another Jewish neocon who had worked with Bill Kristol, giving McCain articles from the neocon Weekly Standard which advocated Kristol and David Brooks' theory that Republicans should return to the domestic activism and foreign interventionism of Theodore Roosevelt. McCain's candidacy went down in flames when he flew to Virginia and attacked Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson as a way of stealing the Republican Party from the religious right. In this bit of overreaching we see once again an indication of Jewish pique against their WASP masters in the post-modern generation. They assimilated to get power, but they got power at the expense of offspring and so now that power is going to be taken away from them. The recklessness of the McCain campaign bespeaks just this sense of we've-got-nothing-to-lose recklessness in a group which stands currently at the pinnacle of its political power but knows it is

going to lose that power over the long haul and decides, as a result, to go for broke in the short run.

The recklessness of the McCain campaign bespoke, when all was said and done, Jewish anger at the Republican Party, which had become a surrogate for the WASP establishment. After following Digby Baltzell's advice, the WASPs were now being attacked by the very people they so magnanimously let into their club. The McCain candidacy showed deep-seated Jewish anger at the WASP establishment, of the sort that Digby Baltzell would say was tantamount to biting the hand that feeds it, but Baltzell had already predicted what was going to happen: "The polished graduate of Harvard in the third generation," he wrote, "will surely not be content. . . either to remain within the confines of his ethnico-religious community or to remain forever a marginal man" (Baltzell, *Establishment*, p. 75). Baltzell could have been describing here the difference between Irving Kristol, who wrote in *National Review* that Jews will always be a minority in this country and should behave accordingly, and his son Bill, the man who just about single-handedly orchestrated the McCain attack on the WASP establishment in the Republican Party. The Jews, as Dershowitz makes clear, exterminated their own ethnos with contraception and abortion, and now they realize too late that they are passing from the political scene. The power they sought so avidly is not theirs to wield, and what they have is going to be

taken away from them . The same rule that applied to the WASPs applies to them: No progeny, no power. Just as the WASP aristocracy had to admit Jews to maintain the empire, so now Jews will have to admit the goyim to maintain an empire their unborn children cannot inherit because they were never born. This is, needless to say, painful to admit. It will always be easier for demagogues to follow the path of least resistance for short term gain, and so instead of uttering their own mea culpa for promoting sexual revolution, the Jews lash out at their imagined enemies. Hence, McCain's attack on the religious right and the publishing industry's attack on Pius XII.

This phenomenon is nowhere more apparent than in the area of foreign policy. Jews in America never had the demographic clout to elect their own legislatures. But foreign policy is not decided by popular election. For years the WASP establishment ran the state department by drawing its members from Yale in general and secret societies like the Skull and Bones in particular. George Bush senior was a member of Skull and Bones, and George Bush preserved the old WASP hegemony over the state department and foreign policy. As a result, the Jews did not like George Bush and worked for his defeat. That animus has carried over into their dislike of his son. Hence, the McCain candidacy.

The prohibition against Jews in higher levels at the State

Department was removed when Bill Clinton became president. We know this because Alan Dershowitz says so in his book. "Bill Clinton's presidency," he writes, "marked the end of discrimination against Jews in the upper echelons of government. For the first time in American history, the fact that an aspirant for high appointive office was a Jew became irrelevant in his or her selection"

(Dershowitz, p. 9). Before long, again according to Dershowitz, "all the officials in Clinton's administration at that time who had power over the economy—the Secretaries of the Treasury, Commerce, Labor and Agriculture, as well as the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board— were Jews." Dershowitz left out the secretaries of state and defense, but, as if to calm the fears of the anti-Semites, goes on to add that "as Jews these individuals will no be serving any particular religious or ethnic agenda" (Dershowitz, p. 59).

Dershowitz concludes his book by calling for a world-wide congress of Jews, modeled on the one Theodore Herzl convoked in Zurich one hundred years ago. Dershowitz's conference, however, will not be held in Zurich because "Switzerland has disqualified itself [as place for the conference] by its disgraceful role during the Holocaust and its current attempt at covering it up" (Dershowitz, p. 340). By mentioning Switzerland, Dershowitz exposes the disingenuous nature of his claim that the Jews in government "will not be serving any particular religious or ethnic agenda," for the attack on

Switzerland over the Nazi-Gold incident and the subsequent attack over immigration was nothing but a government-sponsored looting expedition conducted for the benefit of Jewish organizations. The extortion of billions of dollars from the Swiss could not have taken place without close government support. Senator Alphonse D'Amato of New York worked closely with both the World Jewish Congress and Stuart Eisenstadt of the State Department, who in turn worked with Ambassador Madeleine Kunin. This sort of thing did not happen when Faith Whittlesley was ambassador to Switzerland.

As Norman Finklestein, author of *The Holocaust Industry: The Abuse of Jewish Victims*, makes clear, "The holocaust industry first tried out its strategy in Switzerland. It began with putting Senator Alphonse D'Amato and the United States government on their case. Then came the lawyers with their demands for reparations. The third prong of the attack began with setting bank regulators like Alan Hevesi in action. All of this was accompanied by the hysteria in the media. It took three years to bring Switzerland to its knees" (*Zeitfragen*, 3/20/00, p. 8).

Now the Jewish organizations, which keep 45 percent of the financial booty they acquire in these looting expeditions, have targeted Austria. Holocaust Lawyer Ed Fagan showed up in Austria in February demanding the "return" of \$10 billion in property and artwork, even though these cases had all been settled in 1953. The net result of

these government sponsored looting campaigns for the Jewish organizations which make up what Finklestein calls the "Holocaust Industry" is precisely what they claim they want to combat, namely, anti-Semitism. "Instead of letting the dead rest in peace," Finklestein said, "the Holocaust Industry foments anti-Semitism, wherever it puts its foot down in Europe."

In the imperialistic war in Kosovo, we see the lethal side of allowing one group to run the country's foreign policy for its own benefit. From Bolshevism to the Wolfowitz memorandum, we can see one constant, namely, Jewish animus against Russia. That animus is now running our foreign policy, and it has ruined the window of opportunity for world peace that existed in the early 1990s. The Russians are now convinced that the United States is out to destroy it. The Swiss and the Austrians are convinced of something similar primarily as the result of plundering which Jewish organizations were allowed to do there. The Serbians felt the same wrath. No group covered itself with more shame in the Kosovo war than the neocon imperialists, people like Thomas Friedman at the New York Times calling for the destruction of Belgrade or the lady at the New Republic who wrote the article on "Milosevic's Willing Executioners," taking her title from the bogus tome of Daniel Goldhagen of Harvard.

All of this is the inexorable consequence of empire. As the

disintegration of the Republican party into its ethnic components has made clear, empire is divisive. It pits one group against another in an unending struggle for power. In this regard, the Enlightenment has proved to be its own undoing. The United States, by turning into an empire, has disintegrated into the ethnic components it sought to repress. If anyone is interested in putting Humpty-Dumpty back together again, he will have to consult the instruction manual, namely, the caveats of people like John Adams who warned that the Constitution would only function if the populace internalized the principle of civil order implicit in the moral law.

Alan Dershowitz attacks Rabbi Daniel Lapin and the Jewish columnist Don Feder for taking part in the Christian Coalition's "Road to Victory" conference in 1995, but he can never really explain why they would consort so avidly with what Dershowitz considers their enemies. The answer is something which transcends Dershowitz's view of ethnic politics. The answer is moral revulsion. Jews like Feder, Lapin and Dresner are upset at the moral decay that people like Dershowitz, who defended President Clinton's illicit sexual relationship with a Jewish intern, have brought about. They are especially upset as Jews because as Jews they can never be more than a tiny minority in a vast ocean of what is now becoming a pagan culture. They are upset because a pagan culture is a violent culture. As the rise of the Nazis in Germany showed,

de-Christianization can have unpleasant consequences, even for the most rabid de-Christianizer. "With the enfeeblement of Christianity," Dresner writes, "that world has become pagan root and branch." Those who enfeeble Christianity, whether by sins of commission or omission, would do well to ponder the alternative. The alternative to the alternative, however, is still what it has always been. "We have no constitution that functions in the absence of a moral people," John Adams wrote. The Clinton presidency has proved that fact beyond a doubt. No matter how it looks now, steeped in the blood of empire, America is a country which worked once when it was a republic whose unwritten constitution was the moral law. The only way it is going to work again is the way it worked then, which is to say, in Rabbi Dresner's words, as "a new coalition, a union of Jews and Gentiles with a common commitment to civilization and a common abhorrence of social and moral chaos" (p. 51).

## **4. Guilt by Association**

by E. Michael Jones

This article appeared in the May 2007 issue of Culture Wars.

People love to take your picture in Washington. I was in that labyrinthine town to speak at a symposium entitled "Sam Francis and America's Culture War," which had been arranged by Fran Griffin of FGF books to promote a posthumous collection of Sam Francis's columns, *Shots Fired: Sam Francis on America's Culture War*. As I was getting ready to give my speech at the National Press Club, I looked at all the photos on the wall. It was full of pictures of celebrities I had known from my youth—people like Art Buchwald, Eric Severeid, Marvin Kalb—but somehow they all

looked older and uglier than I remembered them. These photos were not a thing of beauty and a joy forever, or even for the few short minutes I had to view them. So they must have served some other purpose. What the picture did was to testify to the bona fides of the people it portrayed. Both people were validated by the photo of one man giving an award and the other man receiving it—at least in primitive cultures like Washington.

The converse of the same thought occurred to me after I gave my talk. After Joe Sobran gave his speech, someone pushed me in his direction and demanded to take a picture of both of us. Just before the flash went off, I turned to Joe and said, “Joe, this picture is going to ruin your career.” Without missing a beat, Joe responded, “Mutually assured destruction.”

In other words, the idea that somehow Joe was going to be held responsible for what I said or that I was going to be held responsible for what he said, struck us both as inexpressibly funny. It was almost as funny as the idea that either of us had careers to worry about.

And that was almost as funny as the reaction I got to my talk. For those of you who are tuning in late, *the talk I gave was in honor of Sam Francis and was essentially the review of two books connected with the late Sam Francis, which appeared in the March issue of Culture Wars.* My ruminations on the role race played in Sam’s writings set off an explosion which still has debris falling around me. Most of the howling came from Peter Brimelow, editor of the vdare website and author, 12-years ago, of *Alien Nation: Common Sense about America’s Immigration Disaster*. On the Monday following the talk, the following passage appeared on Peter Brimelow’s blog, describing the conference.

CSPAN was there, but VDARE.COM readers probably won’t get to watch the conference because of an extraordinary performance by E. Michael Jones, editor of Culture Wars and a prize specimen even by the standards of my lifelong study of characters on the American Right. Jones denounced Elizabethan England, Puritans, capitalism, Protestants, “revolutionary Jews” (but not all Jews, he was quite nuanced) and, for good measure, the idea that race matters or that America was ever a nation. I like Catholic bigots as much as anyone else, but this had nothing to do with anything Sam Francis ever wrote - except where it actually contradicted his views. Sam felt bitterly that he never had the recognition he deserved while he was alive. Jones ensured that he won’t get it now that he’s dead.

Mr. Brimelow had apparently calmed down by Monday because missing from his blog entry was the hysteria which characterized his e-mails in the immediate aftermath of the conference. It is a rare and disedifying sight to see a grown man so consumed by fear, but here was Peter Brimelow absolutely petrified. And what was he afraid of? That someone might have photographed him standing next to E.

Michael Jones! In the immediate aftermath of the conference, Mr. Brimelow professed to be appalled by my talk, which is his right. The really funny part came later in the same communication when he announced that “I can’t be associated with anything in which that speech is featured [or] . . . to be in any photographs or material of any kind in which Jones is present.” (I had to edit his original text because fear evidently rendered his syntax incoherent.)

Now that is serious fear. Unfortunately, it was a bit too late to do anything about it. On page 2 of a brochure handed out by the Fitzgerald Griffin Foundation on the day of the conference, there we are—Peter Brimelow and I—cheek by jowl, pictures and all, right next to each other. It’s not quite the usual press club deal with the two of us arm in arm the one receiving a plaque from the other, but you got the impression that Peter Brimelow felt this was career-ending material, and there wasn’t a damn thing that Peter Brimelow could do about it. Hence, the terror.

That impression was strengthened when Peter Brimelow’s lawyer contacted conference organizer Fran Griffin on the Tuesday following the talk. In one of those chilling missives that only lawyers know how to write, Fran Griffin, who is a woman by the way, (Why do people like Peter Brimelow beat up on women for things they did not say?) was informed that she must respect Peter Brimelow’s “right of publicity and exclude his speech and any reference to his conference participation from any publication that includes Dr. Jones’s speech.” (As some indication of the sort of association which Mr. Brimelow does not fear, his v-dare site has links to the Zionist fanatic Daniel Pipes.)

Well, as I said, it’s a little late for that. Peter Brimelow can ask his lawyer to beat up Fran Griffin or beat the sea with chains or whatever, but the simple fact of the matter is that Peter Brimelow and E. Michael Jones were, on March 20, 2007, not only in the same room together but were both speakers at the same conference, and all of the lawyers in Washington, D.C. can’t change that fact.

Fran Griffin’s response was suffused with a common sense notably absent from the hysterical response of Peter Brimelow and his pit bull lawyer:

If Peter Brimelow is so worried about Jones, he should take the advice I gave him last Tuesday: ignore Jones, don’t mention Jones, don’t complain about Jones, pretend Jones doesn’t exist. This is the most sensible thing he could have done. If he is worried about Jones, why is he linking himself with him? Why is he giving his readers worldwide a chance to Google him by mentioning him and outlining his complaints against him (see transcript from V-dare below)? This makes no sense. Has Peter ever spoken at a symposium before where he disagreed with a speaker? Or does he always agree 100% with every speaker at every forum he attends?

She then brought up the fact that I might be offended by Brimelow’s tactless joke about burning crosses and the Ku Klux Klan. So let me go on record at this point

and say, that Peter Brimelow need have no fear that my lawyer is going to contact him for the offense of being in the same room with me or cracking tactless jokes that the overwhelming majority of American citizens would find offensive. If, however, a photo of the two of us comes into my possession, he can take it off my hands by leaving \$10,000 in unmarked bills at the foot of the Washington Monument at a time to be mutually agreed upon.

I never knew that photos could be so important, or that they could cause such panic. Once Brimelow and Peter Gemma started circulating their e-mails, however, the panic among the fair weather culture warriors spread like wildfire. Linda Muller, a conference attendee and Buchanan supporter, fired off an e-mail of her which could serve as a primer on how not to react to pressure: “Fran needs to end CYA [i.e., cover your ass] and do a long-winded PRIVATE mea culpa,” which involved the following steps: “1) Admit the mistake; 2) Apologize profusely; 3) Denounce E. Michael Jones; 4) Define a thorough separation from Jones — Sam Francis and those who attended the event.” Mrs. Muller, who describes herself as a “traditional Catholic,” would have loved Stalin’s show trials. She is also probably a fan of cropping photos to delete disgraced members of the Politburo. I say this because her first reaction to my speech indicated sympathy for that behavior. **Once the panic gripped her, Muller sabotaged the Sam Francis website, “I just deleted every reference to the conference off the shotsfired.us website. If anyone has an issue with that, they can try to justify it with me directly.”** (Oddly enough, Fran Griffin, the owner of the site, did have an issue with that.) By the end of her e-mail, Muller was recommending that everyone pretend that I had never set foot in Washington. “Right now I suggest the best thing for all of us to do is to act like the conference never happened.”

Now, given the face that my DNA has inflicted on me, I can understand why people might not want to be photographed standing next to me. I have been told that faces like mine can break cameras, and given the expensive cameras in operation during the conference, who would want to be held liable for the expense of repairing them? But what I can’t understand is how someone like Peter Brimelow could be held accountable for a talk that I gave. He doesn’t look at all like me. He is much more handsome than I am. His hair is gray, and my hair, at least most of it, is brown. He has had two Irish Catholic wives (the first one died), and so far I haven’t had any. (My first wife, the one I am still married to, was an Episcopalian.) There was no possibility of mistaken identity at the conference either. When he took to the podium during the Q and A afterward, Mr. Brimelow shook his fist at me claiming, “I like Elizabethan England.” There could have been no possibility of mistaken identity because I clearly expressed the opposite point of view during my talk.

So why all this nervousness about pictures and making sure that the *Washington*

*Times* spiked the story they were going to run and making sure that C-Span never ran its footage of the conference? Why, in other words, was this conference sabotaged by the very people who should have wanted to promote it? The answer is fear. Washington is a primitive culture which runs on the sympathetic magic known as guilt by association. The denizens of this primitive culture run in fear of guilt by association because it is inflicted on them on an ongoing basis. One of the few sensible reactions to the talk came from Taki, the Greek playboy co-publisher of the *American Conservative*, who weighed in about two weeks after the conference on his blogsite. Taki, who gave an off-the-cuff talk about drinking champagne with Mickey Mantle, criticized me for not talking about Sam Francis. Sam, as far as I know, did not have a lot to say about Mickey Mantle, but he did pose the question “Are Jews White?” as I mentioned in my talk, and he did write an introduction to a book by Kevin MacDonald on the Jews.

But that wasn’t the profound part of what Taki had to say. That came later, when he wrote. “The trouble is in a free society speakers are not vetted before they speak. None of us, Fran Griffin included, were responsible for Michael Jones’s opinions—some (not all) of which were right on, incidentally.” One wonders what free society Taki is talking about here, certainly not Washington, DC, where the prime rule of discourse is guilt by association. This system of control only works if you can be held responsible for the views of the people sitting next to you. That is what happened to John Sharpe. That fact of life is what sent Peter Brimelow into hysterics. That is what provides the maximum amount of intimidation in the political control of discourse. Taki, in this regard, is either more courageous or less perceptive than Linda Muller and Peter Brimelow, who are smart enough to know that the system of intimidation can only work if everyone else in the room could be held responsible and punished for the views that I expressed. If everyone believed what Taki believed, the system of guilt by association would collapse overnight. Since the system is in full force, it should be obvious that no one believes that people can only be held accountable for what they themselves say. If that were the case, why would Peter Brimelow and Linda Muller have exhibited such a panic attack for things they had not said?

A refreshing exception to the fear that pervaded the conference was my meeting with Willis Carto. When it comes to Washington photographs, Willis Carto is even more radioactive than E. Michael Jones. Willis Carto could make a fortune in Washington by being paid to be photographed beside any candidate’s political enemies, but instead he is the publisher of *The American Free Press* and *The Barnes Review*, at whose offices Willis and Michael Collins Piper interviewed me after the talk. After I expounded on the thesis of the revolutionary Jew for about an hour, Willis said, “So you don’t hold much to the racial explanation of Christian identity,”

a position he defended in a pamphlet he sent to me. To which I said, “No, the New Israel is the Catholic Church. It has no racial identity.” So we agreed to disagree, knowing that two grown men with two different sets of ideas could talk to each other intelligently and be open and frank about our differences. Before I left, Willis insisted that one of his staffers take a picture of us together, at which point I turned to Willis and said, “This picture is going to ruin your career.”

