

THE MYSTERY OF JEWISH HISTORY

Vladimir Moss

© Copyright. All Rights Reserved. Vladimir Moss, 2021.

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	4
<u>I. THE RISE OF ISRAEL</u>	5
1. PRE-AUTOCRATIC THEOCRACY: ABRAHAM	6
2. FROM THEOCRACY TO AUTOCRACY: MOSES	10
3. FAILED AUTOCRACY: SAUL	14
4. REALISED AUTOCRACY: DAVID AND SOLOMON	17
<u>II. THE FALL OF ISRAEL</u>	22
5. JUDAH AND ISRAEL	23
6. FROM ZERUBBABEL TO THE MACCABEES	27
7. HEROD THE GREAT	33
8. THE KING OF THE JEWS	36
<u>III. THE CAPTIVITY OF ISRAEL</u>	41
9. THE JEWS, THE ROMANS AND THE CHRISTIANS	42
10. THE TALMUD	48
11. THE JEWS IN BYZANTIUM	53
12. THE JEWS IN MEDIEVAL RUSSIA	59
13. THE JEWS IN MEDIEVAL EUROPE	67
14. THE CABALA	73
15. THE JEWS IN SPAIN AND HOLLAND	78
16. THE JEWS, THE POLES AND THE COSSACKS	83
17. THE MESSIAH IN TURKEY	86
18. THE JEWS AND THE RISE OF CAPITALISM	90
19. THE JEWS AND ENGLAND	98
20. FREEMASONRY AND THE JEWS	103
21. THE GRAND ORIENT	111
22. FREEMASONRY AND THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION	114
23. MASONRY UNDER THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY TSARS	117

24. CATHERINE AND THE JEWS	125
<u>IV. THE EMANCIPATION OF ISRAEL (1789-1917)</u>	131
25. THE JEWS AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION	132
26. THE JACOBINS AND THE ILLUMINATI	139
27. NAPOLEON AND THE JEWS	150
28. THE JEWS UNDER ALEXANDER I	154
29. THE ROTHSCHILD CENTURY	160
30. VARIETIES OF JEWISHNESS: DISRAELI, HEINE AND MARX	166
31. VARIETIES OF JEWISHNESS: MOSES HESS	179
32. THE JEWS UNDER NICHOLAS I	190
33. THE JEWS UNDER ALEXANDER II	194
34. L'ALLIANCE ISRAËLITE UNIVERSELLE	201
35. THE REVOLUTION FROM BELOW	206
38. THE FOUNDING OF ZIONISM	223
39. THE KISHINEV POGROM	232
40. THE JEWS AND THE RUSSIAN PRESS	235
41. THE JEWS IN THE 1905 REVOLUTION	241
42. THE BEILIS TRIAL	247
43. THE JEWS IN THE 1917 REVOLUTION	257
<u>PART V. JEWISH STATEHOOD RESTORED</u>	266
44. THE BALFOUR DECLARATION	267
45. THE BRITISH MANDATE	276
46. THE STATE OF ISRAEL	279
47. THE ARAB/ISRAELI WARS	293
<u>CONCLUSION: THE RESURRECTION OF ISRAEL</u>	299

INTRODUCTION

“The Jewish Question” remains as topical – and controversial – as ever. Some Orthodox Christians speak and write on little else, considering it to be *the* question, the question that everyone must understand if they are to understand the essence of the modern world and of Christian history in general. They see the fount of all evil in the manipulation of world events by a small sect of God-hating and man-hating Talmudist rabbis. Others are shocked by this attitude, considering it to be anti-semitic, and turn away in disgust whenever the subject is raised. They regard any such idea as serious sin, lack of love and the prolongation of the lies that incited the pogroms and the holocaust.

If we turn to the Holy Scriptures and Church Tradition, then we find some confirmation for both points of view. On the one hand, the Apostle Paul calls the Jews who reject Christ “dogs” (Philippians 3.2); he devotes a whole epistle (Galatians), and large parts of other epistles, to the threat of the Judaizers; and in general treats the Jews as the main enemies of the Christians. On the other hand, he writes: “Has God cast away His people? God forbid” (Romans 11.1); he warns the Christian Gentiles not to boast or be high-minded in relation to the Jews, but to fear lest they themselves fall away (Romans 11.20); for “hardness in part has come upon Israel until the fullness of Gentiles has come in. And so all Israel [believing Jews and Gentiles together] shall be saved” (Romans 11.25-26).

So what is the truth about the Jews? And what should be our attitude towards them? In attempting to answer these questions, I shall adopt an historical approach, beginning with the Jews’ calling by God through Abraham to become God’s people, the chosen race, until their apostasy from Christ in the first century (parts I and II); continuing with the long period in which they lived primarily under Christian rulers of one kind or another (part III); then their emergence onto modern history after the French revolution as an independent political force to be reckoned with by all other players (part IV). The last part of my story covers the period since the Balfour declaration of 1917, when the Jews were granted a national homeland in Palestine and were able to re-establish their independent statehood, ending with the Yom Kippur War of 1973 (part V). In the conclusion, I discuss the prophecies of the repentance and resurrection of Israel, the true Israel that sees God in Jesus Christ.

Through the prayers of our Holy Fathers, Lord Jesus Christ our God, have mercy on us!

*September 4/17, 2021.
Holy Prophet and God-seer Moses.
137 Woking Road, Guildford. GU1 1QX.*

I. THE RISE OF ISRAEL

1. PRE-AUTOCRATIC THEOCRACY: ABRAHAM

*He waited for the City which has foundations,
Whose Builder and Maker is God.
Hebrews 11.10.*

The Jews trace their origins to Abraham, the son of Heber, from which is derived the word "Hebrew".¹ He was called by God to leave his native land and people and go to an unknown land which God would indicate to him. And so, trusting in the Word of God alone, he left the world and was led to the Promised Land of Israel – where, however, he was given no permanent settlement.

Having no land, and being the citizen of no State, Abraham was subject to God alone. He is therefore the type of the Christian, who recognizes only God as his ultimate master, and who obeys human rulers only insofar as they do not contradict the commands of God. For "here we have no continuing city, but seek the one to come" (Hebrews 13.14).

Instead of land and citizenship, Abraham was given certain promises by God. These promises, which are known as *the Abrahamic Covenant*, were so important that they were proclaimed in at least eight different versions, or "drafts" (Genesis 12.1-3, 12.7, 12.13,14-17, 14.18-20, 15.1-19, 16.10-12, 17.1-22, 22.17-18), not to speak of their repetition to Isaac and Jacob. Each successive draft makes the Covenant a little more precise and far-reaching, in response to Abraham's gradual increase in spiritual stature.

The promises declare that, of the two sons of Abraham, Isaac and Ishmael, Isaac is his true heir; being the freeborn son of Sarah, Abraham's wife, it is he who inherits the promises and blessings given to Abraham in full measure. In particular, it is from Isaac's line that the Christ, the Redeemer of the world, through Whom all the nations of the earth shall be blessed, will be born (Genesis 26.3-4). Ishmael, however, being the son of a slave, Hagar, who was Abraham's concubine, not his wife, does not inherit this supreme blessing, although he does receive the promise that his heirs will be strong and numerous.

Isaac is the ancestor of the Jews through his son Jacob and the twelve patriarchs, the sons of Jacob, who went down into Egypt and whose descendants were led out from there by Moses in the Exodus. Ishmael, however, became the ancestor of the Arabs. For his descendants are described as "wild" and warlike by the Angel of the Lord who appeared to Hagar in the desert (Genesis 16.10-12) – a description that appears to correspond closely, as St. Philaret of Moscow points out, to the character and life-style of the Arabs until Mohammed and beyond, who were constantly fighting and lived "in the presence of their brethren" – that is, near, or to the east of, the descendants of Abraham from his other concubine, Hetturah – the Ammonites, Moabites and Idumeans.²

¹ The word "Jew" is derived from Judah, the son of Jacob and ancestor of Christ.

² St. Philaret, *Zapiski rukovodstvuiuschia k osnovatel'nomu razumeniu Knigi Bytia* (Notes leading to a Basic Understanding of the Book of Genesis), Moscow, 1867, part 2, p. 98.

In fact, however, the racial interpretation of the two peoples of the Covenant has only limited validity before the Coming of Christ, and none at all thereafter. For, according to the inspired interpretation of the Apostle Paul, the two peoples - or two covenants, as he calls them - represent, not racial, but *spiritual* categories: "Abraham had two sons: the one by a bondwoman, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born according to the flesh, and he of the freewoman through promise, which things are symbolic. For these are the two covenants: the one from Mount Sinai which gives birth to bondage, which is Hagar - for this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and corresponds to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But the Jerusalem above is free, which is the mother of us all." (Galatians 4.22-26).

In other words, Isaac stands for *the Christians*, both Jewish and Gentile, while Ishmael stands for *the Jews who reject Christ*. For the Christians, - and this includes the Jews before Christ who believed in His Coming, - become through faith in Christ the freeborn heirs of the promises made to Abraham and Isaac, whereas the Jews, by remaining slaves to the Law of Moses and refusing to believe in Christ, show themselves to be the children of the bondwoman, and therefore cannot inherit the promises together with the Christians. Moreover, it can be said of the Jews, as of the men of Ishmael's race, that ever since they rejected Christ they have become "wild", with their hands against all, and the hands of all against them, always striving for "freedom" but remaining voluntarily in slavery to the Law (and to their own kahal).³ It may therefore be that the age-old phenomenon of mutual enmity between the Jews and the Gentiles, of anti-semitism and anti-Gentilism, is prophesied in these verses.

That Isaac is the ancestor of Christ and the Christians is indicated also by his choice of wife, Rebecca, who signifies the Bride of Christ, or the Church. Rebecca is freeborn, being of the family of Abraham, and is an even closer image of the Church than Sarah; for she is Isaac's only wife as the Church is Christ's only Bride. Moreover, the Holy Fathers see in the story of the wooing of Rebecca a parable of Christ's wooing of the Church, in which Eleazar, signifying the Holy Spirit, conveyed Isaac's proposal to her at the well, which signifies Baptism, and gave her gifts of precious jewels, signifying the gifts of the Holy Spirit bestowed at Chrismation.⁴

Ishmael, on the other hand, receives a wife from outside the holy family - from Egypt. And she is chosen for him, not by Abraham or a trusted member of the family, but by his rejected mother, the slave-woman Hagar.

The relationship between Isaac and Ishmael is almost exactly mirrored in the relationship between Isaac's two sons, Jacob and Esau. Thus St. Philaret comments on the verse: "The Lord hath chosen Jacob unto Himself, Israel for His own possession" (Psalms 134.4), as follows: "This election refers in the first place to the person of Jacob, and then to his descendants, and finally and most of all to his spirit of faith: for 'not all [coming from Israel] are of Israel' (Romans 9.6). The two latter elections, that is, the election of the race of Israel, and the election of the spiritual

³ St. Philaret, *Zapiski*, p. 100.

⁴ St. Ambrose of Milan, *On Isaac, or the Soul*.

Israel, are included in the first, that is, in the personal election of Jacob: the one prophetically, and the other figuratively.

“The reality of this prefiguration in Holy Scripture is revealed from the fact that the Apostle Paul, while reasoning about the rejection of the carnal, and the election of the spiritual Israel, produces in explanation the example of Jacob and Esau (Romans 9), and also from the fact that the same Apostle, in warning the believing Jews against the works of the flesh, threatens them with the rejection of Esau (Hebrews 12.16, 17).

“And so Jacob is an image, in the first place, of the spiritual Israel, or the Christian Church in general, and consequently Esau, on the contrary, is an image of the carnal Israel.

“Esau and Jacob are twins, of whom the smaller overcomes the larger: in the same day the spiritual Israel was born together with the carnal, but, growing up in secret, is finally revealed and acquires ascendancy over him.

“Isaac destines his blessing first of all to Esau, but then gives it to Jacob: in the same way the carnal Israel is given the promises from the Heavenly Father, but they are fulfilled in the spiritual [Israel].

“While Esau looks for a hunting catch in order to merit his father’s blessing, Jacob, on the instructions of his mother, to whom God has revealed his destinies, puts on the garments of the first-born and seizes it before him. While the carnal Israel supposes that by the external works of the law it will acquire the earthly blessing of God, the spiritual Israel, with Grace leading it, having put on the garments of the merits and righteousness of the First-Born of all creation, ‘is blessed with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ’ (Ephesians 1.3).

“The sword of battle and continuing slavery is given to the rejected Esau as his inheritance. And for the carnal Israel, from the time of its rejection, there remained only the sword of rebellion, inner enslavement and external humiliation.

“The rejected Esau seeks the death of Jacob; but he withdraws and is saved. The rejected old Israel rises up to destroy the new; but God hides it in the secret of His habitation, and then exalts it in strength and glory...”⁵

As for the wives of Jacob, they also, like Isaac and Ishmael, and Jacob and Esau, signify the spiritual Israel of the Church and the carnal Israel of the non-believing Jews. Thus Leah, whom Jacob married first, signifies with her weak eyes and fertile womb the weak faith of the carnal Israel and its abundant offspring. (It is precisely *blindness* that “shall befall Israel until the fullness of the Gentiles shall come in” (Romans 11.25)).

But Rachel, whom he married later but loved first and most strongly, signifies the New Testament Church, which the Lord loved first but married later. For the

⁵ St. Philaret, *Zapiski*, part 3, pp. 27-28.

Church of the Gentiles, that of Enoch and Noah and Abraham before his circumcision, existed before that of Moses and David and the Old Testament Prophets. Moreover, Rachel brought forth her children in pain because the New Testament Church, brought forth her first children in the blood of martyrdom, and is destined to inherit spiritual blessedness only through suffering - "we must through many tribulations enter the Kingdom of God" (Acts 14.22).

Christ recognized that the unbelieving Jews were the children of Abraham from the racial point of view, saying: "I know that you are Abraham's seed" (John 8.37). And yet only a few moments later He denied that they were true Jews, saying: "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham. But now ye seek to kill Me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God. This did not Abraham. Ye do the deeds of your father... Ye are of your father, the devil" (John 8.39-41, 44). Ultimately, therefore, only Christians belong to the chosen people; only they are the true Jews, whereas the Jews who do not believe in Christ are "the synagogue of satan, who say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie" (Revelation 3.9).

As St. Justin the Martyr wrote: "The seed is divided after Jacob and comes down through Judah and Phares and Jesse to David. Now this is surely a sign that some of you Jews are surely the children of Abraham, and that you will share in the inheritance of Christ. But... a greater part of your people... drink of bitter and godless doctrine while you spurn the word of God." ⁶

Thus the foundations of Israelite statehood lie, not in land (for none was given to Abraham), nor in race (for it is the true believers of all races that are Abraham's descendants), but in *faith*. And so when the first true autocracy is founded, its sole ultimate purpose will be to protect the true faith. All other aims and definitions are secondary to this primary one.

⁶ St. Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*, 34.

2. FROM THEOCRACY TO AUTOCRACY: MOSES

*Thou, O Moses, didst preserve the order of sacrifice precious to God,
And the kingdom and the priesthood.*

Menaion, September 4, Mattins, canon, Ode 7, troparion.

All the major States of antiquity were pagan despotisms that concentrated all power, secular and religious, in the hands of one man, and worshipped him as a god. Insofar as the worship of a created being is a blasphemous lie and places the state under the control of “the father of lies”, Satan, such a state can be called a *satanocracy*. Israel, uniquely among the peoples of antiquity, worshipped no man as God, and had no ruler but God; and so its system can be called a *theocracy*.

However, pure theocracy is an extreme rarity and cannot in practice be sustained for long. The only true theocracy in history has been the Church of Christ – which is not, and cannot be, a State like other States, since its essence and heart is not of this world, being in essence the Kingdom that is not of this world. If, therefore, the people of God are to have a State organization, a system of government that comes as close as possible to rule by God must be devised.

The form of government that is closest to theocracy is what Lev Alexandrovich Tikhomirov called “delegated theocracy”⁷ – that is, *autocracy*, whose essence consists in a division of powers between a king and a high priest, with both recognizing the supreme lordship of the One True God.

The very first, embryonic example of autocracy is to be found, paradoxically, in Egypt – the Egypt of the time of Joseph. For the formal ruler of Egypt, Pharaoh, had placed virtually all power in the hands of Joseph, a servant of the True God – as Joseph himself said, “God...hath made me a father to Pharaoh, and lord of all his land, and a ruler throughout all the land of Egypt” (Genesis 45.8); and Pharaoh also showed great honour to Joseph’s father, Jacob. This honour was particularly manifest at the burial of Jacob, when “all Pharaoh’s servants and the palace dignitaries, joined by all the dignitaries of the land of Egypt” (Genesis 50.7) and went up with Joseph and his family to bury the patriarch in Canaan. The relationship between father and son in Egypt was similar to that of the “symphony of powers” in Byzantium; for just as Joseph recognized the spiritual leadership of Jacob, so Jacob recognized the royal dignity of his son in his bowing down to his cross-like staff.⁸

Moreover, according to St. Ignaty Brianchaninov, it was Joseph, and not any of the pagan Pharaohs, who was “the founder of autocratic (or monarchical) rule in Egypt”⁹, transforming it from patriarchal simplicity to a fully organized state with

⁷ Tikhomirov, *Monarkhicheskaia Gosudarstvennost'* (Monarchical Statehood), St. Petersburg, 1992.

⁸ As the Orthodox Church sings: “Israel, foreseeing the future, did reverence to the top of Joseph’s staff [Genesis 47.31], revealing how in times to come the most glorious Cross should be the safeguard of royal power.” (Menaion, September 14, Exaltation of the Cross, Mattins, Canon, Canticle 7, troparion)

⁹ St. Ignaty, “Iosif. Sviaschennaia povest' iz knigi Bytia” (Joseph. A Holy Tale from the Book of Genesis), *Polnoe Sobranie Tvorenij* (Complete Collection of Works), volume II, Moscow, 2001, p. 37.

permanent citizenship and a land tax, which Joseph instituted to prepare for the years of famine, and which lasted, essentially, for hundreds of years.¹⁰

Of course, Egypt remained a pagan country, and on Jacob's and Joseph's deaths the embryonic "symphony of powers" that existed between them and Pharaoh disappeared, being replaced by the absolutist despotism of the Pharaoh "who knew not Joseph" (Exodus 1.8) and hated Israel. It was in the fire of conflict with this absolutist ruler that the first lasting autocracy, that of Moses, came into being. For Egypt was another totalitarian society that rose up against the True God; its apex was the cult of the Pharaoh, the god-king who was identified with one or another of the gods associated with the sun. The book of *Exodus* tells us how he was defeated in the first "war of national liberation" in history. (However, the Egyptians did not record the fact of his defeat, since gods, according to the Egyptian conception, could not fail.)¹¹

At the beginning of the Exodus, God revealed His name for the first time in the vision of the Burning Bush to Moses on Mount Horeb. The bush that burned without being consumed was a type, or prefiguring, of the Incarnation of Christ from the Mother of God, whose flesh was not consumed by the fire of the Divinity that was in her. God sent Moses to the people of Israel to announce to them their coming deliverance from slavery through the Exodus, and when Moses asked for God's name so that he could identify Who it was that was sending him, "God said unto Moses, 'I AM THAT I AM', and He said: 'Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, 'I AM hath sent me unto you'.'" (Exodus 3.13). Up to that point, God had referred to Himself only as "God Almighty" or "the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" - that is, without a specific allusion to the Second Person of the Trinity or His role in the salvation of mankind. But now that salvation was being brought to the Hebrews it was necessary to point to *the Saviour*, that is, Jesus Christ, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, by the name by which He is known in the Old Testament - Jehovah, "I AM THAT I AM", or "He Who Exists" (in the Greek translation of the Septuagint). For it is the unanimous witness of the Holy Fathers that Jesus Christ the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, is indeed Jehovah, "He Who Exists" from all eternity, Who saved the Israelites from Egypt and later the whole of humanity from sin, death and the devil on the Cross.

¹⁰ Ian Wilson confirms this idea. Records show that there were dramatic fluctuations in the level of Nile flooding, and therefore of the harvest yield, during the reigns of the 19th- and early 18th-century BC Pharaohs. One of those Pharaohs was Senwosret III, in whose time "uniquely in all Egyptian history, the great estates formerly owned by Egypt's nobles passed to the monarchy. They did so in circumstances that are far from clear, unless the Biblical Joseph story might just happen to hold the key: 'So Joseph gained possession of all the farmland in Egypt for Pharaoh, every Egyptian having sold his field because the famine was too much for them; thus the land passed over to Pharaoh' (Gen. 47.20). So could Senwosret III or Amenemhet III, or both, have had an Asiatic chancellor called Joseph, who manipulated the circumstances of a prolonged national famine to centralise power in the monarchy's favour?" (*The Bible is History*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1999, p. 37)

¹¹ Graham Phillips has recently claimed to have discovered traces of this defeat in Egyptian archaeology. According to his theory, the Pharaoh of Moses' time was Smenkhkare, whose tomb was plundered and desecrated by his brother and successor, the famous Tutankhamun, in punishment for his failure to avert the catastrophe of the ten plagues of Egypt (*Act of God*, London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1998). However, in favour of the traditional ascription to Rameses II is the fact that Rameses' body was found filled with seawater - which is consistent with his having been drowned in the Red Sea while pursuing the Israelites.