Next to lust and greed, guilt by association is the most common form of political control in Washington. Perhaps Mr. Brimelow was nervous because, after attacking the idea that race could explain anything of significance, including the race wars of the 1960s, I mentioned what had just happened to Lt. Cmdr. John Sharpe. This is what I had to say about John Sharpe in my revised talk, which did not appear in *CW*: The same forces which used the NAACP to turn the Negro into the revolutionary vanguard in the United States, the same forces which subverted the idea of conservatism, are still at work today. As Nelson Algren once said, every movement begins as a cause, becomes a business, and ends up being a racket. This is nowhere more true than in the civil rights movement, where the NAACP made the transition from cause to business, and the name of the racket is the Southern Poverty Law Center. In case you haven’t noticed, the SPLC has declared war on Catholics. Traditional Catholicism is now featured as harboring 100,000 anti-Semites. I have been listed as one of the most prominent of those 100,000, even though I am not now nor have I ever been a traditionalist. Another man on the list is Lt. Commander John Sharpe, who has just been put on administrative leave as public relations officer on the USS Carl Vinson pending an investigation into his involvement in “supremacist” organizations.

Why has John Sharpe, an Annapolis graduate and career officer in the Navy, incurred the wrath of the SPLC? Was it because he plotted to blow up a Church in the South? Was it because he was lowering in the bushes in Mississippi with a rifle waiting to shoot civil rights marchers? Was it because he was a member of the Ku Klux Klan? Was it because he believes in racial supremacy? Was it because he urged people to harm Jews? No, John Sharpe was singled out for persecution because he was a Catholic and because he decided that he didn’t want to go along with all of the Catholic prostitutes—Father Sirico of the Acton Institute springs immediately to mind—who were claiming that free market laissez faire capitalism was completely compatible with what the popes had to say in encyclicals like *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*. John Sharpe made the mistake of re-publishing distributist classics by writers like G. K. Chesterton and Hilaire Belloc, and for that his patriotism has been called into question.

But it wasn’t just distributism that got John in trouble with the SPLC. It was also his two-volume attack on the war in Iraq, Neoconned and Neoconned Again, to which I

contributed. The slanderers at the SPLC referred to the Neoconned volumes as containing “several articles by racists and anti-Semites.” If the Navy had taken the time to look at the book the SPLC cited they might have found notorious anti-Semites like Noam Chomsky, Paul Gottfried, and Jeff Steinberg among its contributors. Why would a Jew hater include Jews among the contributors to his book? Probably because he is not what the SPLC says he is. The article in the *Navy Times* attacking John Sharpe was based on the legwork of the SPLC’s paid troupe of character assassins, and it gives new credence to the old oxymoron joke about military intelligence.

In the end, when Father Scalia entered his hospital room and asked him if he wanted the sacraments of the Church, Sam Francis chose the Higher Logos, and we can honor him by choosing the cause of Logos as we enter the next phase of the culture wars. Both Sam Francis’s deathbed conversion to Catholicism and the persecution of John Sharpe are symbolic of a shift in the culture wars. The offensive launched by the Southern Poverty Law Center is the best indication I can offer that the main front in the culture wars is now the confrontation between Jews and Catholics. The Enlightenment is finally dead. There are no more quasi-Masonic movements, where each of us can rise above whatever sect he belongs to and join the Lodge known as “conservatism” or liberalism, or whatever. I think we, no matter what our religious or ethnic background, should rejoice at this development because in this confrontation 1) the Church has both a history and a set of beliefs that will lay to rest forever the charge of anti-Semitism and destroy it as a tool of political oppression and 2) because no matter how much they want to finesse the attack by focusing on what they consider fringe groups, the Jews have taken on a considerable group of people, who will react eventually to the attack. The situation in Hungary now is a case in point.

And finally, we should be happy because the attack clearly defines the terms of engagement, all of which are all spiritual. The revolutionary Jew is our enemy because he is a rejecter of Logos, not because of his DNA. We are not anti-Semites because we oppose the machinations of the revolutionary Jew. No, we are true Christians because of that, as the Church from the time of St. Peter onward has proclaimed. Like St. Peter and St. Paul, we are suffering at the hands of the Jews, “the people who put the Lord Jesus to death, and the prophets too. And now they have been persecuting us, and acting in a way that cannot please God and makes them the enemies of the whole human race” (I Thess 1:15).

We are now engaged in a battle which has ebbed and flowed over the centuries, but the sides in this battle have not changed. What has changed are the odds. The Jews have never been stronger; the Catholics have never been weaker, but the outcome of spiritual battles—and the battle for the soul of the West, as Tolkien knew, is a

spiritual battle—no matter what the odds, is rarely predictable. If St. Paul, representing the Christian position, has to say, “When I am weak, I am strong.” Then the revolutionary Jew, representing the opposite position has to say, “When I am strong, I am weak.” We are outgunned on every front in the culture wars, but that is no reason for despair, if we follow the Logos that St. Paul followed, because he was outgunned by the Jews too, outgunned but not undone, saying, “We are hard pressed on every side, but not crushed; perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not abandoned; struck down but not destroyed.”

And so, as Theoden said, “we come to it in the end, the great battle of our time, in which many things will pass away. But at least there is no longer need for hiding.” Nor, might we add, any place to hide. Many if not most of us are here today because our careers have already been destroyed by the revolutionary Jew and his goyische front men. The Jews spy on us through our computers. They suborn fellow Catholics to betray us, get us fired, prevent us from speaking. Our backs are to the wall. But in attacking John Sharpe, the SPLC has created the American Catholic version of the Dreyfus affair. They have clarified the issue. By going along with their slanders, the Navy has put itself on trial. It is our duty to play the cards which providence has dealt us. We have never been weaker, and our enemies have never been stronger, but that is no reason for despair, because as Elrond says, “this quest may be attempted by the weak with as much hope as the strong.” And why is that? Because “such is the course of deeds that move the wheels of the world: small hands do them as because they must, while the eyes of the great are elsewhere.” (I, p. 283).

Perhaps the mention of John Sharpe made Peter Brimelow nervous because if there were ever a man who was the victim of character assassination via guilt by association, it was John Sharpe. On the day of my talk, someone handed me an article which had just appeared in the *Navy News*. Andrew Scutro, staff writer for that paper, quoted Heidi Beirich, one of the Southern Poverty Law Center’s paid character assassins, as saying that she “witnessed him [John Sharpe] selling books at a gathering of a group known as ‘American Renaissance,’ that welcomes activists to ‘help the cause of whites,’ according to its web site.” Sharpe countered by claiming that American Renaissance was “the white man’s version of the NAACP” and that he was there to sell books. He also mentioned that he had attended a meeting of progressive Democrats for the same reason. Interestingly, the SPLC did not accuse John Sharpe of being a liberal Democrat because of that fact. Publishers go to events to sell their books, not to endorse the views of the speakers there. Sharpe’s *Neoconned* and *Neoconned Again* volumes opposed the war in Iraq and so might have found acceptance in left-wing circles, but the SPLC ignored that fact because it did not serve their main interest, which was character assassination via guilt by association. In her response to the *Navy Times* reporter, Ms. “Beirich scoffed at

Sharpe's apparent ignorance of the subversive nature of the American Renaissance. "Literally next to him," Beirich continued, "in the next booth, was a guy selling 'White Power' T-shirts . . . . You had to be an idiot not to know where you were."

Which is true enough. But no one is claiming that John Sharpe didn't know where he was. He is claiming that he attended the conference to sell books, but Ms. Beirich is claiming that he is guilty of racism because of the T-shirts the man in the booth next to him was selling. Conspicuous by its absence from this exercise in guilt by association was any mention of the books that he was selling or their contents.

I noticed the same thing in the SPLC attack on me. After announcing that my wife and I almost made it to Woodstock on our honeymoon (something you would think would endear me to the hearts of SPLC supporters), Beirich et al announced that I had sponsored a conference in Germany on "deracination," something dear to the hearts of neo-Nazis. First of all, after reading this feeble attempt at character assassination via guilt by association, I became aware 1) that the Einsteins at the SPLC didn't know that the word "deracination" refers to roots and not race and 2) that they aren't in the practice of consulting the dictionary when they run across big words that they don't understand. But their intention was clear. I was a Nazi because I held a conference in Germany and used a big word that they didn't understand.

But let's engage in a thought experiment that will make guilt by association even easier for the cub reporters at the SPLC. Suppose for a moment that I had addressed a Neo-Nazi rally in Germany. Is there any doubt in anybody's mind what I would have told them? I would have given exactly the same speech that I gave at the Sam Francis memorial in Washington. I would have told them that our enemy is the revolutionary Jew, and that racism is stupid because it prevents us from addressing the real problem, which is the Jewish rejection of Logos and not any malignant (or mystical) DNA. If, by some miracle of regeneration, Adolf Hitler had been present at my talk, I would have told him the same thing and would not have been contaminated because of any proximity to him. If Adolf Hitler at this point stepped forward to have his picture taken standing beside me, I would have said to him what I said to Joe Sobran and Willis Carto, "Adolf, this picture will ruin your career."

Guilt by association is an old story. It is an old Jewish story as well. The Pharisees, if you'll remember, criticized Jesus for eating with prostitutes and tax-collectors, as if somehow their sins could contaminate the Logos. His response was to say that it is the sick who need the doctor and to dismiss the idea that anything that goes into a man's mouth makes him unclean. No, the Christian believes that it is what comes out of your mouth and heart that makes you unclean, and this statement posits the *a fortiori* truth that we are not responsible for what comes out of someone else's mouth.

So, as the pope once said, "Be not afraid, Peter." When it comes to guilt by

association, the choice is fairly clear: we can choose the Logos which sets us free to engage the world in dialogue and allows us Christian freedom of association, or we can succumb to Jewish taboo and fear of the Jews and the constant anxiety that we can at any moment be expelled from the synagogue of political correctness and respectability by an involuntarily incurred instance of intellectual ritual impurity. Once our culture turned away from Christ and began to embrace the Talmud, fear of ritual impurity would become one of the main instruments of political control, a fact nowhere more evident than in Washington.

The more we delve into this matter the more evident the hypocrisy associated with guilt by association becomes, as one of the main forms of political control. To get back to our original instance, John Sharpe is being demonized by the character assassins at the Southern Poverty Law Center as an anti-Semite because he attended an American Renaissance conference. Yet, if we log on to the SPLC website and type American Renaissance into their search engine, we find that the SPLC has good things to say about that racist organization. In fact, a quick search of the SPLC web site informs us that AR president Jared Taylor is “an opponent of anti-Semitism.” Shawn Mercer, the man in charge of the American Renaissance’s web discussion group, we are told, “deletes most postings excoriating the Jews.” This only confirms what we have learned from other sources. In an obit on Sam Francis which appeared in the *American Conservative*, we were told that Jared Taylor wanted to do for white nationalism what William F. Buckley did for conservatism. And what is that? Well, to subvert it in the interests of the Jews. One of the entries at the SPLC site claims that “It is well-known that the American Renaissance does not allow anti-Semitism; it is uptown, 100% clean WN [white nationalism]. Call it a first step if you like, but it is a very important first step, and Jared Taylor has had success.”

Success in what? The dirty secret of “uptown” racism is that it offers cover to revolutionaries by claiming that Jews are white—hence Sam’s question, hence the uproar my exploration of that question caused among the “uptown” race crowd. As I said in my talk, the real armature of the culture wars is ethnic not racial. The American Renaissance is exactly what John Sharpe said it was, although not quite in the way that he intended. The American Renaissance is the white man’s version of the NAACP, which is to say, one more organization which manipulates the race issue in the interests of the revolutionary Jews. The main purpose of the American Renaissance is to convince deracinated Protestants that Jews are white, and, therefore, no threat to their interests. In obscuring the problem by playing the race card, the American Renaissance engages in cultural mystification every bit as much as the NAACP and the Black Panthers, two Jewish-run operations, did before them. In obscuring the real nature of the culture wars, white nationalism becomes a form of political control and a worthy successor to the Jewish-led black operation known

as conservatism. No wonder the race crowd was upset with my talk.

The race crowd, it turns out, was more upset by my talk than the Jews. Even though I identified the revolutionary Jew as our enemy, I made it clear that insofar as he follows Logos, the Jew is not our enemy. If the Jew accepts the Higher Logos known as Catholic Christianity, he is not only not our enemy, he is one of us. Throughout history, Jews have rejected the rejection of Logos, and when they did one of the first things they proposed was burning the Talmud. When Joseph Pfefferkorn converted to Catholicism in 1507, he gave expression to his new-found zeal for the faith by wanting to burn the Talmud, and the Cologne Dominicans supported him in his desire.

Nothing much has changed since then. The chattering class both then (i.e., Erasmus and the humanists) and now was distinguished not so much by their love for the Jews as by their skepticism about the efficacy of baptism to change Jewish DNA, as if that were the issue. Both then and now, the Jews who follow Logos and the Jewish converts to the higher Logos saw that racism deprived the Jew of both his reason and his humanity. He was nothing more than a function of his wicked DNA, which baptism could not change and which Logos could not touch.

One of the people who attended the talk and who was not afraid to have her picture taken with me (she, in fact, took many of the pictures) was Kristin Kazyak, a spiritual daughter of Nicholas Donin, Joseph Pfefferkorn, and Edith Stein. She was, in other words, a Jewess who had accepted the Higher Logos and was, therefore, one of us:

I heard Jones speak on March 20, 2007 at the Sam Francis conference at the Natl Press Club and frankly, of all those who spoke Jones distinguished himself by a presentation that was well-reasoned coupled with a delivery and demeanor that fitted the type of intellectual discussion desired, needed and invited.

Sadly, a couple of those on the panel, either because they knew or hob knobbed with Sam Francis were, in fact, emotionally disturbed dysfunctionals who projected their racism and virulently anti-Catholic bigotry both during their own lectures and also by disrupting the conference with startling, as well as, embarrassing irrational acts and statements.

When Jones failed to join them, they realized — like the Liberals at Vatican II — they stood alone (foiled again which really exorcised them to projectile vomit and foam at the mouth) in highlight with their racist and bigoted statements and antics — engraved and burned for public consumption on DVD and C-SPAN, and in VIVID *contrast* with Jones and the other guest lecturers who were well reasoned and who exhibited their good will (and good manners).

Being of Jewish descent (and not *merely* having a Jewish great-great-great grandmother but a Jewish Mother and the very same Jewish Mother who conceived

Jesus Christ making Him one with His “People of The Name” — the Blessed Ever-Virgin Mother Mary) with family members in Koziénice exterminated at Treblinka and Auschwitz <http://www.jewishgen.org/yizkor/Koziénice/kozXI.html#K> I have no sympathy for homosexuals (no descendants of Lot here) and little sympathy for empty-headed demi-political Catholics (Protestants and Liberal Revolutionary Jews) who fall for the homosexual agenda and attack “neo-cons” for crawling OUT of the dank black scummy swamps of Chaos made by Gay-jewish Revolutionaries, only to find themselves stumbling about on stony ground during a BLACKOUT near-total eclipse of Faith and Reason (while the winds and gates of Hell howl in vain maelstrom against the Church).

In working the crowd after the talk Kazyak found that, even though (or perhaps, because) I identified the revolutionary Jew as the enemy, the Jews she spoke to were more sympathetic to my talk than the racists were:

I’ve found nothing in Jones’ book or his speech at the Sam Francis conference that Fr John A Hardon, SJ (Saint pending) or Pope Benedict XVI would not agree with entirely. I spoke with an undercover Jew (or two) at the conference who (being of right reason and ergo “lower logos”) agreed as well and then some with Jones! *I would suggest a near future conference to include E. Michael Jones and Rabbi Levin and certain others (of similar Moral Virtue and intellectual fortitude) — it’s time WE came out with our Light from under the bushel (her emphasis).*

The doors of our conference MUST be closed to ALL intellectual and moral **predators**. (Leave faggots to shout their racism and anti-Catholic, anti-Jewish bigotry at Queer Nation conferences — they can buy our **unedited** DVDs). I think Sam’s conference dug the graves for some of his former “hanger-ons” who have neither the moral nor intellectual capacity to follow Sam to the Higher Logos. I don’t think they like being left behind, but that *Is* LIFE, and the difference between willing LIFE and choosing death.

They can continue to choose death. Sam willed Life. We can pray for those who choose the gods of Chaos rather than the One God, Who Is Love, Truth and Life but I’d fire up our thermonuclear detonators along with our laser swords and shields and beg the Angel with the Flaming Sword, as well, to keep the Chaos OUT (demoniacs can gnash their teeth outside our conference doors) and Eternally far from US in the event of any future conferences — open to all **men** of good will who love the Truth — both lower logos and Higher Logos.

So what I said in my talk about the Jewish subversion of the civil rights movement and the Jewish attempt to turn the Negro into the revolutionary vanguard in the United States is *a fortiori* true of white racism. The SPLC supports “uptown” racism of the American Renaissance variety, because the SPLC, like the NAACP before it, is an essentially Jewish organization. Supporting “uptown” racism absolves the

revolutionary Jew of any responsibility in the culture wars by giving them the cover of being “white,” and once they are certified as white, they are certified as “good” because of their DNA. How any one can believe this mumbo jumbo is beyond me. If you want a more detailed explanation, I suggest that you contact Jared Taylor.

So, the answer to the question Sam Francis posed and which began my talk, “Are Jews white?” is yes. Jews are white in the eyes of the American Renaissance, and as a result the SPLC, which is a Jewish organization, which is ostensibly against racism, supports them in their efforts to redefine Jews out of the cultural equation. Once race becomes the all-important issue, Jews disappear from the radar screen because, well, because they are not black. John Sharpe, on the other hand, who is being attacked because he is Catholic and upholds the traditional Catholic position on the Jews is demonized as an anti-Semite because of his tenuous association with a group, American Renaissance, which the SPLC goes out of its way to certify as not anti-Semitic.

Is that clear? No? If it isn't, it's because guilt by association is fundamentally irrational. It is the hallmark of a group of people who derive their identity from hatred of Logos. Insofar as we embrace the Logos, we are absolved from these fears. Just as Jesus could eat with whores and tax-collectors, we can get our pictures taken with Joe Sobran and Willis Carto and even people like Peter Brimelow without fear of contamination. The more we embrace the light, the less we will be kept in the dark by the deliberate manipulation of racial doctrines whose purpose is to keep us all divided, confused, and full of fear.

## **5. The Conversion of the Revolutionary Jew**

by E. Michael Jones

This article was published in the October 2006 issue of [\*Culture Wars\*](#) magazine

On June 15, 2006, the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States passed a resolution condemning the Gospels as “anti-Jewish” documents. Since the conclusion which the Episcopalians drew from their recognition of that fact was to censor the Scriptures, especially their liturgical use, by removing anything a Jew might find offensive, many Episcopalians concluded that this was the final apostasy in a long slide which began at the Lambeth conference of 1930 when that church approved the use of contraceptives. Whether it is or it isn't is beyond our purview here. No matter what conclusions the Episcopalians draw from the fact, the statement that the Gospels are anti-Jewish is, beyond the shadow of a

doubt, true. The only real question is why it took the Episcopalians two thousand years to wake up to this fact or why they didn't draw what seems to be the more logical conclusion, namely, that if Episcopalians want to be faithful to the example of Jesus Christ, they must be anti-Jewish as well.

The Episcopalians did not say that the Scriptures were anti-Semitic. If they had said that, the statement would have been false. Anti-Semitism is a relatively recent word. It was created in 1870 by a German by the name of Wilhelm Marr. It refers to race, and claims that Jews are hateful because of certain ineradicable biological characteristics. That idea led to Hitler, but the defeat of Hitler led to a re-definition of the word. Anti-Semitism now has an entirely different meaning. An anti-Semite used to be someone who didn't like Jews. Now it is someone whom the Jews don't like. No Christian can in good conscience be an anti-Semite, but every Christian, insofar as he is a Christian, must be anti-Jewish. In contemporary parlance the two terms are practically synonymous but their meanings are very different, and the distinction is deliberately obscured for political purposes.