The name “He Who Exists” points to the complete independence of God from everything created. For He does not exist in dependence on any other existing thing, which is the case of every other being, but is *absolute* being, *being itself*. This was in sharp distinction from pagan religion – of which Egyptian religion was the most developed kind in that period – which could never conceive of God as wholly independent of created beings, but always identified God or the gods with a part or the whole of created being. The name also points, according to Archbishop Theophan of Poltava, to *the fullness of life*, which cannot be identified with any created pleasure or condition, but only with the life of God, devoid of all – that is, anything contrary to the will of God.¹² Being absolute being and the fullness of life, God wishes to save mankind from the false life that identifies itself with created being. Thus God manifests Himself as *the Saviour* for the first time in the Exodus from Egypt.

The time was ripe for the formation of a State structure for Israel. By the time of Moses the Israelites had grown to 400,000 souls, far beyond the size of unit that a single patriarchal figure could know and control unaided, and had become a people with its own internal structure of twelve tribes. They needed *order*, and consequently, both a law and a judicial system to administer it.

That law was given by God Himself as the Supreme Ruler of Israel (Exodus 20 et seq.). And in obedience to God Moses created a judicial system to administer it, delegating the power of resolving disputes to “the chief of your tribes, wise men, and known,” making them “captains over thousands, and captains over hundreds, and captains over fifties, and captains over tens, and officers among your tribes” (Deuteronomy 1.15), while reserving for himself the final court of appeal. Again, at God’s command, he entrusted the priesthood to his brother Aaron, who became the head of the Levitical priesthood. Thus in the relationship between Moses and Aaron we see the first clear foreshadowing of the relationship between the State and the Church, the monarchy and the priesthood. The symphony of these blood brothers foreshadowed the spiritual symphony of powers in both the Israelite and the Christian autocracies.

However, while the Church in Moses’ time was already a reality, with a real high priest under God, the State was not yet fully formed. For Moses was a lawgiver and prophet rather than a king (in fact, he was also a priest). The Israelites would have to wait for a king until they had acquired a *land*. For as the Lord said to the people through Moses: “When thou shalt come unto the land which the Lord thy God shall choose, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me: thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose: one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother... And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests, the Levites. And it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life: that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of this law and

¹² Theophan, *Tetragramma*, St. Petersburg, 1905, p. 61.

these statutes, to do them: that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren, and that he turn not aside from the commandment, to the right hand, or to the left: to the end that he may prolong his days in his kingdom, he, and his children, in the midst of Israel" (Deuteronomy 17.14-15,18-20).

Thus God blessed the institution of the monarchy, but stipulated three conditions if His blessing was to continue to rest on it. First, the people must itself desire to have a king placed over it. Secondly, the king must be someone "whom the Lord thy God shall choose"; a true king is chosen by God, not man. Such a man will always be a "brother", that is a member of the people of God, of the Church: if he is not, then God has not chosen him. Thirdly, he will govern in accordance with the Law of God, which he will strive to fulfill in all its parts.

3. FAILED AUTOCRACY: SAUL

In the period from Moses to Saul, the people were ruled by the Judges, many of whom, like Joshua, Jephtha and Gideon, were holy, truly charismatic leaders. However, towards the end of the period, since "there was no king in Israel; everyone did what seemed right to him" (Judges 21.25), and barbaric acts, such as that which almost led to the extermination of the tribe of Benjamin, are recorded. In their desperation at the mounting anarchy, the people called on God through the Prophet Samuel to provide them with a king.

God fulfilled their request. However, since the people's motivation in seeking a king was not pure, He gave them at first a king who brought them more harm than good. For while Saul was a mighty man of war and temporarily expanded the frontiers of Israel at the expense of the Philistines and Ammonites, he persecuted true piety, as represented by the future King David and his followers, and he allowed the Church, as represented by the priesthood serving the Ark at Shiloh, to fall into the hands of unworthy men (the sons of Eli).

Some democrats have argued that the Holy Scriptures do not approve of kingship. This is not true. Kingship as such is never condemned in Holy Scripture: rather, it is considered the norm of political leadership. Let us consider the following passages: "In all, a king is an advantage to a land with cultivated fields" (Ecclesiastes 5.8); "Blessed are thou, O land, when thou hast a king from a noble family" (Ecclesiastes 10.17); "The heart of the king is in the hand of God: He turns it wherever He wills" (Proverbs 21.1); "He sends kings upon thrones, and girds their loins with a girdle" (Job 12.18); "He appoints kings and removes them" (Daniel 2.21); "Thou, O king, art a king of kings, to whom the God of heaven has given a powerful and honourable and strong kingdom in every place where the children of men dwell" (Daniel 2.37-38); "Listen, therefore, O kings, and understand...; for your dominion was given you from the Lord, and your sovereignty from the Most High" (Wisdom 6.1,3).

The tragedy of the story of the first Israelite king, Saul, did not consist in the fact that the Israelites sought a king for themselves - as we have seen, God did not condemn kingship as long as *He* was recognized as the true King of kings. The sacrament of kingly anointing, which was performed for the first time by the Prophet Samuel on Saul, gave the earthly king the grace to serve the Heavenly King as his true Sovereign. The tragedy consisted in the fact that the Israelites sought a king "like [those of] the other nations around" them (Deuteronomy 17.14), - in other words, a pagan-style king who would satisfy the people's notions of kingship rather than God's, - and that this desire amounted to apostasy in the eyes of the Lord, the only true King of Israel.

Thus the Lord said to Samuel: "Listen to the voice of the people in all that they say to you; for they have not rejected you, but they have rejected Me, that I should rule over them... Now therefore listen to their voice. However, protest solemnly to them, and show them the manner of the king that shall reign over them" (I Kings 8.4-9). And then Samuel painted for them the image of a harsh, totalitarian ruler of the kind that was common in the Ancient World. These kings, as well as having

total political control over their subjects, were often worshipped by them as gods; so that "kingship" as that was understood in the Ancient World meant both the loss of political freedom and alienation from the true and living God.

God in His mercy did not always send such totalitarian rulers to His people, and the best of the kings, such as David, Josiah and Hezekiah, were in obedience to the King of kings. Nevertheless, since kingship was first demanded by the Israelites from a desire to imitate the pagans, it was a retrograde step. It represented the introduction of a worldly principle of allegiance into what had been a society bound together by religious bonds alone, a schism in the soul of the nation which, although seemingly inevitable in the context of the times, meant the loss for ever of that pristine simplicity which had characterized Israel up to then.

It is important to realize that the worldly principle was introduced because the religious principle had grown weak. For the history of the kings begins with the corruption of the priests, the sons of Eli, who were in possession of the ark at the time of its capture. Thus for the kings' subsequent oppression of the people both priests and people bore responsibility - "like people, like priest" (Hosea 4.9).

And yet everything seemed to go well at first. Samuel anointed Saul, saying: "The Lord anoints thee as ruler of His inheritance of Israel, and you will rule over the people of the Lord and save them from out of the hand of their enemies" (I Kings 10.1). Filled with the Spirit of the Lord, Saul defeated the enemies of Israel, the Ammonites and the Philistines.

But the schism that had been introduced into the life of the nation began to express itself, with tragic consequences. First, before a major battle with the Philistines, the king made a sacrifice to the Lord without waiting for Samuel. Western scholars would call this "caesaropapism", the invasion of the Church's sphere by the State. In consequence, Samuel prophesied that the kingdom would be taken from Saul and given to a man after God's heart. As Patriarch Nikon of Moscow wrote: "Listen to what happened to Saul, the first king of Israel. The Word of God said to Samuel: 'I have repented that I sent Saul to the kingdom, for he has ceased to follow Me.' What did Saul do that God should reject him? He, it is said, 'did not follow My counsels' (I Kings 15.10-28)...This is the Word of God, and not the word of man: 'I made you ruler over the tribes of Israel and anointed you to the kingdom of Israel, and not to offer sacrifices and whole-burnt offerings,' teaching for all future times that the priesthood is higher than the kingdom, and that he who wishes for more loses that which is his own."¹³

Secondly, Saul spared Agag, the king of the Amalekites, together with the best of his livestock, instead of killing them all, as God had commanded. His excuse was: "because I listened to the voice of the people" (I Kings 15.20). In other words, he abdicated his God-given authority and *became, spiritually speaking, a democrat*, listening to the people rather than to God. And so Samuel said: "Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, the Lord also shall reject thee from being king over Israel" (I Kings 15.23).

¹³ M.V. Zyzykin, *Patriarkh Nikon*, Warsaw : Synodal Press, 1931, part II, p. 17.

Thirdly, before the fateful battle of Gilboa, Saul consulted a medium...

And so, writes the Chronicler, "Saul died for the unfaithfulness which he had committed against the Lord, because he did not keep the word of the Lord, and also because he consulted a medium for guidance." (I Chronicles 10.13)

To modern readers accustomed to still worse crimes of contemporary rulers, Saul's sins might seem small. However, they must be understood in the context of the previous history of Israel, in which neither Moses nor any of the judges (except, perhaps, Samson), had disobeyed the Lord. That is why Samuel said to Saul: "To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness as iniquity and idolatry" (I Kings 15.22-23).

For even a king can rebel, even a king is in obedience - to the King of kings. Only the absolutist despot feels that there is nobody above him, that there is no law that he, too, must obey. His power is absolute; whereas the power of the autocrat is limited, if not by man and the laws of men, at any rate by the law of God, whose independent guardian and teacher is the priesthood of the Church.

Abraham lived around the year 2000 BC. Moses died, according to tradition, in 1531. Saul was killed at Gilboa, and David was crowned at Hebron, in about 1000...

4. REALISED AUTOCRACY: DAVID AND SOLOMON

*I was established as king by Him, upon Sion His holy mountain,
Proclaiming the commandment of the Lord.
Psalm 2.6.*

The falling away of Saul led directly to the first major schism in the history of the State of Israel. For after Saul's death, the northern tribes supported the claim of Saul's surviving son to the throne, while the southern tribes supported David. Although David suppressed this rebellion, and although, for David's sake, the Lord did not allow a schism during the reign of his son Solomon, it erupted again and became permanent after Solomon's death...