On October 16, 2004 President Bush signed into law the Global Anti-Semitism Review Act, which establishes a special department within the U.S. State Department to monitor global anti-Semitism, reporting annually to Congress. As one of the major steps in the implementation of that law, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice swore in Gregg Rickman as head of the State Department's office of global anti-Semitism on May 22, 2006. Rickman had ties with both Jewish organizations and congress. He was staff director for former Sen. Peter Fitzgerald (R-Ill.), and chairman of the Republican Jewish Coalition. But his main qualification for the job was the role he played in conjunction with Senator Alfonse D'Amato (R-NY) in shaking down \$2 billion from the Swiss banks during the late '90s. "Gregg Rickman, working with Sen. D'Amato, is almost single-handedly the one who uncovered the corruption and the immorality of the Swiss banks," is how William Daroff, vice president for public policy of the United Jewish Communities, the umbrella body of North American Jewish federations, and director of its Washington office put it. "That kind of doggedness will serve him well in his new capacity, according to representatives of groups that liaise between Washington and small, vulnerable Jewish communities overseas."

Mr. Rickman will not have to define anti-Semitism. His state department office has already done that for him. In its "Report on Global

Anti-Semitism” and its “Global Anti-Semitism Report,” the U.S. State Department lists the following set of beliefs as anti-Semitic:

- 1) Any assertion “that the Jewish community controls government, the media, international business and the financial world” is anti-Semitic.
- 2) ”Strong anti-Israel sentiment” is anti-Semitic.
- 3) ”Virulent criticism” of Israel’s leaders, past or present, is anti-Semitic. According to the State Department, anti-Semitism occurs when a swastika is portrayed in a cartoon decrying the behavior of a past or present Zionist leader. Thus, a cartoon that includes a swastika to criticize Ariel Sharon’s brutal 2002 invasion of the West Bank, raining “hell-fire” missiles on hapless Palestinian men, women and children, is anti-Semitic. Similarly, when the word “Zionazi” is used to describe Sharon’s saturation bombing in Lebanon in 1982 (killing 17,500 innocent refugees), it is also “anti-Semitic.”
- 4) Criticism of the Jewish religion or its religious leaders or literature (especially the Talmud and Kabbalah) is anti-Semitic.
- 5) Criticism of the U.S. government and Congress for being under undue influence by the Jewish-Zionist community (including AIPAC) is anti-Semitic.
- 6) Criticism of the Jewish-Zionist community for promoting globalism (the “New World Order”) is anti-Semitic.
- 7) Blaming Jewish leaders and their followers for inciting the Roman crucifixion of Christ is anti-Semitic.
- 8) Diminishing the “six million” figure of Holocaust victims is anti-Semitic.
- 9) Calling Israel a “racist” state is anti-Semitic.
- 10) Asserting that there exists a “Zionist Conspiracy” is anti-Semitic.
- 11) Claiming that Jews and their leaders created the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia is anti-Semitic.
- 12) Making “derogatory statements about Jewish persons” is anti-Semitic.

The State Department criteria has serious implications for anyone alive today. The most serious is that it turns many Jews, who have made many of the above claims in books and articles they have written, into anti-Semites. But the State Department's definitions have serious historical implications as well. If we take numbers 4 and 7 for example, it seems clear that not just ordinary Catholics but Catholic popes and saints were guilty of anti-Semitism, according to the State Department's criteria. Numerous popes beginning with Pope Gregory IX in 1238 have condemned the Talmud as a blasphemous assault on the person of Christ and the Christian faith and have urged Christians to confiscate and burn it. Concerning #7, St. Peter, the first pope claimed in the Acts of the Apostles that the Jews were responsible for the death of Christ. Even Nostrae Aetate, the declaration of Vatican II on the Jews which ushered in an era of good feeling and "ecumenism" claimed that some Jews were responsible for Christ's death. By their promiscuous use of the term anti-Semitism Rickman and his cohorts in the State Department have turned traditional Catholic teaching into a hate crime.

In spite of 40 years of Jewish exaggeration and chutzpah, certain facts remain. The Church is not and cannot possibly be anti-Semitic, because the term refers primarily to race and racial hatred. The Church cannot promote racial hatred of any group, certainly not of the Jews because its founder was a member of that racial group. However, the Gospel of St. John makes clear that there is a deep and abiding Christian animus against the Jews who rejected Christ. This "Judenfeindlichkeit," if we use Brumlik's word, is part of the essence of Catholicism. The Church is hostile to "Jews" because they have defined themselves as rejecters of Christ. The Church is anti-Jewish, but unlike the Jews, who, as Rabbi Soloveichik has explained in *First Things*, feel that hatred is a virtue, Christians are told to love their enemies. The "Jews" by which St. John means the Jews who rejected Christ, became by that fact Christians' enemies, but all Jews had been transformed by the coming of Christ. They had to accept him as the Messiah or reject him. Those Jews who accepted Christ as the Messiah became known as Christians. Those Jews who rejected him became known as "Jews."

And why did the Jews reject Christ? Because he was crucified. They wanted a powerful leader, not a suffering servant. The leaders of the Jews, Annas and Caiphas, representing all Jews who would reject Him, told Christ that if he came down from the cross, they would accept him as the Messiah. Because they could not accept a Messiah who suffered and died instead of restoring the kingdom as they wanted it restored, which is to say in

carnal fashion, the Jews who rejected Christ became revolutionaries. The Jews who rejected Christ became revolutionaries at the foot of the cross, but the full implication of their decision didn't become apparent until 30 years later, when the Jews rebelled against Rome, and Rome retaliated by destroying the Temple. At this point, the Jews had no temple, no priesthood and no sacrifice, and as a result they had no way of fulfilling their covenant. Seeing which way the battle for Jerusalem was going, a rabbi by the name of Jochanan ben Zakkai had himself smuggled out of Jerusalem in a shroud, and after being recognized as a friend of Rome was granted the privilege of founding a rabbinical school at Javne.

It is at this moment, 30 some years after the founding of the Church, that modern Judaism, Judaism as we know it, was born. The Jews were no longer the children of Moses performing certain rituals in fulfillment of their covenant. Judaism had become essentially a debating society, because in the absence of a Temple, that was all the Jews could do. The results of these interminable debates became known as the Talmud, which got written down over the next six centuries.

The debating did nothing to eradicate the spirit of revolution from the Jews. In many ways, it intensified it by teaching the Jews to look for a military Messiah. The Jews got their military Messiah roughly 60 years after the destruction of the Temple, when Simon bar Kokhbar rose up against Rome in 136. All of the rabbis in Jerusalem recognized bar Kokhbar as the Messiah, and as if to prove that racial Judaism had become meaningless, the Christian Jews were expelled for not recognizing him.

The expulsion of the Christian Jews at the time of Simon bar Kokhbar proved that the Jew was not a racial but a theological construct. The ultimate determinant of Jewishness had become rejection of Christ, and that rejection led inexorably to revolution. When they rejected Christ Jews became revolutionaries. For the past 2000 years, history has been a struggle between the spiritual descendents of two groups of Jews: those who accepted Jesus Christ as the Messiah and those who rejected him. History became, in some sense an intra-Jewish struggle at the foot of the cross.

In the fall of 2003, Mahathir Mohammed, prime minister of Malaysia, announced that "The Jews rule the world by proxy. They get others to fight and die for them." Mahathir was immediately denounced as an anti-Semite and accused of making "an absolute invitation for more hate crimes and terrorism against Jews" in spite of the fact that he had said no such

thing and in spite of the fact that many Jews agreed with him. Henry Makow felt that Mahathir's speech "opposed terrorism." Another Jew, who agreed with Makow that Mahathir wasn't a terrorist, had something similar to say. Elias Davidson, a native of Jerusalem, feels that Jews do rule the world by proxy. He goes on to explain how:

As a Jew myself (but opposed to Zionism) I need no encouragement from Malaysian PM Mahathir Mohammed to observe what should be obvious to the blatant eye: Namely that Jews effectively rule US foreign policy and thus determine to a great extent the conduct of most countries. . . . So it is with the proposition that Jews control the world. Surely they do not control every single action; surely it does not mean that every Jew participates in the "control." But for all practical purposes the proposition holds.

What distinguishes a Jew like Davidson from a Jew like, say, Stanley Fish is obviously not his ethnicity. It is not even his politics. What distinguishes them is their divergent forms of literary criticism. Davidson believes in the objectivity of statements. He holds the Malaysian Prime Minister to what he actually said and, as a result, finds nothing anti-Semitic in his statement. "Mahathir," Davidson continues,

has neither asked to discriminate against Jews, let alone to kill Jews. It is shameful to equate him to the Hitlerites. He urges Muslims to fight Jews by adopting modern methods, technology and educate themselves, in other words to surpass Jews in excellence. What's wrong with that? By this he is doing service to the Muslims (over 1 billion people) and to humanity. Jews must know their place and content themselves with influence derived from their small number. Jews must learn some humility... .

The Jews, if by that we mean the cabal that rules the Jews under the name of the Sanhedrin, the Kahal, the politburo or the ADL or the other major Jewish organizations, has had centuries of experience in dealing with Jews like Makow and Davidson. The modus operandi of Jewish leaders working over Jews who disagree with their leadership goes all the way back to the beginning of modern Judaism, which is to say, to the time of Christ, when, according to the Gospel of St. John, the parents of the man born blind refused to speak "out of fear of the Jews, who had already agreed to expel from the synagogue anyone who should acknowledge Jesus as the Christ." Any Jew who chooses Logos—in any of its forms—over Talmud, which is to say the anti-Christian ideology confected by Jewish leaders to keep their people in bondage, will feel the ire of organized Jewry. Spinoza felt it

in Amsterdam in the 17th century; in our day Norman Finkelstein has felt it as well. Since it sounds more than a little preposterous to call Jews who disagree with other Jews anti-Semites, the modern day Kahal has come up with a new term. Jews who disagree with the latter day Kahal are called “self-hating Jews” as they are being expelled from the modern day synagogue of acceptable speech.

The Kahal was the autonomous legal system which the Jews established in Poland to take care of their own legal affairs. The spirit which informed that legal body was the Talmud. According to the Jewish Encyclopedia, the Talmud is “the supreme authority in religion . . . for the majority of Jews.” The Talmud is a “systematic deformation of the Bible” in which “The pride of race with the idea of universal domination is therein exalted to the height of folly. . . the Ten Commandments are not of obligation in their regard. . . With regard to the Goim (non-Jews) everything is allowed: robbery, fraud, perjury, murder. . .” Whenever its contents were made known, Christians have condemned the Talmud as incompatible with any rational social order. Jewish converts to Catholicism from the time of Nicholas Donin onward have condemned the Talmud as well. Numerous popes have condemned the Talmud because it was a direct assault on both the divinity of Christ and the moral law as handed down by Moses. According to the ex-Rabbi Drach, “the Talmud expressly forbids a Jew to save a non-Jew from death or to restore to him his lost possessions, etc, or to take pity on him.”

The Talmud was created to keep Jews in bondage to Jewish leaders by prohibiting all contact with Logos, whether that is understood as the person of Christ or the Truth or reasoning based on true principles and logic. Taught to deceive by the Talmud, the Jews end up deceiving themselves and playing into the hands of the leaders who manipulate them for their own ends.

The Talmud has led to revolution. You don't have to be religious to be talmudic. Karl Marx was an atheist, but according to Bernard Lazare, he was also “a clear and lucid Talmudist,” and, therefore, “full of that old Hebrew materialism which ever dreams of a paradise on earth and always rejects the far-distant and problematical hope of a garden of Eden after death.” (p. 99). Marx was the quintessential Talmudist and the quintessential Jewish revolutionary, and as such he proposed one of the most influential false Messiahs in Jewish history: world communism. Baruch Levy, one of Marx's correspondents, proposed another equally potent false Messiah, namely, the Jewish Race. According to Levy,

the Jewish people taken collectively shall be its own Messias. . . . In this new organization of humanity, the sons of Israel now scattered over the whole surface of the globe . . . shall everywhere become the ruling element without opposition . . . The governments of the nations forming the Universal or World -Republic shall all thus pass, without any effort, into Jewish hands thanks to the victory of the proletariat. . . . Thus shall the promise of the Talmud be fulfilled, that, when the Messianic epoch shall have arrived, the Jews will control the wealth of all the nations of the earth.

So, it turns out that there was basis in Jewish history for what Mahathir Mohammed said, as well as ample evidence—the creation of the state of Israel, for instance—that world Jewry had advanced considerably toward its goal of world domination in the century and a half since Levy wrote to Karl Marx. The Jews, quite simply, could not shake themselves loose from the notion that they were God’s chosen people, not even after they stopped believing in God. By rejecting Christ, they condemned themselves to worship one false Messiah after another—most recently Communism and Zionism. In their book *La Question du Messie*, the Lemann brothers, both of whom converted from Judaism to Catholicism, and both of whom became priests, compared present day Jews to the Israelites at the foot of Mount Sinai: “having grown weary of waiting for the return of Moses . . . they feasted and danced around the golden calf.” Zionism and Communism are two of the most recent false Messiahs which the Jews have fallen down to worship. Having rejected the supernatural Messiah who died on the cross, the Jews condemned themselves to worship one false natural Messiah after another and repeat the cycle of enthusiasm leading to disillusionment over and over again throughout their history. Those illusions both found fulfillment in and lent themselves to the creation of the birth of the Jewish state. On January 6, 1948, the chief rabbi of Palestine announced that ““Eventually it [Israel] will lead to the inauguration of the true union of the nations, through which will be fulfilled the eternal message to mankind of our immortal prophets.” In the history of Jewish messianism, fantasies of racial superiority alternate with contradictory fantasies of universal brotherhood. “The great ideal of Judaism,” *The Jewish World* announced on February 9, 1883 “is that . . .the whole world shall be imbued with Jewish teaching and that in a Universal Brotherhood of Nations—a greater Judaism in fact— all the separate races and religions shall disappear” (p. 98).

The Jews were condemned to seek heaven on earth through false Messiahs

from the moment they chose Barabbas over Christ, a fact that leads to the already mentioned cycle of enthusiasm followed by disillusionment. When the Jews refused to be “heralds of a supernatural kingdom,” they condemned themselves to the endless task of imposing their vision of a naturalistic heaven on earth onto the world, “and they have put all their intense energy and tenacity into the struggle for the organization of the future Messianic Age.” Whenever a nation turns away from the Supernatural Messiah, as was the case during the French and Russian revolutions, that nation “will be pulled into the direction of subjection to the Natural Messias” and end up being ruled by Jews.

Does that mean that every Jew is a bad person? No, it does not. Jewish leadership controls the “synagogue of Satan,” which in turn controls the ethnic group into which Jews are born. No one has control over the circumstances of his birth. That is why anti-Semitism, if by that term we mean hatred of the Jews because of immutable and ineradicable racial characteristics, is wrong. Over the course of their lives, Jews come to understand that theirs is an ethnic group unlike any other. In spite of the propaganda of racial superiority which the Talmud seeks to inculcate in them, many Jews come to understand that a peculiarly malignant spirit has taken up its home at the heart of their ethnos. Once they become aware of the magnitude of that evil, Jews are faced with a choice. Depending on the disposition of the heart, which only God can judge, they either dedicate themselves to that evil or they reject it—completely as in the case of St. Paul, Nicholas Donin, Joseph Pfefferkorn and other Jews too numerous to mention—or inchoately, as in the case of the Jews of conscience who refuse to go along with something which they know is morally wrong, be that abortion or the eviction of Palestinians from their ancestral lands.

The purpose of the Talmud is to prevent defections from the synagogue of Satan. Behavior based on the Talmud naturally leads to resentment on the part of non-Jews. The leaders of the Jews promote that behavior knowing full well that it will cause reactions because “Pogroms in which the rank and file of the Jewish nation suffer serve the useful purpose of keeping them in absolute dependence on their leaders.” This is another way of saying that the Trotskys promote the revolution and the Braunsteins suffer for it. Jewish leaders promote pogroms, wittingly as the Gomeler Pogrom of 1905 or when Mossad agents deliberately killed Iraqi Jews to spread panic, because pogroms promote fear, and fear is the way the Kahal keeps ordinary Jews in line.

Alice Ollstein, Jewish high school student from Santa Monica, California, noticed this when she attended a recent policy conference of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee Conference in Washington, DC in 2006. Miss Ollstein went as an enthusiastic Zionist but returned “feeling manipulated, disturbed and disgusted with a great deal of what I witnessed there” (<http://www.jewishjournal.com/home/preview.php?id=15634>).

What she witnessed was non-stop fear mongering. In fact the “first thing” she noticed about the conference was “the carefully manufactured atmosphere of fear and urgency.” The hall where the plenary sessions were held

was always filled with dramatic classical music, red lighting and gigantic signs reading “Now Is The Time.” That, combined with the montages of terrorism footage projected onto six giant screens, whipped the audience into a “Save Israel” fervor that most found inspiring. By the time we finished our meal, the audience seemed eager to agree to anything that would protect Israel— even war. . . . Each speaker played upon the audience’s deepest fears. . . .

The Neoconservatives were in charge of the fear-mongering. In particular, John Podhoretz, son of Norman and a columnist for The New York Post, “got to have the first word and the last word on almost every question.” Ollstein found the comparisons which AIPAC drew between Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Hitler particularly manipulative.

To the tune of more dramatic classical music, the six enormous screens flashed back and forth between Hitler giving anti-Jew speeches and Ahmadinejad giving anti-Israel speeches. The famous post-Holocaust mantra “Never Again” popped up several times. Everything was geared toward persuading the audience that another Holocaust is evident ... unless we get them first.

Alice Ollstein resented “being forced to think” that the Prime Minister of Iran was “pure evil through clever sound bites and colorful images.” She came away from the conference feeling manipulated by what Walt and Mearsheimer have characterized as the main agent of the Israel lobby in America. She is not the only Jew who feels this way. Zionism has reached the state of wretched excess that signals that a reaction is about to set in. Jewish disillusionment with the god that failed that was known as Communism came to be known as neoconservatism. The Jewish reaction to Zionism can be seen in the proliferation of “proud, self-hating Jews.”

In response to a Danish magazine running a series of anti-Muslim cartoons in March 2006, a group of Israelis organized an anti-Semitic cartoon contest. Gilad Atzmon, who described the contest on his web site, finds it only natural that “a few Jews who happen to be ethically motivated and talented enough to express themselves would raise their voices” in protest against what was fundamentally a black operation designed to get European countries so annoyed at the Muslim reaction to the cartoons that they would support a nuclear attack on Iran’s nuclear facilities. Atzmon claims that “the morally deteriorated conduct of the Jewish state and its supportive Jewish lobbies around the world” has engendered “a celebration of what I tend to define as ‘proud Jewish self-hatred.’”

Atzmon is only half joking. The objective moment at the heart of this parody is the slow spread of disillusionment with Zionism among Israelis. At the very moment when Israel through proxies like AIPAC rules the world, the Jews they claim to speak for are undergoing a moment of deep disillusionment. Gilad Atzmon, the Israeli musician who has nominated himself as the spokesman for the proud, self-hating Jew, believes “that it is the proud SHJs that will bring Israeli Zionism and even global Zionism down.”

Having been born an Israeli, Atzmon had been subjected to Zionist propaganda for his entire life. He fought in the army, and then one day he woke up and didn’t believe it anymore.