The greatness of David lay in the fact that in his person he represented the true autocrat, who overcame two serious schisms: both that between north and south, and that between the sacred and the profane, the Church and the State. For "like Gideon," notes Paul Johnson, "he grasped that [Israel] was indeed a theocracy and not a normal state. Hence the king could never be an absolute ruler on the usual oriental pattern. Nor, indeed, could the state, however governed, be absolute either. It was inherent in Israelite law even at this stage that, although everyone had responsibilities and duties to society as a whole, society – or its representative, the king, or the state – could under no circumstances possess unlimited authority over the individual. Only God could do that. The Jews, unlike the Greeks and later the Romans, did not recognize such concepts as city, state, community as abstracts with legal personalities and rights and privileges. You could commit sins against man, and of course against God; and these sins were crimes; but there was no such thing as a crime/sin against the state.

"This raises a central dilemma about Israelite, later Judaic, religion and its relationship with temporal power. The dilemma can be stated quite simply: could the two institutions coexist, without one fatally weakening the other?"¹⁴

The reign of David proved that State and Church could not only coexist, but also *strengthen* each other. In a certain sense, the anointed king in the Israelite kingdom could be said to have had the primacy over the priesthood. Thus David appears to have ordered the building of the temple without any prompting from a priest, and Solomon removed the High Priest Abiathar for political rebellion (I Kings 2.26-27). Again, King Jehoshaphat appointed Amariah the chief priest, saying that he was "over you [the Israelites] in all matters of the Lord" (II Chronicles 19.11).

Nevertheless, there was a sphere, the sphere of service in the temple, into which the king entered at his peril, as we see in the case of King Uzziah, who was punished with leprosy for presuming to burn incense before the Lord, that is, for unlawfully taking the place of the priests who alone were ordained for this service...

*

¹⁴ Johnson, *A History of the Jews*, London: Phoenix, 1995, 1998, p. 57.

The central act of David's reign was his conquest of Jerusalem and establishment of the city of David on Zion as the capital and heart of the Israelite kingdom in 993 BC. This was, on the one hand, an important political act, strengthening the centralizing power of the State; for as the last part of the Holy Land to be conquered, Jerusalem did not belong to any of the twelve tribes, which meant that its ruler, David, was elevated above all the tribes, and above all earthly and factional interests. But, on the other hand, it was also an important religious act; for by establishing his capital in Jerusalem, David linked his kingship with the mysterious figure of Melchizedek, both priest and king, who had blessed Abraham at Salem, that is, Jerusalem. Thus David could be seen as following in the footsteps of Abraham in receiving the blessing of the priest-king in his own city.

Moreover, by bringing the Ark of the Covenant, the chief sanctum of the priesthood, to a permanent resting-place in Zion, David showed that the Church and the priesthood would find rest and protection on earth only under the aegis of the Jewish autocracy.

As John Bright writes: "The significance of this action cannot be overestimated. It was David's aim to make Jerusalem the religious as well as the political capital of the realm. Through the Ark he sought to link the newly created state to Israel's ancient order as its legitimate successor, and to advertise the state as the patron and protector of the sacral institutions of the past. David showed himself far wiser than Saul. Where Saul had neglected the Ark and driven its priesthood from him, David established both Ark and priesthood in the official national shrine."¹⁵

The Ark was a symbol of the Church; and it is significant that the birth of the Church, at Pentecost, took place on Zion, beside David's tomb (Acts 2). For David prefigured Christ not only in His role as anointed King of the Jews, Who inherited "the throne of His father David" and made it eternal (Luke 1.32-33), but also as Sender of the Spirit and establisher of the New Testament Church. For just as David brought the wanderings of the Ark to an end by giving it a permanent resting-place in Zion, so Christ sent the Spirit into the upper room in Zion, giving the Church a firm, visible beginning on earth.

Only it was not given to David to complete the third act that was to complete this symbolism, the building of the Temple to house the Ark. That was reserved for his son Solomon, who consecrated the Temple on the feast of Tabernacles, the feast signifying the end of the wanderings of the children of Israel in the desert and the ingathering of the harvest fruits. Such was the splendour of Solomon's reign that he also became a type of Christ. Only whereas David prefigures Christ as the Founder of the Church in Zion, Solomon, through his relationship with foreign rulers, and his expansion of Israel to its greatest extent and splendour, prefigures the Lord's sending of the apostles into the Gentile world and the expansion of the Church throughout the oikoumene. Thus David sang of his son as the type of Him Whom "all the kings of the earth shall worship, and all the nations shall serve" (Psalms 71.11). Moreover, at the very moment of the consecration of the Temple, the wise Solomon looks forward to that time when the Jewish Temple-worship will be

¹⁵ Bright, *A History of Israel*, London: SCM Press, 1980, pp. 200-201.

abrogated and the true worship of God will not be concentrated in Jerusalem, but men of all nations will worship Him “in spirit and in truth” (John 4. 21-23): “for will God indeed dwell on earth? Behold, the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee: how much less this house that I have built” (I Kings 8.27).

As Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow demonstrates, the superiority of the Israelite Autocracy makes of it a model for all nations in all times: “It is in the family that we must seek the beginnings and first model of authority and submission, which are later opened out in the large family which is the State. The father is... the first master... but since the authority of the father was not created by the father himself and was not given to him by the son, but came into being with man from Him Who created man, it is revealed that the deepest source and the highest principle of the first power, and consequently of every later power among men, is in God - the Creator of man. From Him ‘every family in heaven and on earth is named’ (Ephesians 3.15). Later, when sons of sons became a people and peoples, and from the family there grew the State, which was too vast for the natural authority of a father, God gave this authority a new artificial image and a new name in the person of the King, and thus by His wisdom kings rule (Proverbs 8.15). In the times of ignorance, when people had forgotten their Creator... God, together with His other mysteries, also presented the mystery of the origin of the powers that be before the eyes of the world, even in a sensory image, in the form of the Hebrew people whom He had chosen for Himself; that is: in the Patriarch Abraham He miraculously renewed the ability to be a father and gradually produced from him a tribe, a people and a kingdom; He Himself guided the patriarchs of this tribe; He Himself raised judges and leaders for this people; He Himself ruled over this kingdom (I Kings 8.7). Finally, He Himself enthroned kings over them, continuing to work miraculous signs over the kings, too. The Highest rules over the kingdom of men and gives it to whom He wills. ‘The Kingdom is the Lord’s and He Himself is sovereign of the nations’ (Psalms 21.29). ‘The power of the earth is in the hand of the Lord, and in due time He will set over it one that is profitable’ (Sirach 10.4).”

“A non-Russian would perhaps ask me now: why do I look on that which was established by God for one people (the Hebrews) and promised to one King (David) as on a general law for Kings and peoples? I would have no difficulty in replying: because the law proceeding from the goodness and wisdom of God is without doubt the perfect law; and why not suggest the perfect law for all? Or are you thinking of inventing a law which would be more perfect than the law proceeding from the goodness and wisdom of God?”¹⁶

*

Now the reigns of David and Solomon are described in two sources: Kings and Chronicles. Kings contains most of the best-known stories of the two great autocrats, their wars and their wives, their victories and their defeats. But the emphasis of Chronicles is different; it concentrates especially on the kings’ building of the Temple and organization of its liturgical life.

¹⁶ Metropolitan Philaret, quoted in S. Fomin & T. Fomina, *Rossia pered Vtorym Prishestvoiem* (*Russia before the Second Coming*), Moscow, 1994, vol. I, pp. 320-321.

Evidently, as Patrick Henry Reardon points out, for the Chronicler the chief purpose of the Autocracy was the maintenance of the liturgical life of the nation. For the Chronicler remembers David “as the true builder of Solomon’s temple, the spiritual leader who arranged its priestly and Levitical ministries, the master liturgist who composed its music and provided the singers and instruments to give it voice. Compared with these accomplishments, little else about David was worth remembering.

“Moreover, and more importantly, the Chronicler’s view of David is inseparable from his view of Israel. For the Chronicler, what made David different from all other kings of the earth is exactly what made Israel different from all other nations of the earth – the knowledge and correct worship of the one true God.”¹⁷

Since David was the first true king of Israel, a particular importance attaches to God’s covenant with him. This is especially emphasized in the Books of Chronicles. For, as Reardon writes, “By leaving out the details of human history [except the genealogies] prior to David’s monarchy, the Chronicler conveys the impression that everything that happened prior to David was a preparation for the covenant God made with Israel’s first true king.

“Indeed, for the Chronicler the *real* covenant of the Lord is that which He made with David. All the earlier covenants (with Noah, with Abraham, and even with Moses) appear diminished by comparison. This is a perspective unique to the Chronicler. David is his interpretive lens.

“This explains the Chronicler’s lack of interest in the kingdom of Israel, that northern entity established by Jeroboam I at the death of Solomon in 922. Indeed, if the Chronicler does not regard the foundation of the short-lived Northern Kingdom, the schismatic kingdom of Israel (922-722), with so much as an explicit mention, it is precisely because that kingdom was founded in opposition to the Davidic covenant...”¹⁸

So what is the Davidic covenant? On the one hand, “the Lord will build you [David] a house” (I Chronicles 17.10) – evidently, a dynasty, so that “when you must go to be with your fathers, I will set up your seed after you, who will be your sons; and I will establish his kingdom” (v. 11). On the other hand, “he shall build Me a house, and I will establish his throne forever. I will be his Father, and he shall be My son, and I will not take My mercy away from him, as I took it from him who was before you. And I will establish him in My house and in My kingdom forever; and his throne shall be established forever” (vv. 12-14).

The two halves of the covenant are mutually dependent. David’s house, that is, the Davidic dynasty, brings forth Christ, “the Son of David”, Who is also the Son of God and the House of God on earth. The kingdom of David will last forever because it merges into the Kingdom of Christ, Who is the Eternal King...

¹⁷ Reardon, *Chronicles of History and Worship*, Ben Lomond, Ca.: Conciliar Press, 2006, p. 14.

¹⁸ Reardon, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

II. THE FALL OF ISRAEL

5. JUDAH AND ISRAEL

Although King Solomon prefigured Christ in many ways, in other ways – his luxury, his pagan wives and inclination to idolatry, and his vast military projects involving forced labour - he displayed the image of the absolutist pagan despot that the Prophet Samuel had warned against. And after his death, the schism between Church and State that had begun to open in Saul’s reign, but had then been closed by David, began to reopen. The body politic was divided between the two tribes of the southern kingdom of Judah under Rehoboam and the ten tribes of the northern kingdom of Israel under Jeroboam. The political schism was mirrored by a religious schism when Jeroboam built a rival altar and priesthood to the altar and priesthood in Jerusalem.