The very program that worked so well and still works at large in the instance of my former fellow countrymen failed in my case. Not only had I stopped loving myself, I somehow failed to hate the Goyim. This is when I realized for the first time that actually there was no anti-Semitism around. Somehow, when I stopped loving myself, I also started to suspect the entire official Jewish historical narrative, both the Zionist one as well as the biblical one. How to say it, it didn’t take long before I started to question the official Zionist Holocaust tale.

Belief in Zionism, like belief in Communism, was an all or nothing proposition. Once the first doubt took root in Atzmon’s mind the entire edifice was doomed to collapse. The first thing Atzmon doubted was that dogma that “Jew-hating is an irrational act of madness or some backward Christian tendency.” Unlike Ruth Wisse, who articulated one of the dogmas of contemporary Judaism when she claimed that “anti-Semitism is not directed against the behavior of Jews but against the existence of Jews,”

Gilad Atzmon began to entertain “the possibility that anti-Jewish feelings may come as a response or even retaliation to Jewish acts.” In fact, he continued, “Zionism is maintained by anti-Semitism. Without anti-Semitism there is no need for a Jewish State and without the Holocaust there wouldn’t even be a Jewish State.”

According to Atzmon, Jewish organizations like AIPAC and the ADL “are all remarkably good in generating hatred against Jews.” That hatred in turn generates fear and fear is what keeps the average Jew in bondage to the synagogue of Satan. During the course of his soliloquy, Atzmon concludes that as a proud, self-hating Jew he hates neither Jews nor Judaism, which he defines in ethnic terms. His quarrel is with what he calls “Jewishness, . . . the supremacist tendency that draws its force from a materialist secularized misinterpretation of the Judaic code. It is Jewishness rather than Judaism that fuels Zionism with murderous zeal.”

What Atzmon calls “Jewishness” is what Nicholas Donin and Joseph Pfefferkorn and the Fathers Lemann would have called the Talmud, which is to say, the racist, messianic ideology that has been the main engine driving revolutionary Jews throughout history. Many Jews have had this experience. They wake up one day and realize that their ethnic group has been colonized by some dark evil force for centuries. The name of that evil is the Talmud. The Talmud is the constitution for the synagogue of Satan, the cabal which had ruled Jews through fear for 2000 years.

Atzmon isn’t alone in feeling disillusionment with Zionism. Yuri Slezkine also says that “The Zionist revolution is over”:

The original ethos of youthful athleticism, belligerence, and single mindedness is carried on by a tired elite of old generals. Half a century after its founding, Israel bears a distant family resemblance to the Soviet Union half a century after the October Revolution. The last representatives of the first Sabra generation are still in power, but their days are numbered (p. 367).

The rhetoric of racial superiority is hopelessly outdated, even when surrounded by the window-dressing of holocaust victimhood. Holocaust culture postponed the final reckoning, but by the beginning of the 21st century it had become clear that “The rhetoric of ethnic homogeneity and ethnic deportations, tabooed elsewhere in the west, is a routine element of Israeli political life.” The realization arrives half-way through Steven Spielberg’s film *Munich*, when the Jewish toy maker turned bomb

maker tells Avner Kauffman, “Jews don’t do wrong because our enemies do wrong . . . . We’re supposed to be righteous.” During the course of *Munich*, Avner Kauffman comes to the realization I have already mentioned, the same one which turned Gilad Atzmon into a proud, self-hating Jew.

At this point it is not clear whether the proud, self-hating Jew can leverage his disillusionment with Zionism into an escape from the dialectic of Jewish history with its regular cycle of enthusiasm followed by disillusionment followed by enthusiasm for a new Messiah. The objective moment here involves an understanding of what Atzmon calls “Jewishness.” Jewishness is not just another version of ethnicity like Irishness or Polishness. “Jewishness” is an ideology. It is a Talmudic deformation of Logos that has caused suffering, largely in the form of revolution, throughout the last 2000 years of history.

The Catholic Church has always condemned anti-Semitism because Anti-Semitism, which is to say, hatred of the Jewish race, is wrong in and of itself. But beyond that anti-Semitism is also an inappropriate response to what Atzmon calls “Jewishness.” Anti-Semitism is in many ways a competing form of “Jewishness.” Anti-Semitism cannot deal with “Jewishness,” because a Jew is not someone with Abraham’s DNA in his cells. Most Jews aren’t even Semites. The Jew, insofar as he appropriates his “Jewishness,” is a theological construct. He is a rejecter of Christ. The Talmud was created to keep the Jewish people in bondage to a leadership that has existed under various manifestations throughout history—the Sanhedrin, the Kahal, the Politburo, the ADL, AIPAC. Each of these groups has proposed a false messiah as the antidote and alternative to the true Messiah, and each has led either to violent reaction or equally violent disappointment throughout history. In the 20 years following 1648, the entire cycle played itself out. The Chmielnicki pogroms and Shabbetai Zevi were reaction, Messiah, disappointment.

There is some indication that the same thing is happening again. Sixty years ago, the Communist empire spread across the face of the earth, and yet at the same time the Jews who had supported Stalin so faithfully began to experience widespread disillusionment with Communism. The same thing is now happening to Zionism, at the very moment when the Israel Lobby has reached the pinnacle of worldly power.

If this is the case, what are the options at the present moment? In one of his more cryptic moments, Atzmon claims that “Salvation is the Masada of the Proud, Self-Hating Jew.” Atzmon is referring to the mass suicide which

followed the 70 AD insurrection against Rome which eventuated in the destruction of the Temple. The 21st century version of Masada would be much more dramatic because today's despairing Zionists have nuclear weapons, a fact which lends new urgency to dissuading the Jews from taking the whole world with them when they go through one of their inevitable periods of disillusionment.

The other option is conversion, the option which has always been there since the beginning. This means conversion to Logos in all of its forms, from philosophical realism and the tenets of onto-theology to acceptance of Jesus Christ as the one and only Messiah. It also means an equally firm rejection of all forms of Talmudic deception, including sexual liberation, racism, messianic politics, and deconstruction.

The Catholic Church, which throughout its history has urged the conversion of the Jews, has thus far been incapable of lending assistance in this regard because it has been lamed by an interpretation of *Nostra Aetate* which contradicts the Gospels. One of the rituals of post-*Nostra Aetate* ecumenism which has developed over the past 40 years entails having some church dignitary stand up at an ecumenical gathering—after the Jews have denounced the Church as the font of all anti-Semitism and the immediate cause of Hitler's genocide—and announce that the Jews do not need Christ as their savior. In May 2001, at a meeting of the international Catholic-Jewish Liaison committee in New York, Walter Cardinal Kasper, the Vatican official in charge of the Church's relations with the Jews, tried to quell the Jewish discomfort caused by the issuance of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith's *Dominus Iesus* on the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church by claiming that "God's grace, which is the grace of Jesus Christ according to our faith, is available to all. Therefore the Church believes that Judaism, i.e., the faithful response of the Jewish people to God's irrevocable covenant is salvific *for them*, because God is faithful to his promises" (emphasis added).

In placating the Jews, Kasper not only contradicted the Gospels and 2000 years of Church teaching, he also contradicted the recently issued *Dominus Iesus*, which claimed that

There is only one salvific economy of the one and triune God realized in the mystery of the incarnation, death and resurrection of the Son of God, actualized with the cooperation of the Holy Spirit and extended in its salvific value to all humanity and to the entire universe. "No one,

therefore, can enter into communion with God except through Christ by the working of the Holy Spirit.”

Kasper also contradicted Pope John Paul II’s 1990 encyclical *Redemptoris Missio*, which claimed that

Christ is the one Savior of all, the only one able to reveal God and lead to God. In reply to the Jewish religious authorities who question the apostles about healing the lame man, Peter says: “By the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead, by him this man is standing before you well . . . And there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved.” . . . salvation can only come from Jesus Christ.

In attempting to extricate himself from hot water, Kasper only made matters worse by muddying the already muddy waters even more. In November 2002, Cardinal Kasper gave a speech at Boston College in which he claimed that Jews could be saved if they “follow their own conscience and believe in God’s promises as they understand them in their religious tradition, they are in line with God’s plan, which *for us* comes to historical completion in Jesus Christ” (my emphasis).

In using the phrase “for us,” Kasper implied that there were two ways to salvation, a clear contradiction of the Gospels and recent Vatican pronouncement like *Dominus Iesus*. Kasper, however, was not alone in making these heretical claims. In August 2002, the US Bishops’ Committee for Ecumenical and interreligious Affairs, under the direction of William Cardinal Keeler, along with the US National Council of Synagogues issued a paper entitled, “Reflections on Covenant and Mission,” which claimed that: “A deepening Catholic appreciation of the eternal covenant between God and the Jewish people, together with a recognition of a divinely given mission to the Jews to witness to God’s faithful love, lead to the conclusion that campaigns that target Jews for conversion to Christianity are no longer theologically acceptable in the Catholic Church.”

Once the heretical nature of statements like that became apparent, Cardinal Keeler tried to control the damage by claiming that the covenant and Mission statement that the USCCB Committee had released did not constitute any kind of formal position on the part of the US bishops, but rather merely represented “the state of thought among participants” in the dialogue “between Catholics and Jews.” As some indication that Rome agreed, the paper was never promulgated as an official document of the

United States Bishops' conference.

## Deep Crisis

But the fact that it got written at all gave some indication that *Nostra Aetate* had led to a deep crisis in the Catholic Church. In order to participate in ecumenical dialogue with Jews, Catholic "experts" had to be willing to make heretical statements which contradicted the teaching of the Catholic Church. They had to be willing to deny fundamental tenets of Catholic theology. The Church was suddenly in a position where she could not articulate a coherent position because denial of the Gospel had become the condition *sine qua non* of dialogue with the Jews.

In many ways, this problem went all the way to the top. Viewing the history of Pope John Paul II's relations with the Jews, one of the most ultramontane of American Catholic commentators was forced to conclude that "Even Pope John Paul II . . . could occasionally create the impression that the Church was perhaps now prepared to cut a few corners in the interests of better relations" with the Jews. In the "Declaration on the Relation of the Church with Judaism," delivered to a Jewish group in Mainz, Germany, in 1980, "John Paul II," according to the same commentator, "actually made the remark that the old covenant with the Jews had in fact 'never been revoked by God.'" The statement was theologically defensible because God never revoked the covenants with Noah or Abraham, but it gave the impression that the "new and everlasting covenant" which Christ Himself established did not apply to the Jews.

Pope John Paul II's gestures were even worse in this regard. His prayer at the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem was theatrical but ambiguous. Jews who pray at the Wailing Wall pray for the restoration of the Temple. No pope could ever contemplate doing what would be a completely wicked act, but Jewish artists lost no time memorializing that act and all of the ambiguity it embodied as a way of justifying their call for a ban on all forms of "proselytism." It is no wonder then that people like Roy Schoeman are confused. Schoeman is a Jewish convert to Catholicism who thinks the end times have arrived. As a Catholic Schoeman now looks forward to the restoration of the Temple without understanding that if that were to happen it would be tantamount to the abomination of desolation spoken of in Revelation and not the second coming.

The idea of the Jews converting at the pinnacle of their worldly power is implausible unless looked at from a theological perspective, but since the

premise of our argument is that the Jew is an essentially theological construct, that is precisely how we should view the issue. To begin with, the synagogue of Satan needs to be viewed as the antithesis of the Church. So, if Christians, following the example of St. Paul can say, “when I am weak, then I am strong,” the synagogue of Satan would have to say the exact opposite, namely, “when I am strong, then I am weak.” And that admission corresponds uncannily to the psychological phenomenon of the “proud, self-hating Jew” which we have been discussing.

The final collapse of Jewish resistance to Logos will have to take place when they have reached the pinnacle of worldly power. We have no way of knowing what the future will bring, but we can say with confidence that at no time in the history of the past 2000 years have Jews had more power than they hold at the present moment. The fact that the Jews are now in full possession of Jerusalem and, according to some reports, planning to rebuild the temple, lends credence to the belief that the stage is being set for that last great battle over who will rule over the Jewish soul. Fr. Augustin Lemann, himself a Jewish convert, feels that the future conversion of the Jewish people is certain. He bases this on the testimony of many Church Fathers. “There is a well-known tradition cherished by the faithful,” writes St. Augustine, “that in the last days before the Judgment, the great and admirable Prophet Elias is to explain the law to the Jews and to lead them to the acceptance of the True Messiah Our Christ” (Denis Fahey, *The Kingship of Christ and the Conversion of the Jewish Nation*, p. 101). Then “These carnal Israelites,” Augustine continues, “who today refuse to believe in Jesus Christ, will one day believe in Him . . . Osee foretells their conversion in the following terms: ‘The children of Israel shall sit many days without king and without prince and without sacrifice, and without altar and without ephod and without theraphim.’ “Who is there,” Denis Fahey interjects, “who does not see in this a portrait of the present state of the Jewish people” (p. 101-2).

Augustine is not alone in his belief that the Jews will at some point close to the culmination of human history convert. St. Thomas Aquinas claims that “as by the fall of the Jews, the Gentiles who had been enemies were reconciled, so after the conversion of the Jews near the end of the world, there will be a general resurrection by which men will rise from the dead to immortal life.” (p. 105). According to Father Augustin Lemann,

The prophet Elias then shall return upon the earth to bring back the Jews

to the Savior. Our Lord Himself has clearly affirmed it (Matt: XVII, II). . . The fathers are the patriarchs and all the pious ancestors of the Jewish people, the sons represent the degenerate race of the time of Our Lord Jesus Christ and of the succeeding centuries. It is however only some time before the second coming of Our Lord Jesus Christ, before the dreadful day of the Divine Judgment dawns that our Savior will send the prophet Elias to the Jews to convert them and to save them from chastisement.

St. Paul claims that this conversion will only take place at the end of time, and that until that time, the Jews will continue “to fill up their sins always: for the wrath of God is come upon them to the end.” St. Jerome also believes that the Jews will convert at the end of the world when they will “find themselves in dazzling light, as if Our Lord were returning to them from Egypt. . . .” According to Suarez, “The conversion of the Jews will take place at the approach of the Last Judgment and at the height of the persecution which Antichrist will inflict on the Church.” The Jews will, according to all accounts, continue to express their hostility to Christ until the moment of their conversion. The conversion will be dramatic and in the last time Christians will resemble the Jews “because of our sins, in fact they will be worse.” In this regard, Origen supports the contention of Yuri Slezkine in his claim that modernity is Jewish. St. John Chrysostom claims that “God will recall the Jews a second time,” when the Christians have abandoned the faith. Jews will become Christians when Christians will have become Jews.

The Antichrist will be a Jew

At that point of apostasy, the Antichrist will appear, and he will be a Jew, who, according to Suarez, will find “his chief support among the Jews.” He will also “restore the city of their ancestors and its temple in which they have always taken a special pride” because if he did not, he could not “get himself accepted as the Messiah by the Jews who dream of earthly glory for Jerusalem and imagine that that city will become the capital of the future Messianic kingdom.” If Suarez could have been catapulted into the future to contemplate the state of the state of Israel in 2006, he might well conclude that the end times were at hand. If he read Gilad Atzmon’s website, he might conclude that the conversion of the Jews was at hand as well. The unprecedented strength of the Jews, coupled with the unprecedented weakness of the Church, allows nothing but apocalyptic explanations.

At the culmination of history, the Jewish antichrist will be strong, stronger than he has ever been in history, and the Church will be weak, weaker than she has ever been in history. At that moment, the Messianic kingdom of heaven on earth, the kingdom of maximal wealth and power for the Jews (and maximal misery for everyone else) will be at hand and all that the synagogue of Satan has longed for for centuries will seem to be within its grasp. At that point, the Jews will have a choice forced upon them, and, according to Christian tradition, many will choose Christ. Why they would do that then is easy enough to explain. Rabbi Dresner does so in his book on the plight of the American family which is really a tract on the plight of American Jews, who

in their search for passion and pleasure and power, have lost themselves in the kingdom of Caesar. Is it not ironic that the descendants of those who wrote the Psalms and offered prayer to the world became, according to all accountings, the least worshipful. . . . The chosen people seemed to flatten into normality, becoming what the prophets had warned against: “like the nations.” . . . Many postmodern Jews have discovered a puzzling truth. No license has replaced the Law; no symphony, the Psalms, no chandelier, the Sabbath candles; no opera, Yom Kippur; no country club, the synagogue; no mansion, the home; no Jaguar, a child; no mistress, a wife; no banquet, the Passover seder; no towering metropolis, Jerusalem; no impulse, the joy of doing a mitzvah; no man, God. (p. 329).

At the heart of Rabbi Dresner’s panegyric on American Jews, we uncover the psychological mechanism that will lead to their conversion. When they are strong, they are weak. Alan Dershowitz has said something similar about Jewish demographics in America in his book *The Vanishing American Jew*. The more wealth and power the Jews accumulate the weaker they become because becoming rich has deprived the Jew of one of his most perduring illusions, namely, that Tevye would be happy “if I were a rich man.” Tevye’s grandchildren are, as Rabbi Dresner indicates, far richer than Tevye could have imagined, but in becoming rich and powerful they ended up being “proud, self-hating Jews.” Money is, in many ways, the least important issue here. As Rabbi Dresner indicates darkly, “Jews have tried all things.” After having “exhausted modernity,” Jews now “seek the recovery of the sacred” (p. 330).

What Rabbi Dresner failed to understand is that the sacred cannot be recovered by performing outmoded rites. Jews cannot find the sacred among the dead. They can only find it among the living. The Church can capitalize on this moment and save the world from Masada with nuclear

weapons but only if it reasserts its traditional position on the Jews. That means “Sicut Iudeis non . . .” which states that no one may harm the Jew or disturb his worship, but that Christians have an equally solemn duty to prevent Jewish subversion of faith and morals. That means that the Church should condemn anti—Semitism, which means “hatred of the Jews as a race,” but, by the same token the Church should not allow the Jews to define the term for her, because in that instance the Jews will use “the word to designate any form of opposition to themselves” and their infernal project of cultural subversion. According to the Jewish definition of the term, “anyone who opposes Jewish pretensions is more or less mentally deranged.”

### Balancing Act

The Church has never in its history been anti-Semitic. Traditional Catholic teaching on the Jews has always involved a delicate balancing act:

On the one hand, the Church has spoken for the Jews to protect their persons and their worship against unjust attacks . . . On the other hand, the Church has spoken against the Jews, when they wanted to impose their yoke on the faithful and provoke apostasy. She has always striven to protect the faithful from contamination by them. As experience in past centuries showed, if the Jews succeeded in attaining to high offices of State they would abuse their powers to the detriment of Catholics, the church always strove to prevent Catholics from coming under their yoke. They were forbidden to proselytize and were not allowed to have Christians as slaves or servants” (Fahey, p. 80).

At the darkest hour of Nazi persecution during the ‘30s, Pope Pius XI defended the Jews from their persecutors by proclaiming that “anti-Semitism is inadmissible. We are spiritually Semites.” Less well known is the rest of what he had to say. After affirming that it was “impossible for Christians to be Anti-Semites,” Pope Pius XI went on to say that “we acknowledge that everyone has the right to defend himself, in other words to take the necessary precautions for his protection against everything that threatens his legitimate interests.”