Archaeology, which has unearthed next to no tangible remains from the time of King David, has revealed much more about the northern kingdom, demonstrating that it was powerful – perhaps more powerful than the southern kingdom. But in the eyes of the prophets it lacked legitimacy, for its origin was rebellion against God and the God-appointed kings and priests in Jerusalem. And when King Ahab’s wife Jezabel began to make Baalism the official religion of the State and to persecute those who resisted her, the holy Prophet Elijah rose up in defence of the true faith, slaughtering the priests of Baal and the soldiers whom Ahab sent against him. After Elijah’s ascension his disciple Elisha continued the struggle. And although he, like Elijah, worked mainly in the northern kingdom, he made clear his loyalty to the right-believing king of Judah over the usurping king of Israel. Thus when both kings, in a rare moment of alliance, approached the prophet for his advice, he said to the king of Israel: “What have I to do with you? Go to the prophets of your father and the prophets of your mother... As the Lord of hosts lives, Whom I serve, were it not that I have regard for Jehoshaphat the king of Judah, I would neither look at you, nor see you” (II Kings 3.13, 14)... Later, Elisha anointed a new king for Israel, Jehu, in the place of Ahab; he led the counter-revolution that killed Jezabel and restored the true faith to Israel.

We read of King Jehoshaphat that he appointed Amariah the chief priest to be over the people in “all matters of the Lord”, and Zebadiah the son of Ishmael as “governor of the house of Judah, in all the king’s matters” (II Chronicles 19.11). In other words, there were autonomous secular and ecclesiastical administrations, but the king was in a certain sense above both, as appointing the leaders in both. This unifying function of the king is found also in New Testaments times, in Byzantium and in those Orthodox kingdoms that were modeled on Byzantium.

Both Israel and Judah enjoyed a certain recovery in the first half of the eighth century. However, idolatry continued, combined with greed, injustice and debauchery. Then Israel descended into a time of troubles in which many illegitimate rulers came briefly to power and then disappeared – “they have set up kings, but not by Me,” said the Lord through the Prophet Hosea (8.3). Instead of relying on the Lord, Israel turned to the foreign powers, and even invaded its brother-state of Judah. Therefore God permitted its conquest by despotic Assyria in 722, and the deportation of its inhabitants to the eastern provinces of the Assyrian empire, which spiritually speaking constituted a reversal of the exodus from Egypt

- "now will He remember their iniquity, and visit their sins; they shall return to Egypt" (Hosea 8.13).

Judah was spared for a time because of the remnants of piety that were still preserved in her. Thus King Hezekiah, though a vassal of Assyria, reversed the syncretistic policies of Ahaz, and Josiah – those of Manasseh. This attracted God's protection, and in one famous incident the angel of the Lord struck down 185,000 of the warriors of Sennacherib in one night. This showed what could be done if faith was placed, not in chariots and horses, but in the name of the Lord God (Psalm 19.7). Moreover, Judah even survived her tormentor Assyria, which, having been used to punish the sins of the Jews, was then cast away and conquered by Babylon (Isaiah 10.15).

In this period, as the people became weaker in faith, the kingship became stronger. This was good if the king was good, for his strength and piety could in part compensate for the weakness of the Church. But if the king worshipped idols, then, like Ahaz, he might reign during his lifetime, but after his death "they did not bring him into the sepulchres of the kings of Israel" (II Chronicles 28.27). And if he did not understand his role, and was not kept in his place by a good high priest, then the results could be catastrophic.

Thus in the reign of King Ozias (Uzziah) the kingship began to encroach on the altar. Blessed Jerome explains: "As long as Zacharias the priest, surnamed the Understanding, was alive, Ozias pleased God and entered His sanctuary with all reverence. But after Zacharias died, desiring to make the religious offerings himself, he infringed upon the priestly office, not so much piously as rashly. And when the Levites and the other priests exclaimed against him: 'Are you not Ozias, a king and not a priest?' he would not heed them, and straightway was smitten with leprosy in his forehead, in accordance with the word of the priest, who said, 'Lord, fill their faces with shame' (Psalm 82.17)... Now Ozias reigned fifty-two years... After his death the prophet Isaias saw the vision [Isaiah 6.1]... While the leprous king lived, and, so far as was in his power, was destroying the priesthood, Isaias could not see the vision. As long as he reigned in Judea, the prophet did not lift his eyes to heaven; celestial matters were not revealed to him."¹⁹

But betrayal could come not only from the kings, but also from the high priesthood. Thus according to Jewish tradition the high priest and temple treasurer in the time of Hezekiah, Somnas, wished to betray the people of God and flee to the Assyrian King Sennacherib. St. Cyril of Alexandria says of him: "On receiving the dignity of the high-priesthood, he abused it, going to the extent of imprisoning everybody who contradicted him."²⁰

Ozias and Somnas represent what have come to be called in Christian times caesaropapism and papocaesarism, respectively – distortion to the right and to the left of the ideal of Church-State symphony.

¹⁹ St. Jerome, *Letter to Pope Damasus*, quoted in Johanna Manley (ed.), *The Bible and the Holy Fathers*, Menlo Park, Ca.: Monastery Books, 1990, p. 412.

²⁰ St. Cyril, *P.G.* 70, 516B.

The prominent role played by the kings in restoring religious purity foreshadowed the similarly prominent role that the Orthodox autocrats would play in defense of the faith in New Testament times. Thus when the Emperor Justinian pressed for the anathematization of the works of three dead heretics, his supporters pointed to the fact that King Josiah had repressed the living idolatrous priests, and burned the bones of the dead ones upon the altar (II Kings 23.16).²¹

Josiah was killed by Pharaoh in the valley of Megiddo. His death, according to David Baron, was “the greatest sorrow which had till then befallen Judah, inasmuch as he was ‘the last hope of the declining Jewish kingdom, and in his death the last gleam of the sunset of Judah faded into night.’ In that great mourning for Josiah the prophet Jeremiah took part, and wrote dirges for it (II Chronicles 35.25), and the national lamentations over him continued and became ‘an ordinance’ in Israel, which survived the seventy years’ captivity and continued ‘to this day’, when the chronicles were closed.”²²

Josiah was Judah’s “last hope” because, as the Prophetess Huldah explained to the king, in spite of his and Hezekiah’s piety, the sins of Ahaz and Manasseh had to be paid for. He himself would be spared the sight of Judah’s punishment, but after his death, judgement was inevitable (II Chronicles 34. 22-28). And so, a few years later, the Lord raised the Babylonian King Nebuchadnezzar to punish her. He destroyed the Temple and exiled the people to Babylon in 586 BC. The Jews had hoped to rebel against the Babylonians by appealing to the other despotic kingdom of Egypt. But the Prophet Jeremiah rebuked them for their lack of faith. If God wills it, he said, He can deliver the people on His own, without any human helpers, as He delivered Jerusalem from the Assyrians in the time of Hezekiah.

However, national independence had become a higher priority for the Jews than their faith. The only remedy, therefore, was to humble their pride by removing their last remaining vestige of independence. And so, said the Prophet, “bring your necks under the yoke of the king of Babylon, and serve him and live! Why will you die, you and your people, by the sword, by the famine, and by the pestilence, as the Lord has spoken against the nation that will not serve the king of Babylon... And seek the peace of the city where I have caused you to be carried away captive, and pray to the Lord for it; for in its peace you will have peace...” (Jeremiah 27.12-13, 29.7).

Nebuchadnezzar’s conquest of Jerusalem and carrying away of the Jews to Babylon, writes L.A. Tikhomirov, “was understood by the Jews as a punishment of God for their apostasy and corruption. In Babylonia, therefore, there began a process of repentance and regeneration. But on the other hand a powerful spiritual temptation awaited the Jews. Chaldea at that time had become an advanced country of pagan culture. In respect of religion it preserved all the charms of the magic of ancient Sumeria and Akkad, adding to it the astronomical and astrological science of Assyrian star-gazing. The three main branches of ‘Chaldean wisdom’ combined a considerable fund of real scientific knowledge with the higher philosophy worked out through the ages by the mind of the Assyro-Babylonians, combined with the teaching of Zoroaster and offshoots of Hinduism. Paganism presented itself before

²¹ A.A.Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1952, p. 152.

²² Baron, *Commentary on Zechariah*, Grand Rapids, Mich.: Kregel Publications, 1988, pp. 451-452.

the captives from Jerusalem as a huge intellectual power armed with everything that men could learn and assimilate at that time.

“To this we must add that Babylon had attained the highest level of political might and represented a remarkable system of state structure which was hardly excelled by all the ancient states. A profoundly worked out law guaranteed the inhabitants’ rights, and the Babylonian citizens of other tribes here came upon such perfect civil conditions as they could not even imagine in their native countries. The agriculture, industry and trade of Babylon were at a high level of development. As captives of another tribe, crushed materially and morally, recognizing that they had betrayed their Lord, the Jews came into a country that was striking by its might, glitter, wealth, knowledge, developed philosophical thought – everything by which one nation could influence another. If they ‘sat by the waters of Babylon and wept’, dreaming of revenge on the destroyers of their fatherland, they also could not help being subjected to the influences of Chaldean wisdom.

“They had grown up in the thousand-year conviction of the loftiness of their chosen people, of which there was no equal upon the earth. They remembered amazing examples of the help of the Lord in the past, when He had crushed the enemies of Israel, including the Assyrians themselves. They were filled with determination to raise themselves to the full height of their spirit and their providential mission. On the other hand, they did not have the strength not to submit to the intellectual influence of Babylon. In general, the age of the Babylonian captivity was the source of very complex changes in Israel. In the higher sphere of the spirit prophetic inspirations finally matured to the vision of the nearness of the Messiah. In the conservative layer of teachers of the law there arose a striving to realize that ‘piety of the law’, the falling away from which, as it seemed to all, had elicited the terrible punishments of God. There began the establishment of the text of the law and the collection of tradition; an embryonic form of Talmudic scholarship was born. Beside it, the masses of the people involuntarily imbibed the local pagan beliefs, and the teachings of ‘Chaldean wisdom’ was reflected in the minds of the intelligentsia; there was born the movement that later expressed itself in the form of the Cabbala, which under the shell of supposedly Mosaic tradition developed eastern mysticism of a pantheistic character...”²³

²³ Tikhomirov, *Religio-Filosofskie Osnovy Istorii* (The Religio-Philosophical Foundations of History), Moscow, 1997, pp. 135-136.

6. FROM ZERUBBABEL TO THE MACCABEES

Although the political schism between Israel and Judah had been “healed” by the disappearance of the northern kingdom of Israel, and although the political passions of Judah had been at least partially quenched by the exile to Babylon in 586, the spiritual “schism in the soul”, the schism between faithfulness to the God of Israel and the opposite tendency, remained among the Jews. In the Prophets Ezekiel and Jeremiah we see how, even in exile, most of the Jews did not repent but stayed among the pagans and learned their ways. At the same time, the books of Daniel, Esther and Tobit show that piety was not completely extinguished even among those Jews who stayed in Persia; and a pious remnant, stirred up by the Prophets Haggai and Zechariah, returned to Jerusalem under Zerubbabel to rebuild the Temple.