In giving his gloss on Pius XI’s speech, Denis Fahey simply reiterates what the church has always proclaimed in the statements on the Jews known as “Sicut Iudeis non . . .”:

On the one hand, the Sovereign Pontiffs strive to protect the Jews from physical violence and to secure respect for their family life and their worship, as the life and worship of human persons. On the other hand, they aim unceasingly at protecting Christians from the contamination of Jewish Naturalism and try to prevent Jews from obtaining control over Christians. The existence of the second needs to be strongly stressed because to some extent it has been lost sight of in recent times. Catholics need to be made familiar, not only with the repeated Papal condemnations of the Talmud, but with the measures taken by the Sovereign Pontiffs to preserve society from the inroads of Jewish naturalism. Otherwise they will be exposed to the risk of speaking of Pope St. Pius V and Pope Benedict XIV, for example as Anti-Semites. . . .

Opposition to Jewish ambition “to impose its rule on other nations” is not anti-Semitism, even if the Jews want to portray it that way. The Christian must oppose anti-Semitism, defined as hatred of the Jewish race, but he must also oppose the Jewish agenda of opposition to Logos. As many Catholics have done in the past, the Catholic must oppose the agenda of the revolutionary Jew, even now—nay, especially now—when Jews have adopted the tropes of conservatism to disguise their true aims.

St. Pope Pius X felt that the endtimes had arrived in 1903. And in a sense he was right, by the time the dust had settled after World War I, all of Europe’s remaining Catholic empires had been toppled and the Jewish communist antichrist had been placed on the vacant throne of Russia’s Christian Czar. Perhaps Pius X had a vision of the future when he wrote on October 4, 1903 that

Whosoever weighs these things has certainly reason to fear that such perversion of mind may herald the evils announced for the end of time and as it were, the beginning of those calamities and that the son of perdition of whom the Apostle speaks may have already made his appearance here below. So great are the fury and hatred with which religion is everywhere assailed, that it seems to be a determined effort to destroy every vestige of the relation between God and man. On the other hand — and this is, according to the same Apostle, the special characteristic of Antichrist—with frightful presumption man is attempting to usurp the place of his Creator and is lifting himself above all that is called God. . . . is dedicating the visible world to himself as a temple, in which he has the pretension to receive the adoration of his fellow men. ‘So that he sitteth in the temple of God showing himself as if he were God’” (II Thess, II, 4). (p. 177).

As John the Evangelist has written, there are “many Antichrists” (I John II, 18), and the Jews have welcomed all of them. “Down the centuries,” writes Father Lemann, “the Jews have welcomed all the enemies of Jesus Christ and his Church and have constituted themselves their auxiliaries. In the Great Sanhedrin, held at Paris in 1807, they applied the Biblical titles, exclusively reserved to the Messias to Napoleon, though Napoleon was not of Jewish blood. They even welcomed the principles of the French Revolution as the Messias: “The Messias came for us on Feb. 28, 1790, with the Declaration of the Rights of Man.”” (p. 187).

Inspired by Pius X’s statement Msgr. Robert Hugh Benson wrote *Lord of the World*, a novel which appeared in 1907 but which was set in the early 21st century, roughly 100 years in the future, which is to say in 2007. In that novel a weakened English pope confronts an antichrist with the iconic name of Julian Felsenburgh on the plains of Megiddo.

In June of 2006 Pope Benedict XVI announced that he was going to Megiddo in 2007. Megiddo is another word for Armageddon. The apocalyptic aura of his visit was overshadowed by the apocalyptic nature of the age. George Bush, like the antichrist Julian the Apostate was locked in an unwinnable war in Iraq and threatening to extend that war to the east by dropping nuclear weapons on Iran. Judging from appearances, the conversion of the Jews did not seem imminent. The Jews had never been more powerful; the Church was weak. But appearances can be deceiving. Benedict XVI was the author of *Dominus Iesus* and had said, even before becoming pope, that he was looking forward to the conversion of the Jews. Reversal was in the air.

## **6. “The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit and Its Impact on World History”:**

### **A Review**

**By Robert A. Sungenis, Ph.D.**

**(NB: This review appears in the May 2008 issue  
of *Culture Wars*)**

Reviewing a work as long (1000+ pages), as detailed (1000+ footnotes), and as provocative

(the Jews) as E. Michael Jones' book, *The Revolutionary Jew* is certainly no easy task, but it has been one of the most enriching and mind-opening endeavors I have ever undertaken. To do justice to this wonderful work would take a book in itself. I will quote from it extensively if for nothing else than to lead you to those pages and its surrounding context so that you will read them for yourself. So packed is it with mind-numbing facts and insightful commentary that one is tempted to embark on a trip to a remote place and lock oneself up in a room and absorb every word. When the excursion is over, one's whole view of the world will be dramatically changed. You will see the inner workings of life that only a genius the likes of Dr. Jones, unclouded by the lust for power, fame or fortune, and spurred on only by his sincere and undying love for Jesus Christ and the Catholic Church, could give you. Not only will it change you, but this book has the potential of changing the world. Note well, the revelations you are about to read in Jones' book are not things you will ever hear in a history class at Berkeley or on the website of the Anti-Defamation League. Be prepared to be shocked and awed. My recommendation is: stop what you are doing, purchase the book, and don't come back to civilization until you've completed it. It is that good. But let me also warn you. Like me, after seeing

~ 2 ~

the utter devastation that has been done to our society and especially its root causes, you may find yourself weeping by the time you get to the end, even as Jesus once did when he wept for Jerusalem. Naturally, since provocative words have a tendency to evoke all kinds of prejudices, emotions, and especially in this case, inevitable charges of "anti-semitism" just for using the word "Jew," the best place to start is to define both "Jew" and "Revolutionary." Dr. Jones does a good job here. He uses Jesus Christ as the dividing line, often referring to him as the "Logos" in reference to divine revelation and reason as the distinguishing marks of Christianity. For contrast, Jones first explains how Islam regards the Logos. Because Islam believes God can, if he chooses, contradict reason, Jones posits that Muslims have a distorted view of reason, but have neither a hatred for nor reject the Logos, *per se*. With this distinction in the foreground, Jones then reveals what is meant by the

term, "The Revolutionary Jew." He writes: "...the attack on Logos...from the side of Judaism, which manifests itself not by the threat of invasion from without, as is the case with Islam, which has sought to spread its faith by military conquest, but by the threat of subversion from within, otherwise known as revolution. If Muslims are *alogos*, because of Mohammed's imperfect understanding of the monotheistic traditions he absorbed from his position beyond the borders of a collapsing Greco-Roman civilization, then Jews are *anti-Logos*, in the sense that they reject Christ altogether. Islam did not reject Christ; Islam failed to understand Christ, as manifested in its rejection of both the Trinity and the Incarnation, and ended up trying to mask that misunderstanding by honoring Jesus as a prophet. The situation with Jews is completely different. The Jews were God's chosen people. When Jesus arrived on earth as their long-awaited Messiah, the Jews, who, like all men, were given free will by their God, had to make a decision. They had to either accept or reject the Christ, who was, so Christians believe, the physical embodiment of Logos....When the Jews rejected Christ, they rejected Logos, and when they rejected Logos, which includes within itself the principles of social order, they became revolutionaries" (pp. 15, 16).

Further defining this concept a few pages later, Jones makes it even clearer: "But there is a special tragedy if a member of the Chosen people rejects what he or she was chosen for— as we see in the Gospels. Anyone can choose to reject Logos— all of us do this or are tempted to do so every day. But to have that rejection at the unavoidable core of one's religion or even as a determining factor of who is to count as a member of one's community means that a revolutionary spirit is entwined with that community" (p. 20). So the Jew is one whose *core belief* is a rejection of Jesus Christ. Later in the book, Jones' definition is more or less confirmed by a Jewish rabbi writing in, of all places, the Catholic magazine, *First Things* (Jan. 2003, pp. 41-46). In an article titled "The Virtue of Hate," Rabbi Meir Y. Soloveichik posits that hate can be utilized by the Jew at his discretion (quite opposite, to be sure, of Jesus' maxim: "You have heard it was said...Hate your enemies, but I say unto you, love your enemies"). The rabbi is quite candid about how he and other Jews will apply the

“virtue of hate,” for he reveals that “the very question of how to approach our enemies depends on whether one believes that Jesus was merely a misguided mortal, or the Son of God” (pp. 1013-15). Abe Foxman gives us another shining example of this “core belief” when he tells Otto Huber (the producer of the Oberammergau Passion play): “There’s no absolute need to do it. Give me another play; if it’s about a Crucifixion in which the Jews kill Christ, you can never clean it up enough. So don’t expect an embrace” (p. 1026).

~ 3 ~

Still, Jones recognizes that “debate over who the Jews are never ceases.” In one of his better analogies, Jones says that the way our modern society defines “Jew” is like defining the word tree: “...a word which, according to the nominalists, has no clear meaning, since in the real world the only thing which exists are individual birches, maples, etc. According to this unwritten rule of discourse, the term “Jew” refers to no category of beings in reality. Use of the term “Jew” as a category is, as a result, *ipso facto* evidence of anti-Semitism” (p. 16). Obviously, there is a lot of confusion today regarding the definition of a “Jew” and even more confusion as to what constitutes “anti-semitism.” Jones delves a little into Belloc’s experience in this surreal world of definitions, but says that it is much worse in our day, for “now it is impossible to write about Jews without opening oneself to the charge of anti-Semitism.” And because a precise definition is so central to the ongoing debate, we must sympathize with Jones when he says: “...its use is determined by the political advantage of those who use it. Thus, it is permissible in some circles to use the group designation when Jews are victims of some attack, but any reference to Jews as the perpetrators of some attack is, again, *ipso facto* evidence of anti-Semitism and also a sign of conspiracy mania as well. It’s heads I win, tails you lose. So, again, according to another variation of the canons of contemporary discourse, it is permissible to say that Jews played a large role in the civil rights movement, but it would be anti-Semitic to say that they played a large role in the abortion rights movement. By revolution we mean revolution against Logos – the deepest kind of revolution” (p. 17).

Jones points out rather well how this “anti-Logos” sentiment, or what he specifies as a “spontaneous feeling” within the Jewish community, played itself out in history, and, more or less, the rest of his book is an anthology of all those events, from the first century to our twenty-first century. In a way, Jones takes over where St. Luke left off in the *Book of Acts*, adding twenty centuries of proofs showing how the Jews at large not only opposed the Logos and the spreading of the Christian Gospel but sought to replace it with their own gospel, whether it was the antics of Julian the Apostate, the Enlightenment Judaism of Moses Hess or the psychoanalysis of Sigmund Freud. Jones allows us to see why, after almost three decades of dealing with the Jews, St. Paul resigned himself to say in 1 Thess 2:14-16: “the Jews, who killed both the Lord Jesus and the prophets and persecuted us; they do not please God, and are opposed to everyone, trying to prevent us from speaking to the Gentiles that they may be saved, thus constantly filling up the measure of their sins. But the wrath of God has finally begun to come upon them” (NAB). Displeasing God and being “opposed to everyone” is the trademark of revolution.

One of the more meritorious badges of Jones’ book is his consistent appeal to Jewish sources to confirm his insights and conclusions, and here is no exception. In proving his thesis of Jewish incited revolution, Jones begins by citing rabbi Louis Israel Newman who “points out how Jews have consistently supported revolutionary movements throughout history. Jews joined forces with heretics during the Albigensian crisis, the Hussite revolution, the Reformation, and at the birth of modern England. They joined forces with revolutionaries during The Enlightenment, the Russian Revolution and the Civil Rights movement. We also see the conflict between the Church and Judaism working itself out at the birth of the Spanish Inquisition, the spread of the Polish empire and the Chmielnicki rebellion that began the break-up of that empire. Finally, we see a Jewish presence in the rise of the American Empire” (p. 21).

~ 4 ~

Yet Jones is careful to remind us of the boundaries of this discussion: “Does that mean that

every Jew is a bad person? No, it does not. Jewish leadership controls the 'Synagogue of Satan,' which in turn controls the ethnic group into which Jews are born. No one has control over the circumstances of his birth. That is why anti-Semitism, if by that term we mean hatred of the Jews because of immutable and ineradicable racial characteristics, is wrong. Over the course of their lives, Jews come to understand that theirs is an ethnic group unlike any other. In spite of the propaganda of racial superiority which the Talmud seeks to inculcate in them, many Jews come to understand that a peculiarly malignant spirit has taken up its home at the heart of their ethnos. Once they become aware of the magnitude of that evil, Jews are faced with a choice. Depending on the disposition of the heart, which only God can judge, they either dedicate themselves to that evil or they reject it – completely as in the case of St. Paul, Nicholas Donin, Joseph Pfefferkorn and other Jews too numerous to mention – or inchoately, as in the case of the Jews of conscience who refuse to go along with something which they know is morally wrong, be that abortion or the eviction of Palestinians from their ancestral lands” (p. 1067).

My review of Jones' book will concentrate on the latter half of the anthology, since the events Jones describes there will resonate better with you for the simple fact that you, the modern reader, have lived through many of the events Jones describes in that half of the book, yet, I am almost certain, without ever having looked at them from the perspective of “Jewish revolution” that Dr. Jones provides. In fact, Dr. Jones enlightens you to the fact that you have been systematically dissuaded from viewing history through these particular lenses by the Jewish revolutionary himself, since he invariably labels such investigation as an act of “anti-semitism.” Yet what makes Jones' treatment of this issue both inviting and convincing is that he exhibits no emotionally laden arguments, no name-calling, no attempt to frame the Jew with the stereotypical images so as to win you over by demagoguery. All in all, Jones' book is about as pure and simple a factual case for a given thesis that I have read in quite a long time. If anything, Jones constantly makes you aware that it is his opponents who use below-the-belt tactics to discredit critics like himself.

An example of Jones' genteel way of handling this subject is his constant appeal to fairness. Even though we have before us 1000+ pages of nothing but graphic and detailed "revolutionary" activity of only one group of people, the Jews at large, Jones is completely sensitive to the fact that "as always, movements are led by the few – a few who often may not be representative of the many" (p. 21, see also pp. 740, 746, 755). To back up this disclaimer, Jones cites psychologist Kevin MacDonald who "has suggested the following approach to the issue — that a Jewish movement is a movement dominated by Jews 'with no implication that all or most Jews are involved in these movements and restrictions on what the movements are'" (p. 21). Further demonstrating this unbiased approach to the Jews, Jones cites the long-standing directive from Pope Gregory the Great in the sixth century, otherwise known as the *Sicut Iudeis non*, which states quite simply: "no one has the right to harm Jews or disrupt their worship services, but the Jews have, likewise, no right to corrupt the faith or morals of Christians or subvert Christian societies." Unfortunately, Jones' book reveals that it is precisely the latter half of this directive that has been systematically transgressed in the last two millennia. For those living in our day, Jones makes a special effort to show you: (a) how dramatically and thoroughly the Jews at large have turned Christian faith and morals on their ~ 5 ~

collective head, and (b) countering charges from Jews like those of Daniel Goldhagen who writes: "For centuries the Catholic Church...harbored anti-Semitism at its core, as an integral part of its doctrine, its theology and its liturgy" (p. 23).

In chapters one through twelve, Jones show us the first 1800 years of the exploits of the Revolutionary Jew. As he explains everything from why St. John referred to the Jews of his day, twice, as the "Synagogue of Satan" (Ap 2:9; 3:9); to the futile efforts of Julian the Apostate to rebuild the Jewish temple in the fourth century and the coincidence of this fiasco with the rise of the Arian heresy that denied the deity of Christ; to the Catholic Church's crusades beginning in the eleventh century to take Jerusalem back from the Jews, Jones gives us remarkable insight into the back and

forth struggle between the Church and the Jews that has continued unabated until this present day.

I would venture to say that few people in the world realize how prominent and how divisive the Jews have been throughout the last two millennia, since our classroom history books simply do not address it from that particular perspective, and, in fact, are forbidden to do so for fear of being stigmatized by the show-stopping label of “anti-semitism.” If I am reading Jones correctly, I believe he is telling us that the time is long overdue to diffuse that epithet and educate ourselves and our children to the truth in order to uphold our own faith and devotion to God and the Catholic Church.

All in all, as we witness the innovative way the Jews, a highly outnumbered and ostracized people, have sought their way into the upper echelons of society, they are, for lack of a better worldly estimation, noteworthy examples of what L. Ron Hubbard once said was the main motivation for man’s drive – the will to survive. And there was one thing that made the Jews’ collective will to survive seem stronger, at times, than other societies, especially at the beginning of the second millennium. As Jones, quoting partially from Norman Cohn, puts it: “‘What made the Jews remain Jews,’ according to Cohn, ‘was ... their absolute conviction that the Diaspora was...a preparation for the coming of the Messiah and the return to a transfigured Holy Land.’ ....At the close of the 11th Century, ‘it was no longer Jews but Christians who cherished and elaborated prophecies in the tradition of ‘Daniel’s dream’ and who continued to be inspired by them.’ The temptation to look for heaven on earth was known as Judaizing....What sharply distinguished the Jews from other peoples was their attitude towards history and in particular towards their own role in history.

‘Precisely because they were so utterly certain of being the Chosen People,’ Cohn tells us, ‘Jews tended to react to peril, oppression and hardship by phantasies of the total triumph and boundless prosperity, which Yahweh, out of his omnipotence, would bestow upon his Elect in the fullness of time.’ ....Through their suffering, the Jewish people would liberate all mankind. The Christian undertone is unmistakable. Moses Hess would take this reasoning to its logical conclusion in the 19th Century, claiming the Jewish people had become its own Messiah....The millennialist kingdom

that will be 'the culmination of history' and that 'will have no successors' found numerous adherents from Karl Marx to the neoconservative Francis Fukuyama, whose *The End of History* announced the neoconservative millennium when Marx's millennium failed" (pp. 94-95).

It is this "Chosen People" mentality, spurred on by a rehashing and resizing of it in the Talmud, the Zohar, Mendelssohn, Hess, Marx, and even in gematria, that persists in the Jewish mind and serves as the impetus for much of their "revolutionary" posture. As Jones sees it, to make the

~ 6 ~

revolution work to their advantage, either the Jews would foment their own rebellion, or they would climb on the back of some Gentile rebellion and reap whatever fell from the apple cart, as it were. Always, of course, the ultimate crosshairs were set on the Catholic Church. On this theme, Jones goes through the Bohemian revolt in 1412 in which "Jews were converting in unprecedented numbers in Spain, and those who did not convert were looking nervously for a safe place to land. And Bohemia, the jewel of central European Catholic and monastic culture, was on the verge of the first full-blown revolution on European soil." (p. 149); as well as the Protestant Reformation and the subsequent Peasant revolt of the 1520s, from which "'It is beyond question,' Walsh continues, citing a Jewish historian, 'that the first leaders of the Protestant sects were called semi-Judaei, or half-Jews, in all parts of Europe, and that men of Jewish descent were as conspicuous among them as they had been among the Gnostics and would later be among the Communists'" (p. 268). After this, Jones analyzes the Anabaptist rebellion, the Anglican rebellion and Freemasonry, showing how the Jewish element was involved in each one, and how the Jews profited, both literally and figuratively, from pitting one side against the other – a strategy that continues to this day when dealing with their opponents.

Coming closer to modern times, Jones then comes to the revolution of 1848 in the wake of the Enlightenment that had peaked in 1783. As Jones sees it, citing Haberer, "The continuity in radical Jewish behavior was traceable to the Enlightenment in general and Mendelssohn in particular.

Haberer feels that Mendelssohn is the ultimate source of Jewish Nihilism...” (p. 653). There was also “Jewish nationalism or Zionism, which reared its ugly head in 1862 with the publication of Moses Hess’s tract *Rom und Jerusalem*” (p. 571). With the papal states diminishing and Italy becoming nationalized, Hess saw that “with the liberation of the eternal city on the Tiber, the emancipation of the eternal city on Mt. Moriah begins” (p. 591). In Russia, “groups of Judaizers spread with ‘wide dissemination’” (p. 576). In essence, the Jewish gospel was spread by revolution. Jones adds: “As Moses Hess predicted in *Rom und Jerusalem*, the Jews became revolutionaries within ten years of the arrival of the Enlightenment in Russia... ‘Its members,’ Isaiah Berlin wrote, describing the new Jewish-Russian intelligentsia, ‘thought of themselves as united by something more than mere interest in ideas; they conceived themselves as being a dedicated order, almost a secular priesthood, devoted to the spreading of a specific attitude to life, something like a gospel.’ Once the ideas of the Enlightenment cracked open the orthodox shell surrounding the *shtetl*, Jews saw their participation in revolution as ordained by God. Revolution was the task of God’s chosen people” (pp. 647-48).

And revolutions were supported by lots of money. While Bauer said: “If they wish to become free the Jews should not embrace Christianity, as such, but Christianity in dissolution, religion in dissolution; that is to say, the Enlightenment, criticism and its outcome, a free humanity,” Marx, in his book *The Jewish Question*, had no qualms saying that “‘the proven basis of Judaism’ is ‘practical need and self-interest’; that ‘the worldly cult of the Jew’ is ‘Huckstering,’ and that ‘his worldly god’ is Money” (p. 585), noting that, by this time in history, “The Jew has emancipated himself in a Jewish manner, not only by acquiring the power of money, but also because money has become, through him and also apart from him, a world power, which the practical Jewish spirit has become the  
~ 7 ~

practical spirit of the Christian nations. The Jews have emancipated themselves in so far as the Christians have become Jews” (p. 586).

Jones adds: "Salvation, in other words still came from the Jews, but now it was a different kind of salvation—utopian socialism—coming from a different kind of Jew, the underground revolutionary terrorist....The Czar was simply the Pharaoh in his latest incarnation" (p. 654). This mentality led to the other key ingredient of revolution – assassination – and there were plenty of *cherem* and messianic themes in the Old Testament to which the opportunistic Jew could appeal to sanction the bloodbath and end the five-hundred-year Romanov dynasty with Karl Marx's 1848 *Communist Manifesto* as its ideological blueprint. Bolshevism, which Jones proves beyond the shadow of a doubt was primarily a Jewish movement bent on the destruction of world religion and the overthrow of civilization (pp. 743-58) and which even the *American Hebrew* said was "the product of Jewish thinking, Jewish discontent [and] Jewish effort to reconstruct" (pp. 747), had been well supported by the familiar Jewish banking names of Rothschild and Schiff (pp. 731-37). In Germany, the same things began to happen. By 1918, "Jews filled the vacuum after the collapse of the Reich reaching 'the highest positions of authority' in the Weimar Republic...which gained a reputation as the 'Judenrepublik'...redefining German culture as something most Germans found repugnant" (p. 738). One of their own, Eugene Levine, made it a point to attack Eugenio Pacelli, who was then a Vatican diplomat in Germany and later to become Pius XII (p. 738).

At this point Jones gives us a well-timed excursus on Daniel Goldhagen, the most prominent Jewish writer today leading the charge accusing Pius XII, and many other critics, of "anti-semitism." According to Jones, Goldhagen's Jewish apologetic in *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, would have the world believe that "...nothing Jews do or don't do can cause people to either like or dislike them. Their behavior has no effect on other people's behavior because the fundamental fact of life is irrational anti-Semitism based on 'millennium old urge that powerfully infected and shaped European history,' to give Charles Krauthammer's formulation. So, Palestinian animus toward Jews has nothing to do with how the Israelis have treated them for five decades. And the pogroms in Russia in the 1880s following the assassination of the czar had nothing to do with the perception

that Jews were in the forefront of the revolutionary terrorism there. And the specter of Bolshevism that haunted Europe during the '20s had nothing to do with Hitler's rise to power, because nothing causes anti-Semitism. It just is. The historical record tells a different story" (p. 743).

Jones goes on in the next dozen or so pages to give us the actual "historical record," and it is indeed eye-opening. Just this information alone is worth the price of the book, for it confirms once and for all why his book was titled "The Revolutionary Jew." You will see quotes from such Jews as Elie Wiesel who said: "We have to make revolution, because God told us to. God wants us to become communists," and admissions from popular presses such as the *Chicago Tribune* which wrote that Bolshevism was "an instrument for Jewish control of the world" (p. 752). Concentration camps, Jones informs us, were the invention of Soviet Jews, not Hitler (p. 757). Millions of Christians, Muslims and political opponents to Bolshevism were slaughtered in the Gulag long before Auschwitz. In fact, Jones seeks to set the record straight for Hitler's main motivation to power – the threat he saw coming from the Jewish leadership in communist Russia. In one of his more

~ 8 ~

astounding revelations, Jones, in his unique candidness, reveals that: "Hitler rose to power by convincing a significant portion of the German people that Jews and Bolsheviks were one and the same thing. National Socialism was a reaction to communism. Goldhagen's statement that anti-Semitism has nothing to do with Jewish behavior renders an entire era incomprehensible. More comprehensible is Saul Friedlander's claim that 'hatred for communism played a greater role in the rise of Hitler than anti-Jewish attitudes.' Hitler was stymied by Jewish assimilation and German acceptance of it; he could not have turned people against the Jews without the threat of Bolshevism and the experience of the Bavarian Soviet Republic, which he referred to as 'temporary Jewish rule.' In *Mein Kampf*, Hitler wrote 'in 1918 it was still not possible to talk about programmatic anti-Semitism. I can still remember the difficulties one encountered as soon as the word Jew was mentioned. You were either looked at as if you were crazy or you encountered the stiffest

resistance.' In 1933 Hitler told Max Planck, 'I have nothing against the Jews *qua* Jews. But the Jews are all communists, and these are my enemies, and it is against them that I am fighting.' As evidence that anti-Communism trumped racism, von Bieberstein quotes Hitler's saying 'Lieber sind mir 100 Neger im Saal, als ein Jude.' 'Better a hundred Negroes in the room than one Jew.' In a diary entry for February 10, 1937, Hans Frank wrote, 'I confess my belief in Germany ... which is in truth God's tool for the extermination of evil. We are fighting in God's name against the Jews and their Bolshevism. God protect us.' Hitler always maintained the Jew was his enemy primarily because the Jew spread revolution. In a table talk entry dated June 7, 1944, he still maintained 'without Jews there would be no revolution.' Nazi theoretician Alfred Rosenberg said: 'Bolshevism is in its essence the form of Jewish world revolution...There is no such thing as Bolshevism without Jews'" (p. 750). But Hitler was not the only one who recognized the "Jewish connection." Even the Catholic periodical *La Civiltà Cattolica*, which published the article "World Revolution and the Jews," stated that communism was "the perversion of a Semitic fantasy" that came "from the Jewish race" (p. 754). In fact, many Catholics in the hierarchy concluded that communism became the ultimate weapon for the Jews to topple the Catholic Church. Jones tells us that, "Polish bishops traced the Bolshevik fury to the 'traditional hatred' Jews felt for Christendom." The bishops released a pastoral letter in 1920 stating that "the true goal of Bolshevism is world conquest. The race which has the leadership of Bolshevism in its hands...is bent on the subjugation of the nations...especially because those who are the leaders of Bolshevism [the Jews] have the traditional hatred toward Christendom in their blood" (p. 753). Fr. Erich Przywara, SJ, in his 1926 book *Judentum und Christentum*, using quotes from Martin Buber and other Jewish thinkers, traced this ideology to "its roots in Jewish messianism," forcing him to conclude that "the Jew 'is driven to become the tireless revolutionary of the Christian world by an inner necessity' [the Jew] is 'driven to his tireless activism by his deepest religious convictions, He is truly the restless Ahasver'" (p. 753). As Jones concludes: "The social dislocation that followed defeat after World War I allowed the revolutionary movement to

achieve its greatest successes. The Jews could avenge themselves on the traditional Christian monarchies that had persecuted them. The Jews, according to Lerner 'were enthusiastic representatives of the collapse of traditional communities because those communities discriminated against Jews.' Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter maintain 'the goal of the Jewish radicals was to alienate the Christians from their society just as the Jews had been alienated from those same cultures.' In 1849, in *Israel's Herald*, Karl Ludwig Bernays explained 'The Jews took

~ 9 ~

revenge on a hostile world in a completely new way...by liberating mankind from every religion and any kind of patriotic sentiment.' In the November 30, 1917 issue of *The Jewish Chronicle*, Trotsky was described 'as the Avenger for Jewish suffering and humiliation' under the Czars" (p. 753). After reading the arsenal of Jewish and Gentile corroboration supporting his thesis of the "Revolutionary Jew" reaching the final stages of gestation in 20th century Bolshevism, an astute Catholic can cease wondering why Our Lady pointed to Russia, and no other nation, as the demonic menace that would be unleashed on the world if the consecration due her was not forthcoming from her children.

Intermittently throughout the second half of his book, Jones interludes with several chapters on the relationship between the Jews and the Blacks (e.g., Ch. 14: Otilie Assing and the American Civil War; Ch. 16: Redemption of the South and the NAACP; Ch 17: The Trial of Leo Frank; Ch 19: Marcus Garvey; Ch. 20: The Scottsboro Boys; Ch. 22: Lorraine Hansberry; Ch. 29: The Black Panthers). Admittedly, I don't have as much interest in this side of the debate, and since this review is limited in length, I will leave these chapters to the enthusiast who wants to glean a wealth of information from the pen of Dr. Jones. Suffice it to say, in my reading of the chapters, Dr. Jones presents a cascade of facts and analysis that convincingly demonstrates how the Jew often exploited the Negro for his own profit, much like the *Southern Poverty Law Center* does today, an organization, we should add, that wastes no time in stigmatizing critics of such Jewish oppression as "anti-semites," as Dr. Jones himself can testify (<http://www.culturewars.com/2008/CUA.htm>).

Jones adds some interesting side lights to the issues, such as the real story of Fr. Charles Coughlin, the Canadian born Irish Catholic priest who reached over 30 million Americans through his radio show *The Golden Hour of the Little Flower* but was brutally and unjustly attacked by the pro-Jewish press as an “anti-semite” (pp. 825-827); and the story of General George Patton who, with Secretary of War, Henry Stimson, “protested against the pro-Jewish clout in the military government’ and “a conspiracy of international bankers, labor leaders, Jews and Communists...” (p. 830-31); as well as the massive social engineering and “sensitivity training” plans of B’nai B’rith and the ADL to deter people, including government, business, police, *etc.*, from voicing any criticism of Jewish ideologies and politics (p. 835).

One of the more intriguing and informative dimensions of Jones’ book is the attention he pays to the demise of the Catholic Church’s influence at the hands of ideological Jews, especially in America. First on the agenda was the effort to increase the already wide “separation of church and state” (a phrase, incidentally, Jones informs us was “a legal fiction created from one phrase in a letter by Thomas Jefferson”) way beyond the bounds intended by the constitutional framers. By the collaborative effort of a “WASP/Jewish” alliance, the goal was to stop the United States from being turned into a “Catholic country,” and the wider the margin created between church and state the more successful the campaign would be. The strategy was clever. Rather than have Jews “stand apart as a visibly distinct group, it would be wiser to Americanize and assimilate as quickly as possible and insist that government must not support religion at all,” so wrote Elliott Abrams of the Reagan administration, married to the daughter of Norman Podhoretz and Midge Decter, two of the countries most outspoken Zionists. Not only did this alienate the Catholic Church, but as Jones surmises, “it was tantamount to submerging America in Judaism. America was redefined in Jewish

~ 10 ~

terms, and the courts capitulated to the Talmudic redefinitions of American law during the high noon of American judicial activism” (p. 837).

Jones has a knack for noticing watershed moments, and with that ability he informs us that, “The man most responsible for de-Christianization of American culture was the AJC’s [American Jewish Congress] Leo Pfeffer, who, says the AJC’s Murray Friedman, ‘advised, planned and argued more church-state cases before the U.S. Supreme Court than anyone else in American history.’ Pfeffer’s ‘social revolution’ began with *Everson* in 1947 and culminated in *Lemon v. Kurtzman* in 1974. The one constant was Pfeffer’s animus toward the Catholic Church....Friedman portrays Pfeffer’s cases as a clear victory for the Jewish viewpoint. ‘*Everson and McCullum*,’ he writes, ‘in which the committee, the ADL and Pfeffer’s Congress were joined together, were crucial victories’ because they ‘vindicated Pfeffer’s belief that litigation could be a primary tool to achieve the Jewish agencies’ objectives.’ In reports to its members, the AJC put a less ethnocentric spin on Pfeffer’s achievement, declaring ‘it had achieved a “social revolution” for religious equality,’ but the word “revolution” let the cat out of the bag. ‘Joined now with the ascendant Jewish intellectual and cultural elite and with liberal Protestant and civil liberties bodies, Jewish groups had come to play a critical role in the ‘de-Christianization’ of American culture.’ Only the Catholics complained, especially the Jesuits in their journal *America*. Friedman denounced ‘such criticism’ as ‘carrying with it a whiff of anti-Semitism,’ a phrase he uses to discredit views he finds repugnant” (p. 838).

In the wake of the new consensus, a new movement was born – Neo-conservatism, or as David Brooks candidly put it in the *Wall Street Journal*: “Neo means new and con means Jew” (p. 1007). Jews had become more and more disaffected from both their communist roots and the Democratic party and were seeking a firmer foundation to continue their ideological crusade, while at the same time continuing the corralling of the Catholic Church. Enter William F. Buckley. Buckley launched *National Review*, a “rallying point for the new conservatism” (p. 863). As Jones puts it: “*National Review* existed to destroy competing conservatisms, especially those incompatible with the internationalist foreign policy establishment. *National Review* used conservatism to mobilize certain ethnic groups, e.g., Catholics, behind government policies. It existed to colonize certain

groups, to divide and conquer, and then get them to act against their own interests. NR was created to destroy isolationist conservatism. Conservatives who criticized America's march to empire were demonized and decertified" (p. 864).

This posture was needed, of course, since both Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI had vociferously condemned the war in Iraq which, incidentally, was another place where Catholics, once protected by Sadaam Hussein, were now killed or dispelled by the thousands, even as they were in Nagasaki and Hiroshima. Jones goes even deeper, citing Murray Friedman's book *The Neoconservative Revolution: Jewish Intellectuals and the Shaping of Public Policy* that "National Review was run by Jews" (p. 864). Buckley was merely one of the "goyische front men," that was surrounded by "Buckley's circle of Jews," which included five Jews on the editorial board, and others such as "Marvin Liebman, a former communist who came to conservatism via Zionism, in particular via the terrorist organization Irgun Zvai Leumi." In fact, Jones concludes: "Much of what is attributed to William F. Buckley was the work of Jewish thinkers and financiers....never a deep

~ 11 ~

thinker, Buckley relied on Jews for the heavy lifting....Buckley's job was to serve as a model for the Catholic students from Villanova and Fordham who flocked to the YAF. His job was to destroy any conservative movement not toeing the line of the internationalist establishment. All forms of isolation were anathema. It also meant an all out attack on anything 'anti-semitic'" (pp. 865-66).

Some of those Jewish thinkers were people like Bill Kristol, son of Zionist icon Irving Kristol. As Jones notes: "Bill Kristol was part of an aggressively Jewish younger generation of neoconservatives raised to think of themselves not as outsiders but as destined to haunt the halls of power in Washington and to rule the world" (p. 1053). In the end Jones says: "Before long it became clear that conservatism became whatever certain Jews defined as conservatism, and any conservative who disagreed was expelled from the synagogue of organizations like the Philadelphia Society by being labeled an anti-Semite....Even the philo-Catholic Jews at *National Review* were unable to get

beyond the rhetoric of Messianic, revolutionary politics, and unable to tolerate anyone who disagreed with their essentially Talmudic understanding of conservatism....Real conservatism was Jewish. Real conservatism was Talmudic. Real conservatism was revolutionary. Or, as Friedman puts it: 'Meyer declared, in a manner Jewish Neoconservatives would adopt later, "a revolutionary force" had shattered "the unity and balance of civilization"' (p. 867).

As Dr. Jones heads for the home stretch in chapters 24-32, even more startling information is revealed. This, to me, is the most relevant part of the book because it hits so close to home – the generation of Americanism that I lived through for the past forty years and wondered what the heck was going on with this country. Thanks to Dr. Jones, as Johnny Nash's song says, "I can see clearly now, the rain is gone, I can see all obstacles in my way." As we noted previously from quotes of both Jewish and Gentile authors, it is no secret that the Jews at large, in their messianic consciousness, seek to restore the fame and fortunes they had in bygone days. This seems to be the drive that drives them like no other. Once Catholics are educated to this secret ideological design, things will change, which, I believe after talking with Dr. Jones about his book, is the very purpose he wrote *The Revolutionary Jew*. His book is not merely a history lesson. It is a gauntlet being thrown down to decide who is going to influence the hearts and minds of mankind, Jewish thoughtmodes or Catholic thought-modes. Forgive me for being blunt, but if you don't come out of this discussion believing one way or the other, then you haven't understood a word of Jones' book, or you just may be afraid to commit to the truth he is giving you.

Fortunately, more and more people are beginning to understand it. At Vatican II, Leon de Poncins saw it, and he had to educate the 2300 bishops assembled there with his pamphlet *Le Problème Juif face au Concile* ["The Jewish Problem Facing the Council"]. Poncins, using "the texts of Jewish authors themselves," had such convincing documentation exposing the subterfuge and subversion that Jewish ideologues were using to influence the Council, Pope Paul VI vetoed the original draft of *Nostra Aetate*, and it exists today in a much modified form (yet, even then, it has

been consistently used as “a weapon designed to overthrow traditional Catholicism” (p. 934).

Poncins nixed Jules Isaac's claim that “the Jews are ‘the people of the Old Testament’ by showing they want, not a Messiah, but ‘a terrestrial reign in which they will control the social, economic and political life of the nations....Judaism seeks to impose itself as the sole standard and to reduce the

~ 12 ~

world to Jewish values” (p. 928). As Jones sums it up: “From the Jewish perspective, the Vatican Council was simply one more revolutionary moment of opportunity to ‘rectify Christianity,’ which included, according to Jehouda, ‘The Renaissance, the Reformation, [and] the Revolution of 1789.’ Like Rabbi Louis Israel Newman, Jehouda supported all of history's revolutionary movements from the Reformation onward. The upheaval began with Reuchlin, who ‘shook the Christian conscience by suggesting as early as 1494, that there was nothing higher than Hebraic wisdom.’ In promoting the Cabala, ‘Reuchlin advocated returning to Jewish sources,’ which unleashed ‘the new spirit which was to revolutionize the whole of Europe’ and to find expression in the revolutions of France and Russia. The French Revolution, according to Jehouda, ‘continues through the influence of Russian Communism, to make a powerful contribution to the de-Christianisation of the Christian world” (pp. 929-30).