Zerubbabel is called “governor of Judah” rather than king, because he was still under the suzerainty of Persia. However, he was of the line of David, so it was through his line that the promises of God concerning the continuance of the autocracy were passed. Moreover, he carried out the functions of an autocrat on a small scale; that is, he saw as his primary task the restoration of the Temple, the true worship of God. And in his relationship with the chief priest, Joshua, he mirrored the “symphony” between Church and State that we find in all true autocracies. Thus in the prophetic vision of Zechariah chapter 4, Joshua and Zerubbabel are seen as two olive trees, the two anointed ones through whom God’s grace is given to the people.

In chapter 6, we have a striking messianic prophecy about Him Who would combine the roles of king and priest within Himself, being Himself the Source of grace for both the autocracy and the priesthood. For as crowns are placed on the head of Joshua, the Lord says: “Behold the Man whose name is the Branch; and He shall grow up out of His place; and He shall build the Temple of Jehovah; even He shall build the Temple of Jehovah; and He shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon His throne; and He shall be a priest upon His throne; and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.” That this refers primarily to Jesus the Messiah rather than Joshua the Jewish high priest is evident from several facts. First, the phrase “Behold the man” was later to be used by Pilate of Christ, and the name “Jesus” is in fact the same as “Joshua”. Secondly, the “Branch” is a name for the Messiah in several Old Testament prophecies (cf. Isaiah 4.2, 11.1; Jeremiah 23.5, 33.15). Earlier, the Lord had said to Joshua that He would bring forth His servant, the Branch (3.8), so Joshua and the Branch are not in fact the same person. It is the Branch, not Joshua, Who will build the Temple, not of the Old Testament Church (that was completed by Zerubbabel), but of the New Testament Church, the Body of Christ. He will “sit upon His throne”, which is not a normal thing for a priest to do, because He is not only a priest but also a king. In fact, He is both the King of the Jews, and the High Priest, being the only Person (except for Melchizedek) ever rightfully to combine the two roles, or two “crowns”, in one Person. Normally, the attempt to combine the two roles leads to war between God and man; but Christ, being the rightful King and Priest, brings “the counsel of peace” between them...

The rebuilding of the Second Temple under Zerubbabel was a very small-scale,

inglorious affair by comparison with the building of the First Temple under Solomon (Haggai 2.3). But in fact its glory would be greater than that of Solomon's Temple (Haggai 2.8) because the great King and High Priest, of whom all kings and high priests were only forerunners and types, would Himself enter into it, sanctifying it by His presence. That is perhaps why, from the time of Zerubbabel and the building of the Second Temple to the Coming of Christ over five hundred years later, there is no real restoration of the Israelite Autocracy: all eyes were now to be trained not on the shadow of the True Autocracy, but on its substance, not on the forerunners of the true Autocrat and King of the Jews, but on the Man Himself...

Probably the most important Jewish leader in this transitional period was the priest Ezra. "His main task," writes Tikhomirov, "was the re-establishment of the Law of Israel. Under him there began a collecting of the Sacred Scriptures and traditions, and the people's getting to know them, and a multiplication of copies of Scripture. Around him there gathered the so-called soferim – the first 'scribes', the forerunners of the Pharisees. Under their leadership the regeneration of Israel progressed, but this regeneration was placed in the soil of the most narrow exclusiveness. The inhabitants of Palestine in the time of the captivity, the Samaritans and others, wanted to join the Jews and serve Jehovah together with them, but they were severely rejected. Since a very large number of mixed marriages had been entered into, and a significant number of children had been born from them, a triumphant repentance of the people was appointed, the marriages were broken, and the foreign wives and their children were sent back to their parents.

"The task of the religious conservatives, who were first of all national patriots, consisted in strongly organizing the Jewish people and concentrating it under the leadership of the intelligentsia of that time – the Pharisees. This was not a priestly party and was even hostile to the 'Sadducees', the priestly party. The Pharisees constituted the *intelligentsia*, who, inflating the cult of the law, received in it the means for holding the whole people in their hands. The interpretation of the law given by the Pharisees was in general rational and humane, being adapted to the conditions and way of life of the time. But the endless details of the law thus interpreted required a special class of scholars, since the mass of the people had no opportunity to study these details and subtleties and had to seek enlightenment and guidance from the specialists.

"It was these nationalists who at that decisive moment of history determined the destinies of Israel..."²⁴

However, we are running ahead of our story... In spite of the attempt to revive observance of the law under Ezra and Nehemiah, piety declined in Israel, especially after the conquest of the Persian empire by Alexander the Great. Not that *he* harmed Judah: on the contrary, he even gave equal citizenship to the Jews of Alexandria. The trouble began only after Alexander's death, when "his servants [the Ptolemys and Seleucids] bore rule every one in his place. And... they all put crowns upon themselves: so did their sons after them many years: and evils were multiplied in the earth..." (I Maccabees 1.7-9).

²⁴ Tikhomirov, *Religiozno-Filosofskie Osnovy Istorii*, pp. 141-142.

The image of “putting crowns upon themselves” reminds us of the difference between the true, autocratic king, whose crown is given him by God, and the false, despotic king, who takes the crown for himself in a self-willed manner.

“The pagan idea of kingship was only one of the aspects of pagan culture that now began to penetrate Jewry, leading to conflicts between conservative, law-based and reformist, Hellenist-influenced factions among the people. Those who were occupied with this and guided the people, that is, the Pharisees and Scribes, who produced interpretations by their joint efforts and composed the ruling class. They were undoubtedly deeply convinced people who faithfully served the idea of the Jewish fatherland and were able to achieve popularity. According to their interpretation, the Messiah who was to come had to appear as the political leader of Israel and accomplish the domination of the Jews in the pagan world. The Kingdom of God was understood as the earthly kingdom of Israel. Their passionate conviction that these dreams would be fulfilled showed itself in successive rebellions of the Jews, in those ‘zealots’ whose first representative was Judah of Galilee, who died in a rebellion in the time of Christ.”²⁵

In 175 Antiochus IV Epiphanes, a god-king on the Middle Eastern despotic model, came to power. As US Senator Joseph Lieberman points out, “The ruler’s name hinted at imminent struggle; Antiochus added the title to his name because it meant, ‘A Divine Manifestation’. That underscored the primary difference between the ancient Greeks and Jews: The Greeks glorified the magnificence of man, while the Jews measured man’s greatness through his partnership with the Creator. For the children of Israel, man was created in the image of God; for the ancient Greeks, the gods were created in the likeness of man.”²⁶

Johnson has developed this distinction, one of the most important in the history of ideas: “The Jews drew an absolute distinction between human and divine. The Greeks constantly elevated the human – they were Promethean – and lowered the divine. To them gods were not much more than revered and successful ancestors; most men sprang from gods. Hence it was not for them a great step to deify a monarch, and they began to do so as soon as they embraced the orient [where, as we have seen, kings were commonly deified]. Why should not a man of destiny undergo apotheosis? Aristotle, Alexander’s tutor, argued in his *Politics*: ‘If there exists in a state an individual so pre-eminent in virtue that neither the virtue nor the political capacity of all the other citizens is comparable with his... such a man should be rated as a god among men.’ Needless to say, such notions were totally unacceptable to Jews of any kind. Indeed, there was never any possibility of a conflation between Judaism and Greek religion as such; what the reformers [the Hellenising Jews] wanted was for Judaism to universalize itself by pervading Greek culture; and that meant embracing the polis.”²⁷

²⁵ Tikhomirov, *op. cit.*

²⁶ Lieberman, “Hanukkah”, *Orthodox Christian Witness*, vol. XXXIII, N 10 (1483), January 17/30, 2000, p. 5.

²⁷ Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

Antiochus was soon acting, not as “Epiphanes”, “divine manifestation”, but as his enemies called him, “Epimanes”, “raving madman”. In his eagerness to speed up the Hellenization of Judaea, he removed the lawful Jewish high-priest Onias and replaced him by his brother Jason, who proceeded to introduce pagan Hellenistic practices. After a struggle for power between Jason and Menelaus, another hellenizing high-priest, Antiochus invaded Jerusalem in 168. He plundered the Temple, led many of the people away into slavery, banned circumcision, Sabbath observance and the reading of the law, declared that the Temple should be dedicated to the worship of Zeus, that pigs should be sacrificed on the altar, and that non-Jews should be permitted to worship there with Jews. Those who resisted him were killed.

Lieberman continues: “The Jews resisted Antiochus’ edict and worshipped in secret. The conflict festered before finally coming to a head in Modi’in, a small village outside Jerusalem, where a priest named Matityahu rose up against a Greek soldier who dared sacrifice a swine on the village altar. Soon thereafter, Antiochus’ army swept through Jerusalem and ravaged the Holy Temple, torturing and murdering many Jews along the way.”²⁸

But a liberation movement led by Matityahu (Mattathias) and his sons succeeded in expelling the Greeks from Israel, purifying the Temple and restoring the True Faith. This victory, which is celebrated to this day in the feast of Hannukah, or Purification, is a clear example of how, in certain extreme circumstances when the faith is under direct attack, God blesses the taking up of arms in defense of the faith.

However, a true autocracy on the Davidic model was not re-established in Judah, for the Maccabees (or Hasmonaeans, as they were called after Matityahu’s surname, Hasmon) unlawfully combined the roles of king and high priest (I Maccabees 13.42). Their dynasty, which continued from 168 to 37 B.C., was composed exclusively of representatives of the tribe of Levi, who according could only be priests, not kings. For God’s covenant with David had been with him and his son; the promises were only to the descendants of the tribe of Judah.

Since the Hasmonaeans’ combination of priestly, kingly and legal power in the hands of one person was illegal, the crisis of the restoration of the Jewish autocracy was not resolved. It could only be resolved by the Coming of the Son of David and Lion of Judah, Christ Himself...

Simon’s son, John Hyrcanus, writes Johnson, “accepted as literal truth that the whole of Palestine was the divine inheritance of the Jewish nation, and that it was not merely his right but his duty to conquer it. To do this he created a modern army of mercenaries. Moreover, the conquest, like Joshua’s, had to extirpate foreign cults and heterodox sects, and if necessary slaughter those who clung to them. John’s army trampled down Samaria and razed the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim. He stormed, after a year’s siege, the city of Samaria itself, and he demolished it entirely, and brought streams to it to drown it, for he dug ditches to turn it into floods and water-meadows; he even took away the very marks which showed a city

²⁸ Lieberman, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

had been there.’ In the same way he pillaged and burned the Greek city of Scythopolis. John’s wars of fire and sword were marked by massacres of city populations whose only crime was that they were Greek-speaking. The province of Idumaea was conquered and the inhabitants of its two main cities, Adora and Marissa, were forcibly converted to Judaism or slaughtered if they refused.

“Alexander Jannaeus, John’s son, took this policy of expansion and forcible conversion still further. He invaded the territory of the Decapolis, the league of ten Greek-speaking cities grouped around the Jordan. He swept into Nabataea and took Petra, the ‘rose-red city half as old as time’. He moved into the province of Gaulanitis. The Hasmoneans pushed north into the Galilee and Syria, west to the coast, south and east into the desert. Behind their frontiers they eliminated pockets of non-Jewish people by conversion, massacre or expulsion. The Jewish nation thus expanded vastly and rapidly in terms of territory and population, but in doing so it absorbed large numbers of people who, though nominally Jewish, were also half Hellenized and in many cases were fundamentally pagans or even savages.

“Moreover, in becoming rulers, kings and conquerors, the Hasmoneans suffered the corruptions of power. John Hyrcanus seems to have retained a reasonably high reputation in Jewish traditional thought. Josephus says he was considered by God ‘worthy of the three greatest privileges: government of the nation, the dignity of the high-priesthood, and the gift of prophecy’. But Alexander Jannaeus, according to the evidence we have, turned into a despot and a monster, and among his victims were the pious Jews from whom his family had once drawn its strength. Like any ruler in the Near East at this time, he was influenced by the predominantly Greek modes and came to despise some of the most exotic, and to Greek barbarous, aspects of the Yahweh cult. As high-priest, celebrating the Feast of Tabernacles in Jerusalem, he refused to perform the libation ceremony, according to ritual custom, and the pious Jews pelted him with lemons. ‘At this,’ Josephus wrote, ‘he was in a rage, and slew of them about six thousand.’ Alexander, in fact, found himself like his hated predecessors, Jason and Menelaus, facing an internal revolt of rigorists. Josephus says the civil war lasted six years and cost 50,000 Jewish lives.

“It is from this time we first hear of the Perushim or Pharisees, ‘those who separated themselves’, a religious party which repudiated the royal religious establishment, with its high-priest, Sadducee aristocrats and the Sanhedrin, and placed religious observance before Jewish nationalism. Rabbinic sources record the struggle between the monarch and this group, which was a social and economic as well as a religious clash. As Josephus noted, ‘the Sadducees draw their following only from the rich, and the people do not support them, whereas the Pharisees have popular allies.’ He relates that at the end of the civil war, Alexander returned in triumph to Jerusalem, with many of his Jewish enemies among his captives and then ‘did one of the most barbarous actions in the world... for as he was feasting with his concubines, in the sight of all the city, he ordered about eight hundred of them to be crucified, and while they were living he ordered the throats of their children and wives to be cut before their eyes’...

“Hence, when Alexander died in 76 BC, after he had (according to Josephus) ‘fallen into a distemper by hard drinking’, the Jewish world was bitterly divided

and, though much enlarged, included many half-Jews whose devotion to the Torah was selective and suspect..."²⁹

²⁹ Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 107-109.

7. HEROD THE GREAT

It was at this point that the shadow of Roman power (with which the Maccabees had maintained friendly relations³⁰) began to fall across the scene, taking the place of the already severely weakened Seleucids. In 64 the Roman general Pompey arrived in Antioch and deposed the last of the Seleucid kings. The two sons of Alexander Jannaeus, Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II, were fighting each other for the kingship and high priesthood at this time, and they both appealed to Pompey for help. The Pharisees also sent a delegation to him; but they asked him to abolish the monarchy in Judaea, since they said it was contrary to their traditions. In 63 Pompey, taking the side of Hyrcanus, captured Jerusalem and, to the horror of the Jews, entered the Holy of Holies.

Later, an Idumaeen named Antipater came to power. His son, who was placed in charge of Galilee, was named Herod, known in history as “the Great”, the first persecutor of Christianity, and the man who finally destroyed the Israelite autocracy... In 43 BC, Antipater was poisoned by the Jewish nationalist party, and his son Herod was forced by the Sanhedrin to flee to Rome. Thus when the Hasmonean Antigonus with the help of the Parthians conquered Jerusalem in 37, Herod was in Rome being fêted by Antony and Octavian. In a triumphant procession they led him to the Capitol. “And there, as A. Paryaev writes, “amid sacrifices to Jupiter of the Capitol that were impermissible for a Jew, and which caused deep consternation among the Jews, he was formally raised onto the Jewish throne.”³¹ Three years later, after a bloody civil war in which the Jews supported Antigonus, Herod was installed in Jerusalem with the aid of the Roman legions.

Now since Herod was not only not of the line of David, but not even a Jew by birth³², pious Jews inevitably wondered how the promises made by God to David about the eternity of his dynasty (Psalms 131.11-15) could be fulfilled. Perhaps the time had come for the appearance of the Messiah, whose kingdom would be eternal. After all, the “seventy times seven” prophecy of Daniel (9.24-27) indicated that his coming would be in the first half of the first century AD.³³ Moreover, had not the Patriarch Jacob, declared: “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto Him shall the gathering of the people be” (Genesis 49.10)? Now that the sceptre, in the form of the Jewish kingship,

³⁰ See I Maccabees 8 for a fascinating and largely approbatory portrait of the Roman republic.

³¹ Paryaev, “Tsar Irod i ego Soobschiki: Istoria i Sovremennost’” (“King Herod and his Associates: History and Modernity”), *Suzdal'skie Eparkhial'nie Vedomosti* (Suzdal Diocesan News), N 3, January-February, 1998, pp. 31-32.

³² Tom Mueller writes: “His mother was an ethnic Arab, and his father was an Edomite, and though Herod was raised as a Jew, he lacked the social status of the powerful old families in Jerusalem who were eligible to serve as high priest, as the Hasmonaean kings had traditionally done. Many of his subjects consider Herod an outsider – a ‘half Jew’, as his early biographer, the Jewish soldier and aristocrat Flavius Josephus later wrote – and continued to fight for a Hasmonaean theocracy.” (“Herod: The Holy Land’s Visionary Builder”, *National Geographic Magazine*, December, 2008, p. 41).

³³ Bishop Alexander (Mileant) of Argentina (“On the Threshold”, *Orthodox America*, vol. XVIII, N 5 (161), January, 2000, p. 12) writes: “Daniel’s prophecy so explicitly and synonymously points to Jesus Christ as the promised Messiah, that the Gemaric rabbi forbids his compatriots to calculate the dates of the Daniel septenaries, saying, ‘Those who calculate the times will hear their bones rattle’ (Sanhedrin 97).”

appeared to have departed from Judah, was it not time for the appearance of Shiloh?

34

Herod tried to remedy the fault of his non-Jewish blood by marrying the Hasmonaean princess Mariamne, the grand-daughter of King Aristobulus and Hyrcanus II on her mother's side. He also rebuilt the Temple with unparalleled splendour. But his Jewish faith was superficial. When Octavian declared himself divine, he built a temple in his honour in Samaria, renaming it Sebaste, the Greek equivalent of the emperor's new title, Augustus. And he built so many fortresses, gymnasia, temples and other buildings that Palestine under Herod (Octavian made him procurator of Syria, too) became the most powerful Jewish kingdom since Solomon and the wonder of the East.

Under Herod, the Jews, though under Roman dominion, reached the peak of their influence in the ancient world. But of course the essence of the kingdom was quite different from that of David and Solomon. Apart from the fact that the real ruler was Rome, and that outside Jerusalem itself Herod showed himself to be a thorough-going pagan (for example, he rebuilt the temple of Apollo in Rhodes), the whole direction of Herod's rule was to destroy the last remnants of the Jewish Church and monarchy. Thus he killed most of the Sanhedrin and all of the Hasmonaean family, not excluding his own wife Mariamne and their sons Alexander and Aristobulus. He was, in fact, the closest type of the Antichrist in Old Testament history...

Metropolitan Moses of Toronto writes: "Without Roman rule, Herod would not have [had] a place in the Jewish kingdom. At a time when it seemed his rule was threatened he killed his father-in-law Hyrcanus. Later he arranged that his brother-in-law Aristobulus be made High Priest. Aristobulus was from the Hasemonian dynasty and a legitimate choice for high priest. For this reason he was extremely popular with the Jews and fearing his popularity, the tyrant Herod had him drowned in an 'accident.' From this point on, the high priests were not of the legitimate lineage and were put in place by the tyrant Herod, i.e., not according to the proper order.

"Shapiro, a modern Rabbi comments, 'As a result of Herod's interference and the ever-spreading Hellenistic influences among the Jewish upper classes, the Temple hierarchy became very corrupt. The Sadducees, a religious group of the wealthy, who collaborated with the Romans in order to keep their power base, now controlled the Temple, much to the chagrin of the mainstream Jewish majority, the Pharisees, and of the extreme religious minority, the Zealots.'

³⁴ Bishop Alexander recounts a tradition from the Midrash "that when the members of the Sanhedrin learned that they had been deprived of the right to try criminal cases (in AD 30), they put on sackcloth and, tearing their hair, gathered and began to cry out: 'Woe to us, woe to us: it has been a great while since we had a king from Judah, and the promised Messiah is not yet come!' This occurred at the very beginning of Jesus Christ's ministry" (*ibid.*).

“This was the state of things when ‘in the fullness of time’ our Creator fulfilled His promises. These events were prophesied to take place when ‘a ruler failed from the house and lineage of Judah.’”³⁵

“The last years of the life of Herod,” writes Paryaev, “were simply nightmarish. Feeling that his subjects profoundly hated him, haunted at night by visions of his slaughtered wife, sons and all the Hasmoneans, and conscious that his life, in spite of all its external successes and superficial splendour, was just a series of horrors, Herod finally lost his mental stability and was seized by some kind of furious madness.”³⁶ The final product of his madness was his attempt to kill the Lord Jesus Christ and his slaughter of the 14,000 innocents of Bethlehem (it was his son, Herod Antipas, who killed John the Baptist).