What was being reflected in Rome was being actualized in America. As Jones informs us:

“Beginning in 1970, *Time* was in the forefront of announcing the Jewish takeover of American culture. ‘The United States,’ claimed *Time*, ‘is becoming more Jewish....Among American intellectuals the Jew has even become a culture hero.’ *Time* quoted poet Robert Lowell: ‘Jewishness is the center of today's literature much as the West was in the ‘30s.’ Twenty years later, *Time* repeated the theme, ‘Jews are news. It is an axiom of journalism. An indispensable one, too, because it is otherwise impossible to explain why the deeds and misdeeds of a dot-on-the-map Israel get an absurdly disproportionate amount of news coverage around the world” (pp. 996-997). *Time* was preceded by *Look* magazine which “on January 25, 1966, published an article explaining ‘How the

Jews Changed Catholic Teaching” (p. 934). This was echoed by Leo Pfeffer in a speech in October 1976 on “The Triumph of Secular Humanism,” as he “declared victory in the culture wars and announced the Jews had defeated the Catholics in their 40 years war over American culture. The terms of the Carthaginian peace imposed on the defeated American Catholics included abortion, pornography, the loss of Catholic academe, the redefinition of deviance, and the transformation of discourse” (p. 1000). The sad thing is, Pfeffer is right. The evidence of a “Jewish takeover” is just dripping from our society. Jones gives many examples to prove the case. By the 1960s, Yuri Slezkine argued that “modernity was ‘about...dismantling social estates for the benefit of individuals, nuclear families and book-reading tribes (nations). Modernization, in other words, is about everyone becoming Jewish.’ Friedman says much the same thing. The Jews transformed American society after World War II, remaking it in their image. The older generation of Protestant novelists and poets, many of whom - e.g., T.S. Eliot and Ezra Pound - had serious reservations about modernity even though their writing was “modern” in form, were replaced by almost exclusively Jewish writers. Ernest Hemingway, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Ezra Pound, and T.S. Eliot, who came to prominence in the ‘20s, were replaced in the ‘50s by Saul Bellow, Aaron Copland, Leonard Bernstein, Philip Roth, J.D. Salinger, Norman Mailer, Arthur Miller, Herman Wouk, Bernard Malamud, and Alan Ginsberg. Leslie Fiedler called it ‘the great takeover by Jewish American writers.’ Friedman says the Jews not only wrote books, they also taught Americans how to dance (Arthur Murray) how to behave (Dear Abby and Ann Landers) how to dress (Ralph Lauren), what to read (Irving Howe, Alfred Kazin and Lionel Trilling) and what to sing (Irving Berlin, Barry Manilow, Barbara Streisand)” (p. 919).

~ 13 ~

Modernization also brought Hollywood, which was purely a “Jewish creation.” “Tevye brought about a curious change in American culture and Jewish identity. As Jews became more overtly Jewish, Judaism became more American, and America became more Jewish. *Fiddler on the Roof* gave

a lot of attention to pogroms but never mentioned any connection to the assassination of two Czars and the rise of the revolutionary Jew in Russia...because by then Tevye was living on the lower East Side of New York” (p. 920). Jewish intellectualism brought things such as “Freudianism [which] became a ‘salvation religion,’ with a priesthood and sacred texts. Ministers became therapists, and therapists became ministers, and America became what Philip Reiff called the therapeutic state. ‘Freudianism, which was predominantly Jewish, proclaimed the beleaguered loneliness of the newly “emancipated” to be a universal human condition.’” Reiff adds: ‘For many Jews, psychology and Freud represented a path toward a more sophisticated, cosmopolitan America; for many Catholics, Freud signified a heretical departure from fundamental religious values.’ And Jones concludes: “Once psychology replaced religion, ethnic compartmentalization was no longer valid, and the Jew, who was a ‘genius,’ became the guide to how everyone should live in the ‘modern’ world” (p. 921). The deleterious effects soon came. The Catholic viewpoint – the Christian viewpoint of man’s psyche – was turned on its head. Jones shows the consequences: “The redefinition of psychology was a revolution in the truest sense of the word....the definition of mental illness changed from passion out of control to passion repressed. This unleashing of sexual passion from the bonds of reason corresponded with Jewish involvement in pornography and the constant chafing at prohibitions against nudity in Hollywood films. The Jewish takeover of psychology put instinct in the saddle, where it was used as cultural control...” (p. 921).

After Freud petered out, other psychological wizards took his place, and they were mainly from Jewish intellectual ranks. Note the continuing theme of “revolution” that Jones keeps uncovering in their literature: “...behaviorism was the refuge of divinity students who abandoned religion. The third way of Erich Fromm, Carl Rogers, and Abraham Maslow was less aggressively atheistic but still retained Jewish animosity toward the unthinking *goyim*, who needed to be liberated from repression....‘Fromm wanted to reconnect secular Jewish idealists with the “revolutionary” principles of their ancestors’....Abraham Maslow debated changing his name to something less

identifiably Jewish, but decided not to because 'Jewishness encouraged intellectual independence and even rebelliousness.' Like Carl Rogers, Maslow took Kurt Lewin's research into group dynamics and turned it into a weapon against unsuspecting *goyim*. In April 1962, Maslow lectured to nuns at Sacred Heart, a Catholic women's college in Massachusetts. Maslow noted in his diary that the talk had been very 'successful,' which he found troubling. 'They shouldn't applaud me,' he wrote, 'they should attack. If they were fully aware of what I was doing, they would [attack]'" (p. 922).

Where Freud, Fromm and Maslow were confined to books and university curricula, their humanistic views found their way into our new 1960s color television sets, proving Jones' point that "under Jewish influence, American psychology became Talmudic" (p. 922). Joyce Brothers led "a hoard of female Jewish advice columnists, who popularized and spread the tenets of Jewish psychology in the mass media, contributing to the decline in sexual morals and the rise of feminism" (p. 933). By the 1970s, quoting Heinze, 'If a woman were going to end up as a psychological adviser to Americans, the odds were very good that she would be Jewish.' Jones continues: "The Jewish

~ 14 ~

twins from St. Paul, Minnesota, Esther Pauline Lederer and Pauline Esther Phillips, became advice columnists Ann Landers and Abigail Van Buren. They invariably advised 'seek counseling' whenever a troubled reader brought up a problem involving sexual morality. They and Joyce Brothers contributed to the decline in American morals by psychologizing behavior that had previously been considered under the purview of faith and morals. America's largely Jewish advice columnists had become experts in persuading *goyische* America to ignore what their consciences and their ministers were telling them and to engage in Talmudic rationalization, abetted by the psychologists, instead. When advice and attitude formation shifted to AM talk radio, Jews moved here too. The most famous radio advice show host was Dr. Laura Schlessinger...." (p. 923).

"Before long" Jones writes, "the goyim felt they had to imitate the Jews if they wanted to be published or performed. Jewish control of the media arose in the performing arts as early as the

1930s, when, according to Bloom, 'Cole Porter...decided that he needed to steep his art in American popular music's ascendant Jewishness – to write "Jewish tunes" like those of Jerome Kern, Richard Rodgers and George Gershwin"' (p. 983). In one of Jones' more insightful discoveries, he catches Jewish humorist Philip Roth inadvertently pulling away the curtain so that we can see clearly who and what is behind the commercialization of Christmas and Easter. Read it carefully. This is one of those "ah!" moments you experience in Jones' book. Jones writes: "In *Operation Shylock*, Philip Roth claims he got his program for cultural subversion by listening to Irving Berlin: 'The radio was playing "Easter Parade" and I thought...this is Jewish genius on a par with the Ten Commandments....God gave Moses the Ten Commandments, and then he gave Berlin "Easter Parade" and "White Christmas." The two holidays celebrate the divinity of Christ – the divinity that's at the very heart of the Jewish rejection of Christianity – and what does Irving Berlin brilliantly do? He de-Christ's them. Easter he turns into a fashion show and Christmas into a holiday about snow...[this] schlockified Christianity is Christianity cleansed of Jew hatred"' (p. 984). After reading the above, it should come as no surprise that "Milton Berle competed head to head with Bishop Fulton Sheen on prime time TV and lost. Fifty years later, Bloom says laconically, 'shows like Sheen's no longer air in network prime time or even on the national cable spectrum.' They have been replaced by 'the Shticks of numerous funny Jews, such as Seinfeld, Paul Reiser, Fran Dresner, Richard Lewis, and Jenna Elfman,' not to mention the ineffable Howard Stern, whose 'conquest of cable and radio, of movie theaters and bookstores, marks for better or worse the unequivocal arrival of Jewish funniness' as well as the triumph of Jewish sexual degeneracy....The average American could chose Hollywood pornography or neoconservative wars in the Middle East for his nightly entertainment" (p. 985).

Nowhere has Jewish ideology been more prevalent than in sexual matters and the abortion issue. In his unique and unabashed candidness, Jones informs us that, "The abortion movement was part of the sexual revolution. The abortion revolution was, nonetheless, unique. It coincided with

the rise to cultural prominence of American Jewry in the wake of their breaking of the Hollywood production code and the Arab-Israeli Six-Day War, when it became the opinion of the WASP state department elite that Israel was a strategic asset in America's quest to secure oil in the Mid-East....Jews were the vanguard in the abortion movement as they were the vanguard of Bolshevism in Russia and of pornography in the United States. The movement to overturn abortion laws in New York was an essentially Jewish movement that saw itself as a revolutionary force against the darkness of Christianity in general and the Catholic Church in particular. The movement was certainly not exclusively Jewish, but it could not have survived or succeeded without Jewish leadership" (p. 943).

~ 15 ~

Obviously, this was yet another instance of "revolution" Jews were perpetrating on society. Once again, Jones uncovers this key word in the writings of Jewish abortion advocates. Prior to his conversion to the pro-life side, "...Nathanson considered abortion a revolutionary act and...he considered himself a revolutionary because of the fact that he was Jewish...he became, in his own words, 'an enlistee in the Revolution'" (p. 942). Jewish hatred for the Catholic Church shines through in these instances like no other light can reveal it. "Shortly after meeting Nathanson, Lader explained his strategy of legalizing abortion by attacking Catholics. The pro-abortion forces had to 'bring the Catholic hierarchy out where we can fight them. That's the real enemy. The biggest single obstacle to peace and decency throughout all of history'" (p. 943). The tactics, like the act of abortion itself, were nothing short of diabolical. "Lader brought Betty Friedan [author of *The Feminine Mystique*] into NARAL, she brought with her the communist tactics she had learned from her youthful work with the party. Making it seem that women, irrespective of ethnicity, supported abortion was a 'brilliant tactic'" (p. 944). "Then," as Jones quotes Nathanson, 'The stage was set...for the use of anti-Catholicism as a political instrument and for the manipulation of Catholics themselves by splitting them and setting them against each other.' NARAL would supply the press

with 'fictitious polls and surveys designed to make it appear as if American Catholics were deserting the teachings of the Church and the dictates of their consciences in droves'" (p. 944). Jones adds: "Many self-described 'Jews' continue to lead the abortion movement and, most pitiable of all, 'rabbis,' properly cloaked in the correct trappings, proclaim abortion is not only a necessity, but a Good Thing for America," and then Jones gives us two full pages of statistics to prove the point (pp. 1041-42).

One might be puzzled as to how the Jewish neoconservatives managed to suppress the traditional opposition to abortion represented by the evangelicals and other conservative groups. The clever ploy that has worked so well in the past with other issues was now to be used against abortion. By 1992, "The neocons, who had been silent on the issue of abortion, the prime political issue among conservative Catholics, finally broke their silence and said that, compared to Israel's survival, abortion was of little or no significance. The same was true, with some exceptions, of homosexuality, the other great "social issue" which motivated Catholics and Evangelicals" (p. 1038). The irony of retrieving holocaust memories to put abortion and homosexuality in the back seat of the Republican platform is that pro-life advocates had coined the term "The American Holocaust" in a brochure depicting the abortion of the 40 million+ babies that had been killed since the 1973 *Roe v. Wade* decision. As Jones reveals: "A sidebar entitled 'Who is Responsible for the American Holocaust in California?' listed names that were almost exclusively Jewish" (p. 1024). In any case, the holocaust rhetoric works very well, especially in inciting militaristic advances against Israel's Arab neighbors, particularly Iran. During one recent AIPAC conference, even a young Jewish high school student, Alice Ollstein, noticed the subliminal message. In what she calls "the carefully manufactured atmosphere of fear and urgency" she noticed that 'Everything was geared toward

~ 16 ~

persuading the audience that another Holocaust is evident...unless we get them first' (p. 1068). It's no wonder that Jewish commentator Gilad Atzmon says that organizations such as AIPAC and the

ADL 'are all remarkably good in generating hatred against Jews' (p. 1069).

As for sexual mores, the influence of secular Jews has been even more devastating. As Jones puts it: "Once the majority of American Jews defined themselves as sexually deviant, pornography, along with homosexual rights, feminism, and New Age goddess worship, became a natural expression of their worldview. Because they controlled Hollywood, they could make their worldview normative for the culture. The traditional animus against majority culture combined with a decline in moral scruple led 'the advocates of Woody Allen' [a term coined by Rabbi Dresner] to pornography as a form of cultural warfare" (p. 1031). Consider that the advance of abortion and pornography are not in a vacuum. Leading to them or coming from them are a whole host of insidious societal perversions, such as artificial insemination, surrogate motherhood, contraception, masturbation, pedophilia, teenage pregnancy, divorce, adultery, wife-swapping, incest, bestiality, homosexuality, lesbianism, embryonic stem-cell research, sexually transmitted diseases, *etcetera*. This is what everything from Sigmund Freud's wish to release the sexual psyche, to Benjamin Spock (who was educated in child-rearing at a Jewish pediatric institution; whose own daughter committed suicide; and whose name was nevertheless immortalized in the *Star Trek* character by the same name), has precipitated today. The Catholic rules, in contrast, are very simple, and if followed precisely, will lead to a wholesome and happy life: marriage is for the joy of creating children for God, and sex outside of marriage is forbidden, no exceptions.

As noted previously, the Jews knew that by creating a wide gap between "the separation of church and state," they would have the needed rationale to slip their revolutionary ideas past the noses of those who built the nation on freedom of the press. Quoting Jewish icon Irving Kristol from his 1995 book: *Neoconservatism: The Autobiography of an Idea*, Jones uncovers that, like secular humanism, pornography was perceived as 'good for Jews' because it... "permits individual Jews a civic equality and equality of opportunity dreamed of by previous Jewish generations. It is natural, therefore for American Jews to be, not only accepting of secular-humanist doctrines, but

enthusiastic exponents. That explains why American Jews are so vigilant about removing all the signs and symbols of traditional religions from “the public square,” so insistent that religion be merely a “private affair,” so determined that separation of church and state be interpreted to mean the separation of all institutions from any signs of a connection with traditional religions. The spread of secular humanism throughout American life has been “good for Jews,” no question about it. So the more, the better” (p. 1034).

Of course, when all this degeneracy is exposed, the anti-semitic race card is soon to follow.

Jones reveals that “When British journalist William Cash wrote about Jewish control of Hollywood in the October 1994 *Spectator*, Hollywood and its academic support troops reacted with rage verging on hysteria. In the *Los Angeles Times*, Neal Gabler, author of *An Empire of their Own: How Jews Created Hollywood*, attacked Cash’s article as ‘an anti-Semitic bleat from a reactionary crackpot’” (p. 1035). In his usual penchant to sum up the situation in a few choice words, Jones concludes: “William Cash’s and Joe Breen’s candor about Hollywood shows the battle over the

~ 17 ~

sexualization of American culture was a battle between America’s Jews and Catholics. From 1934 to 1965, Hollywood’s Jews were forced to repress their ‘permissive, value-free attitude’ in the films they made. The golden age of Hollywood was not a collaborative effort; it was Catholics saving Jews from their worst instincts. The Catholics lost, with dire consequences for the nation. The Rabbi Dresner Jew declined and the Woody Allen Jew rose as an icon for the entire culture. The Catholics lost the culture wars because they internalized Woody Allen Jewish values on sexuality, just as they adopted WASP values on birth control” (p. 1036).

Jewish *chutzpah* was displayed no better than when Al Goldstein, the Jewish publisher of *Screw*, was asked by Luke Ford why so many Jews were engaged in trafficking porn. Goldstein’s answer was: “The only reason that Jews are in pornography is that we think that Christ sucks. Catholicism sucks. We don’t believe in authoritarianism” (p. 1056). But there is a more practical

reason Jews dominate pornography, for it is a means to revolution. As even Luke Ford admits:

“Why does porn attract so many non-Jewish Jews?’ Because ‘even when Jews live in a society that welcomes them instead of harassing them, many Jews hate the majority culture.’ Pornography weakens the majority culture by moral subversion. Jews often lead in the application of new technology. That meant using high resolution photography, the VCR, and the Internet to deliver pornography just as it meant dynamite, forgery, and smuggling to bring down the Czar in Russia” (p. 1055).

As he does intermittently through his book, Jones is careful to say that these sexual peccadilloes are not indicative of all Jews or of all Jewish culture. Jones’ lengthy description of Rabbi Samuel Dresner’s opposition to the degenerate Jewish culture is noteworthy (see ch. 31: “The Jewish Takeover of American Culture”). At one point Jones quotes from the Jewish authored *Bookleggers and Smuthounds: The Trade In Erotica 1920-1940*, which states: ‘While few Jews are radical, many radicals (and pornographers) are Jews. Writes non-Jew Ernest van den Haag in *The Jewish Mystique*, “Out of one hundred Jews, five may be radicals, but out of ten radicals, five are likely to be Jewish”’ (p. 1056).

In his Epilogue, *The Conversion of the Revolutionary Jew*, Jones ties up some loose ends regarding the definition and application of both what it is to be a Jew, an anti-semite, a Zionist and even what “Jewishness” is. He does a masterful job. He also gives his opinion regarding the future of the Jews and Israel. He recognizes that, when all is said and done, this is a spiritual battle. It is a battle for who will win the Jewish soul – Christ or the devil. As he puts it: “The final collapse of Jewish resistance to Logos will take place when they have reached the pinnacle of worldly power. At no time in the past 2000 years have Jews had more power than now. The Jews possess Jerusalem and, according to reports, plan to rebuild the temple, lending credence to the belief the stage is set for that last great battle over who will rule the Jewish soul” (p. 1073).

The only point in the book of which I take issue with Dr. Jones is his belief, and admittedly a

very popular belief among Catholics, that just prior to the return of Christ we will witness a large conversion of the Jews (pp. 1073-1074). After extensive study of this issue for the past 35 years, I have come to the conclusion that there is very little if any solid evidence to support the claim.

Similar to the dubious belief among many of the Fathers that the “Sons of God” of Genesis 6:2 were

~ 18 ~

fallen angels who impregnated human females of their choosing, the idea that there would come a massive conversion of Jews in the distant future from the evangelistic efforts of a resurrected Enoch or Elijah was based on a very shaky theological foundation. It was an idea that began in the chiliastic eschatology of the very early Fathers (e.g., Irenaeus, Justin) since they believed that a large number of converted Jews would be needed to rule in a 1000-year reign of Christ on earth, otherwise known as “millennialism.” But when the Catholic Church officially rejected millennialism at the Council of Ephesus (and later by Pius XII), somehow the “mass conversion of Jews” theory hung on in many later patristic writings, even though the new anti-chiliastic eschatology introduced by Augustine really had no practical room for it. The only passage that believers in a future Jewish conversion point to, both then and now, is Romans 11:25-26, but as the history of interpretation shows, not one patristic or medieval theologian ever did a thorough exegesis of the passage to demonstrate how such a conclusion can be logical and safely derived from those verses. For further information on this topic, see my 37-page article titled: “Will Enoch and Elijah Return to Preach to the Jews?” at the website (<http://catholicintl.com/catholicissues/enoeli.pdf>).

Finally, I want to thank and congratulate Dr. Jones on a truly remarkable book, a book that is both long overdue and stands as one of the greatest of all time.

## **7. An Interview with Dr. E. Michael Jones on**

### ***The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit***

**by Martin Vianney**

**This interview appears in the September 2008 issue of [Culture Wars](#).**

It was once said of Michael Jones that he was too radical to be a conservative and too conservative to be a radical. There is one word that always describes the man and his writing. Controversial. Jones, however, would say that a different word describes his writing. Catholic. And he would doubtless add that if one writes in the modern age as a Catholic one is necessarily controversial.

However, even by these standards Michael Jones' latest book, [The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit and its Impact on World History](#), is his most controversial and ambitious book to date. At 1,200 pages this tour of history which shines a theological light on conflicts between Catholics, Protestants, Jews and revolutionaries through the ages is intended to provide a key to understanding the present age.

I discussed the book with Dr Jones and tried to find out the thesis of the book and explore some of the difficult theological and political issues it brings up.

1. What made you decide to write this book?

Reading Daniel Goldhagen's attack on Pius XII. Suddenly, I realized that all of the talk about a new era of Catholic/Jewish relations following Vatican II was a decidedly one-way street. Virtually every celebration of Nostra Aetate's various anniversaries was characterized by Catholics apologizing for everything from St. John's Gospel to the Holocaust and Jews renewing their attacks on the Church as the font of all anti-Semitism with renewed chutzpah.

2. Were you surprised by the size of the undertaking?

The surprise came when I realized that the book was 1,200 pages long, in spite of a rather rigorous paring down during the editing process.

3. What do you mean by Jewish?

A Jew is now a rejecter of Christ and thereby to some extent a rejecter of Logos, which is the Greek word for the rational order of the universe. Insofar as they rejected Christ, the Jews rejected Logos, and in rejecting Logos, they rejected the order of the universe, including its moral or political order. As a result, they became revolutionaries, a decision they solemnly ratified when they chose Barabbas over Christ.

**4. But even your book allows that there is some racial element. After all, many rejecters of Christ/Logos are not Jews. And the Jews are seen in the New Testament as a distinct people who will endure until the End Times when there is a prophecy of conversion. So surely a Jew is not a rejecter of Christ/Logos simpliciter?**

A Jew is an ethnic Jew who has rejected Christ. An ethnic Jew who has accepted Christ is not a Jew. Ethnicity is the necessary but not sufficient condition for being a Jew. The sufficient condition is rejection of Christ. This was ratified by the Israeli Supreme Court when they denied Oswald Rufeisen citizenship because he had been baptized a Catholic. From a more religious perspective I note in the book the words of Jewish scholar Jacob

Neusner: “While not all Jews practice Judaism [it is] the iron-clad consensus among contemporary Jews, Jews who practice Christianity cease to be part of the ethnic Jewish community, while those who practice Buddhism remain within.”

5. What relation, then, does Judaism have with the religion of the Old Testament? What place do the Temple, the Torah and the Talmud have in Judaism?

Judaism is not the religion of the Old Testament. Catholicism is the religion of the Old Testament. Anything that claims to be the religion of the Old Testament must have a Temple, a priesthood, and sacrifice. After the destruction of the Temple in 70 AD, Judaism had none of these things, but the Church had all of them. The Temple was Christ, who explicitly stated that he was its replacement. The Church also had the priesthood, which celebrated the new sacrifice, which was the unbloody sacrifice of the Mass.

Judaism as we know it is a religion that was created by Jochanan ben Zacchai after the destruction of the Temple. It was, as Jews have to admit, not the Old Testament religion, because the Jews at that point had no Temple to perform the sacrifices which were needed to fulfil their covenant. As a result, the Jewish religion became a debating society or school, which met at synagogues. The codification of those debates became known as the Talmud, which got written down between the third and seventh centuries AD. The Talmud is a systematic distortion of the Torah—“Whatever the Torah forbids, the Talmud permits”—whose purpose is to keep the Jewish people away from Logos and in bondage to Jewish leaders.

6. What do you mean by Revolutionary?

Any attempt to overthrow the state or the cultural order of a particular people and replace it with one or other version of Messianic politics which promises us all heaven on earth but ends up delivering something quite different.

**7. But surely there are cultural orders that are largely at odds with Logos. Should not these be overthrown? Moreover, are people like Caiaphas and Annas revolutionaries? Many would regard them rather as reactionaries, fearful of the people’s reception of what they took to be a worldly Messiah.**

In Spe Salvi, Pope Benedict XVI reminds Catholics that the way of revolution, the way of Spartacus and Simon bar Kokhba, is not the Catholic way. He says this knowing, I’m sure, that Aquinas justifies the overthrow of unjust regimes in some instances. We don’t know if Annas and Caiaphas would have joined in the revolution against Rome over 30 years after Christ’s death. I think it is reasonable to think that they would.

8. What do you mean by Spirit?

What the Germans call Geist, which is to say what Aristotle and Plato would call “form,” as in “the soul is the form of the body.”

9. Christians today appear to be most at risk of persecution in Islamic countries and places like China. Aren’t these places where the Jewish Revolutionary Spirit never took hold?

I disagree. No one has been persecuted more ruthlessly than the Catholics of the United States. We simply lack the vocabulary to describe that persecution. That's why I have written, in addition to *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit: and its Impact on World History*, *Libido Dominandi: Sexual Liberation and Political Control*, and *The Slaughter of Cities: Urban Renewal as Ethnic Cleansing*.

**10. But in terms of killing and degradation you still need to account for the enormities which continue to be committed in these countries. One is not banned on pain of death from hearing Mass in the US so we cannot dismiss the persecution in other parts of the world, parts not obviously infected with the Jewish Revolutionary Spirit. Bloody persecution has often been more effective in wiping out Christians than ethnic cleansing of a non-lethal kind. Where do states like China and Saudi Arabia fit with regard to the Jewish Revolutionary Spirit?**

The Gospel tells us not to fear those who can kill the body. I think the point is that there are worse things in this life than physical persecution. Moral corruption is one of them because it kills the soul. And if one thing characterizes the Catholics of the babyboomer generation it is moral corruption, for which they bear responsibility, but we're talking, nonetheless, about a moral corruption which was foisted on them by their parents' generation, through the media, through the corruption of Catholic education, and all of the insidious means I described in *Libido Dominandi*.

The last time I looked China was a communist country. Communism is one of the prime examples of the Jewish revolutionary spirit. Saudi Arabia is run by the Wahhabi sect of Islam. I do not deal with the relationship of Islam to Judaism in the book, but in it you'll find a milder form of the rejection of the cross and suffering in favor of a more carnal vision of worldly power and wealth.

11. What do you say to people who view the Islamic world as a greater threat to the world than this Jewish Spirit?

It depends which "people" you mean. I can understand why Serbs, given their history, would view Islam as a greater threat than the Jewish Revolutionary Spirit, although they certainly suffered under the imposition of Communism. However, when I hear an American talk about the dangers of "Islamofascism," I think it's an infallible sign that I am in the presence of either a propagandist, an intellectual coward or a useful idiot.

12. What do you take the term anti-Semitism to mean?

Anti-Semitism is a form of biological determinism or racism which claims that Jews are prisoners of their DNA. This would manifest itself in the Church, for instance, if someone were to say that a Jewish convert could not be trusted. This ugly attitude has always been repudiated by the Church, which has always maintained that Jewish converts are to be accepted "without calumny." It came out very clearly in Erasmus's attack on Pfefferkorn, which I cover in my book. Anti-Semitism is the flip side of Jewish racism, which claims that Jews are superior because of their DNA. This idea is put forth by the Jews who question Jesus in the Gospel of St. John. They claim that they are somehow racially superior to everyone else because they are the "seed of Abraham." A recent manifestation of this racial outlook was the Charles Murray symposium on Jewish intelligence held at the

American Enterprise Institute.

**13. But aren't there forms of anti-Semitism that are not explicitly racial? For example, if someone shows a great propensity to believe the worst of Jews in spite of a mountain of evidence to the contrary, is he not an bigoted anti-Semite (just as someone might be an anti-Catholic who believes all priests are child abusers in spite of the evidence), even if he has no beliefs about inferior DNA?**

No, anti-Semitism is a racial concept. Being anti-Jewish is something else. It can be rational, as, for example, in the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, where it is a manifestation of the rejection of the rejection of Christ that is obligatory for all Christians, or it can be irrational, but it's fundamentally different from anti-Semitism, which is racial.

14. In your book you refer to your friend the late Rabbi Dresner, a highly moral Jew (and author of *Can Families Survive Pagan America* and *Rachel*). Does he not represent a type of Judaism that takes the Torah seriously and is thoroughly Jewish yet not infected with a Revolutionary Spirit?

Yes, I wish Rabbi Dresner were alive today. He was a man who was open to the truth and, incidentally, an admirer of my writing, who would urge the Catholics he knew to support me by subscribing to *Culture Wars*. On the other hand, he would also write to me and chastise me for talking about Jewish villains. He came to the defense of Leo Pfeffer, who in my opinion was a Jewish villain if ever there was one. So he was torn, as I said in the article I did on him after his death, between Torah and Ethnos. I have no doubt that he was a sincere follower of Torah. But he was also troubled by the fact that virtually every prominent Jew in America—he was particularly annoyed by the cult of Woody Allen—was a proponent of some sort of revolutionary subversion of the moral law. As I said, I wish he were alive today. I would like to know what he would have thought of The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit.

15. You refer to neoconservatism as a Jewish movement, yet the majority of Jews in the US are opposed to it, just as they were to the Iraq war.

We're talking about successive revolutionary movements here. Most Jews still retain an ancestral allegiance to the Messianic ideologies known as Marxism, socialism, communism—in general—the ideologies of the left that were regnant among American Jews during the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Zionism didn't really catch on among American Jews until the collapse of the Black-Jewish alliance and the 1967 Six-Day Arab Israeli war.

**16. Yet you certainly see Neoconservatism as a Jewish Revolutionary movement. Why do you think this and could you tell us what you think Neoconservatism is?**

First of all, Irving Kristol, the founding father of neoconservatism, was a Trotskyite during his college years. If you look at the tenets of neoconservatism--perpetual war, the uprooting of social structures, hierarchies, classes - you see that all the major elements of Trotsky's version of messianic politics have been maintained, *mutatis mutandis*, with the United States instead of the Soviet Union now being the land that is going to liberate the world.

17. You seem to see Protestantism as an inherently Judaizing religion. Can you explain

why?

Because when the Catholics who wanted to break with the Church needed an alternative authority that was as authoritative as the Church they invariably turned to the Old Testament. John Milton's treatise on divorce, in which he appeals to Moses as a greater authority on the issue than Christ, who clearly forbade what Milton wanted to have approved, is a classic instance of what I'm talking about. Judaizing also flowed naturally from the Protestant notion of sola scriptura. If the Bible is our only guide, it's quite natural that the Old Testament will predominate in any question, because there are more books in the Old Testament, and, from a carnal point of view, they are also a lot more interesting. The Old Testament detached from the New Covenant and the Church becomes a gross distortion of what it is meant to be.

18. Aren't some of the great critics of Judaism Protestants - e.g. Martin Luther and Johannes Andreas Eisenmenger. Why should this be?

I can't speak for Eisenmenger, but I do know that Luther was extremely pro-Jewish at the beginning of his career, operating under the principle that the enemy of his enemy (in this case, Rome) must be his friend. Luther also felt that once the Jews were exposed to the gospel in its purity (i.e., as preached by Martin Luther), the Jews would convert in droves. When this didn't happen, Luther (who was nothing if not choleric) turned on the Jews and wrote the violent diatribe against them in the 1540s for which the Lutherans have been apologizing ever since.

19. What is the relation between Freemasonry and the Jewish Revolutionary Spirit?

Freemasonry is another word for what Frances Yates would call "Christian Cabala." It was the "scientific" reaction to the excesses of the Judaizing Englishmen known as Puritans. But the "science" in question derived, via people like Fludd, Bacon, and John Dee, from the Cabala, which was Jewish magic.

20. Arguably the most important European revolution was the French Revolution (not to mention the English Reformation). Yet in the French Revolution there is no evidence of extensive Jewish involvement. Doesn't this present a problem for your thesis?

The French Revolution was a black operation which, as they invariably do, got out of control. The Whigs who came to power in England after the Glorious Revolution of 1688 used the Masonic lodges on the continent to spread Enlightenment propaganda among the Catholic French in order to bring down the House of Bourbon. Voltaire was, as Alexander Pope suspected, a Whig operative and spy. The goal was to bring about the French version of the Glorious Revolution, but when that black operation took on a life of its own and careened out of control, the English were appalled by what they had wrought and declared war on France.

So the French revolution derived from Freemasonry, which was, as I stated above, a form of Cabala. This, of course, rightly leaves the whole question of direct Jewish involvement in the French Revolution out of the picture. **But as Daniel Pipes has pointed out, the evidence is there, even if not as he would portray it. When Barruel got the evidence, in the letter from Simonini, he simply suppressed the evidence, even though he received**

**a letter from both the pope and Napoleon's uncle supporting Simonini's allegations.**

21. You have much to say about Russia but say very little about Stalin's anti-Semitism. Why, according to you, were the Jews persecuted by Stalin's revolutionary movement?

Because every successful revolution leads to a civil war. The Stalin-Trotsky split was inevitable because the victors always quarrel after they win, and the Jew/Goy split in Communism was the ethnic fault-line that no one could ignore.

22. Explain what you mean when you say the Jews rejected Christ/killed Christ. Are you saying that all the Jews in Jerusalem rejected Christ or only some? Are Jews today guilty of deicide? If so, how does this fit in with the idea that all sinners share responsibility for Christ's suffering?

No, obviously not. Many Jews accepted Christ as the Messiah. The situation becomes confusing because of how St. John, for one example, handles the term "Jew." By the end of his Gospel, it's clear that Jew no longer has a purely ethnic meaning. A Jew is primarily someone who rejects Christ. The ethnic Jews who did not reject Christ became known as the Church or the New Israel, at which point blood, DNA were not the point. Nostra Aetate says that "not all Jews at the time of Christ" were guilty of calling for his death. Logically, this, of course, means that some Jews at the time of his death were guilty of deicide. Using the definition of the Jew which St. John formulated, we could say that only Jews were responsible for his death. Those Jews also ratified that death when they said "Let his blood be on us and our children." We are not talking about some occult "blood curse," as some modern day Jews like to portray it. We are talking about a profound and premeditated form of rejection—murder being the ultimate form of rejection—that has perdured to this day. As long as Jews perdure in rejection they will be in the avant garde (as Marx would call it) of revolutionary ferment. Every Christian who sins participates in the rejection of Christ, but they will never constitute an avant garde like Jews because they cannot pervert their status as God's chosen people because they never enjoyed that status.

**23. But wouldn't what you have said make Pilate a Jew? And might there not have been a mass of Jews in Jerusalem who were merely indifferent to Christ?**

Pilate, as a matter of fact, did feel that he was being drawn into a Jewish struggle. That's why he said at one point, "Am I a Jew?" If Pilate felt that way, then the Jews felt the same thing to a much greater degree, to the point where I would say that, at a certain level, no one in Jerusalem at that time was indifferent to Christ. The entire adult Jewish population was either for him or against him. In a sense, all of us have to become one kind of Jew or another, either the kind of Jew who accepted Christ or the kind who rejected him. The United States today is a Jewish country, which is to say a country where the culture is controlled by those Jews who rejected Christ. Any follower of those Jews who accepted Christ is going to be persecuted. As Yuri Slezkine said in his book *The Jewish Century*, modernity has turned us all into Jews.

24. Is Nostra Aetate a document that preaches error with regard to the Jews?

No.

25. What are your thoughts on the papacy of Pope Benedict XVI, and especially on his handling of Catholic-Jewish relations?

The pope has shown a lack of even-handedness in dealing with Muslims and Jews, symbolized best by his trip to Cologne. The pope went to the synagogue in Cologne, where he was insulted by the rabbi there, but the Muslims had to come to meet with him at the chancery office. The pope wags his finger at the Muslims, but he never chastises the Jews in his meetings with them. I think the Muslims are offended by this double standard. Islamic terrorism did not spring full-blown from the mind of Zeus. Much of it is a function of Israeli behavior in Palestine and American support of those policies. To mention the former without mentioning the latter is a manifestation of the double standard they're talking about. The classical Catholic position was articulated in the title of Raimondo Martini's book: *Pugio Fidei adversos Mauros et Iudeos*, or *The Dagger of Faith aimed at Moors and Jews*.

**26. But did not this same pope bring back and amend the Good Friday prayer calling for the conversion of the Jews, thereby showing he was not to be intimidated in these matters?**

As to the pope, I think he realized that the Church stood at the brink of the abyss when he ascended to the throne of Peter. If he had not written that prayer, he would have denied the Gospels, and no pope will ever do that. But this doesn't change the fact that he is not even-handed in dealing with Jews and Muslims.

27. Some people find your language harsh and yet uncritical of Catholic behaviour in the past. Does it worry you that some Jewish readers may be put off by this and become less likely to embrace the Church?

This reminds me of a discussion I had about another book I wrote. The title I chose was "Nigger Hell." When the publisher felt that that title was offensive, I offered to change it to "Nigger Heck." The real issue though is that the title was a direct quote taken from Claude McKay's book *Home to Harlem*. This is the language that was used at the time, and I felt it was better to use that than capitulate to the sensibilities of the school marms and the commissars.

The same is true of *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit*. The shocking part is not so much what I say but what I report other people saying. I have been called an anti-Semite (in Prague, to be specific) for quoting Christ's statement to the Jews, "Your father is Satan." I have been called an anti-Semite for using the phrase "the synagogue of Satan," as if I had made up the term, when I was citing the Book of Revelation. Similarly, I get blamed when a term like "the vomit of Judaism" appears in my book, when the phrase comes from St. Bernard of Clairvaux. I could go on and on, but you get the point. Nothing I have said is as pointed or as "anti-Semitic" as what the evangelists, church fathers, and even Jesus Christ has said before me. The Jews of Jesus' time found language like this off-putting, so I'm not surprised that some Jews would feel the same way today. On the other hand, there are always going to be the "true Hebrews" like Nathaniel, a man without guile, who will respond to the truth when they hear it.

28. And what do you say to the criticism that you have a tendency to minimize or underestimate the bad behavior of those claiming to be Catholic, seeing their behavior, at worst, as reactive to Jewish faults? Surely there is much wrong on both sides, with Catholics having less excuse?

Anyone who reads my book will know that this isn't true. There's plenty of blame to go around here.

29. What have been the consequences to you in undertaking this controversial work? Knowing what you now know, would you do it all again?

Would Zebedee's sons have drunk from the cup if they had known what drinking from it entailed? Probably not. That's why Jesus doesn't let us peek into a crystal ball before he asks us to do something.

30. What has been your experience of Jewish people throughout your life? Did you ever discuss the ideas in your book with them?

From 1966 until 1979 (with the exception of the three years that I spent in Germany), I spent most of my time hanging around with Jews, primarily in the art world (working for Sam Maitin, the Philadelphia artist, and at the Prints for People art gallery, which involved me in hanging shows at the Frank Lloyd Wright-designed synagogue on Old York Road) but in the literary world in Philadelphia as well (through Robert Summers, the playwright, who was my creative writing teacher, poetry readings at the Painted Bride, and graduate school in English and American Literature at Temple University, where Stanley Fish, the "Reader-Response" literary theorist, was one of my teachers). I was also a camp counselor at a summer camp for handicapped children sponsored by the Variety Club, which was a Jewish organization. I have lost contact with just about everyone from that era, but I did discuss the idea of the book with my friend Paul Goldstein in its formative stages.