Perhaps the clearest sign of the degeneration of the Jews under Herod was the behaviour of the Pharisees. We have seen that they had led the movement against Hellenising influences in the first century BC, and were zealots of the purity of the law. But just as the Maccabee movement for renewal of the true faith degenerated into its opposite, so did that of the Pharisees who in matters of religion became hypocritical worshippers of the letter of the law while ignoring its spirit, and in politics became extreme nationalists...³⁷

In the Old Testament, the faith of the Jews, though turned in on itself to protect itself from paganism, contained the seeds of true universalism. Thus God commanded Abraham to circumcise not only every member of his family, but also “him that is born in the house, or bought with the money of any stranger, which is *not* of thy seed” (Genesis 17.12). The Canaanite Rahab and the Moabite Ruth were admitted into the faith and nation of the Jews. King Solomon prayed that God would hear the prayer of non-Israelites who prayed in his temple, “that all people of the earth may know Thy name, and fear Thee, as doth Thy people Israel” (II Chronicles 6.33). And by the time of Christ there was a large Greek-speaking diaspora which was spreading the faith of the Jews throughout the Greco-Roman world and winning converts such as the Roman centurion Cornelius (Acts 11).

However, the Pharisees, who from this time came to dominate Jewry, were interested only in converts to the cause of Jewish nationalism (cf. Matthew 23.15). It was the Pharisees who incited Christ’s death because He preached a different kind of spiritual and universalist Kingdom that was opposed to their nationalist dreams. And after His death the Jews became possessed by an egoistical, chauvinist spirit that was expressed in such a way that, as Rabbi Solomon Goldman put it, “God is absorbed in the nationalism of Israel.”³⁸

³⁵ Metropolitan Moses, *Sermon on the Feast of the Entry of the Theotokos into the Temple*, 2013.

³⁶ Paryaev, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

³⁷ Their nationalism did not prevent them, however, from sending a delegation to Rome asking for the establishment of a *republic* in Judaea under the sovereignty of Rome (Paryaev, *op. cit.*, p. 34).

³⁸ Goldman, in Douglas Reed, *The Controversy of Zion*, Durban, South Africa, 1978, p. 48.

8. THE KING OF THE JEWS

Let us try and understand how the Jews' nationalism led them to apostasy from their true King and God.

William Barclay writes: "Throughout all their existence, the Jews never forgot that they were in a very special sense God's chosen people. Because of that, they naturally looked to a very special place in the world. In the early days, they looked forward to achieving that position by what we might call natural means. They always regarded the greatest days in their history as the days of David; and they dreamed of a day when there would arise another king of David's line, a king who would make them great in righteousness and in power (Isaiah 9:7, 11:1; Jeremiah 22:4, 23:5, 30:9).

"But as time went on, it came to be pitilessly clear that this dreamed-of greatness would never be achieved by natural means. The ten tribes had been carried off to Assyria and lost forever. The Babylonians conquered Jerusalem and carried the Jews away captive. Then came the Persians as their masters; then the Greeks; then the Romans. So far from knowing anything like dominion, for centuries the Jews never even knew what it was to be completely free and independent.

"So another line of thought grew up. It is true that the idea of a great king of David's line never entirely vanished and was always intertwined in some way with their thought; but more and more they began to dream of a day when God would intervene in history and achieve by supernatural means that which natural means could never achieve. They looked for divine power to do what human power was helpless to do.

"In between the Testaments were written a whole flood of books which were dreams and forecasts of this new age and the intervention of God. As a class, they are called *Apocalypses*. The word literally means *unveilings*. These books were meant to be unveilings of the future. It is to them that we must turn to find out what the Jews believed in the time of Jesus about the Messiah and the work of the Messiah and the new age. It is against their dreams that we must set the dream of Jesus.

"In these books, certain basic ideas occur. We follow here the classification of these ideas given by Emil Schuerer, who wrote *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*.

"(1) Before the Messiah came, there would be a time of terrible tribulation. There would be a messianic travail. It would be the birth-pangs of a new world. Every conceivable terror would burst upon the world; every standard of honour and decency would be torn down; the world would become a physical and moral chaos.... The time which preceded the coming of the Messiah was to be a time when the world was torn in pieces and every bond relaxed. The physical and the moral order would collapse.

"(2) Into this chaos there would come Elijah as the forerunner and herald of the Messiah. He was to heal the breaches and bring order into the chaos to prepare the way for the Messiah. In particular he was to mend disputes....

“(3) Then there would enter the Messiah.... Sometimes the Messiah was thought of as a king of David's line, but more often he was thought of as a great, superhuman figure crashing into history to remake the world and in the end to vindicate God's people.

“(4) The nations would ally themselves and gather themselves together against the champion of God....

“(5) The result would be the total destruction of these hostile powers. The Jewish philosopher Philo said that the Messiah would 'take the field and make war and destroy great and populous nations'.... The Messiah will be the most destructive conqueror in history, smashing his enemies into utter extinction.

“(6) There would follow the renovation of Jerusalem. Sometimes this was thought of as the purification of the existing city. More often it was thought of as the coming down of the new Jerusalem from heaven....

“(7) The Jews who were dispersed all over the world would be gathered into the city of the new Jerusalem.... It is easy to see how Jewish this new world was to be. The nationalistic element is dominant all the time.

“(8) Palestine would be the centre of the world and the rest of the world subject to it. All the nations would be subdued. Sometimes it was thought of as a peaceful subjugation.... More often, the fate of the Gentiles was utter destruction at which Israel would exult and rejoice.... It was a grim picture. Israel would rejoice to see her enemies broken and in hell. Even the dead Israelites were to be raised up to share in the new world.

“(9) Finally, there would come the new age of peace and goodness which would last forever.

“These are the messianic ideas which were in people's minds when Jesus came...”³⁹

Christ by no means rejected all of these apocalyptic ideas. After all, several of them were grounded in the God-inspired Scriptures. But He rejected their cruelty, their national ambition, and their anti-Gentilism.

He was Himself the Messiah, the Son of David; and His forerunner was St. John the Baptist, who came in the spirit of Elijah. But He came as the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53, not the ferocious warlord of the apocalypses. And He came to restore Israel, not as a State ruling over all the nations by the power of the sword, but as the head of the Universal Church ruling by the power of the Spirit. The question was: would the Jews accept Him as the Messiah, as the true King of Israel, embodying the spiritual-universalist, not the nationalist-chauvinist image of Messiahship and kingship? On this would depend both their individual salvation and the salvation

³⁹ Barclay, *The Gospel of Mark*, pp. 223-230.

of their State...

Tragically, in their great majority the Jews failed this test. They both crucified their True Messiah and King, God Himself, and said to Pilate: "We have no other king but Caesar" (John 19.15). At that moment they became no different spiritually from the other pagan peoples; for, like the pagans, they had come to recognize a mere man, the Roman emperor, as higher than God Himself. As St. John Chrysostom writes: "Here they declined the Kingdom of Christ and called to themselves that of Caesar."

What made this apostasy worse was the fact that they were not compelled to it by any despotic decree. Pilate not only did not demand this recognition of Caesar from them, but had said of *Christ* - "Behold your king" (John 19.14), and had then ordered the sign, "Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews", to be nailed above the cross. The Jews had in effect carried out both a *democratic revolution* against their True King, and, at the same time, a *despotic obeisance* to a false god-king. Thus did the City of God on earth become the City of Man, and the stronghold of Satan: "How has the faithful city become a harlot! It was full of justice, righteousness lodged in it, but now murderers" (Isaiah 1.21). Thus did the original sin committed under Saul, when the people of God sought a king who would rule them "like all the nations", reap its final wages in their submission to "the god of this world".

The Jews' primary motivation, as Metropolitan Anthony (Khrapovitsky) showed in a detailed analysis of the Gospel texts⁴⁰, was fear that Christ's preaching of a universal Kingdom not of this world would undermine their attempts to stir up the people to a revolutionary war against Rome and establish a very this-worldly Jewish kingdom. Their fears intensified after the Raising of Lazarus and the triumphal Entry of Christ into Jerusalem, which led them to "frame" Him for blasphemy and deliver Him to Pilate for execution as if it was He, and not they, who were the enemies of Roman power. Pilate saw through their plot, and mocked their revolutionary intentions. But when the Jews hinted that they would report him to Caesar, he gave in and delivered the innocent Man to death.

In 66-70 AD the Jews rebelled against Rome and were ruthlessly suppressed; hundreds of thousands of Jews were killed, and the Temple was destroyed.⁴¹ The message of the revolutionaries was striking similar to that of another Jewish-inspired revolution - that of Russia in 1917. Thus Neil Faulkner writes: "The revolutionary message of sectarian radicals and messiahs was addressed, above all, to the poor. Josephus was explicit about the class basis of the conflict: it was, for him, a struggle between dunatoi - men of rank and power, the property-owning upper classes - and stasiastai - subversives, revolutionaries, popular leaders whose appeal was to 'the scum of the districts'. The Dead Sea Scrolls were equally explicit, though from the other side of the barricades: whereas 'the princes of Judah... wallowed in the ways of whoredom and wicked wealth' and 'acted arrogantly for the sake of riches and gain', the Lord would in due time deliver them 'into the hands of the poor', so as to

⁴⁰ Khrapovitsky, "Christ the Savior and the Jewish Revolution", *Orthodox Life*, vol. 35, N 4, July-August, 1988, pp. 11-31.

⁴¹ For a moving and instructive discussion of this war, see Fr. Timothy Alferov, "Katastrofa", http://www.catacomb.org.ua/modules.php?name=Pages&go=print_page&pid=659.

'humble the mighty of the peoples by the hand of those bent to the dust', and bring them 'the reward of the wicked'...

"The popular movement of 66 CE amounted to a fusion of Apocalypse and Jubilee, the radical minority's vision of a revolutionary war to destroy corruption having become inextricably linked with the peasant majority's traditional aspiration for land redistribution and the removal of burdens..."⁴²

In 130, the Emperor Hadrian renamed Jerusalem Aelia Capitolina after himself, and planned to erect a temple to Jupiter on the site of the Temple. In 135 there was another rebellion under Bar Koseba. It was crushed with the deaths of 580,000 Jewish soldiers, the city and ruins were ploughed over and a completely Hellenic city built in its place...

Paradoxically, the Jews' last stand in both their rebellions took place in the hilltop fortresses built at Herodium and Masada by that arch-Hellenist, Herod the Great.⁴³ Equally paradoxically, their submission to pagan rulers was the result of their rejection of their mission to the pagans. Instead of serving as God's priests to the pagan world, enlightening them with the knowledge of the One True God, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, they were puffed up with dreams of national glory and dominion over the nations. And so God subjected them to those same nations whom they despised, entrusting the mission to the New Israel, the Church.

"On coming into the world," writes Tikhomirov, "the Saviour Jesus Christ as a man loved his fatherland, Judaea, no less than the Pharisees. He was thinking of the great role of his fatherland in the destinies of the world and mankind no less than the Pharisees, the zealots and the other nationalists. On approaching Jerusalem (during His triumphal entry) He wept and said: 'Oh, if only thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace!'..., and recalling the coming destruction of the city, He added: 'because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation' (Luke 19.41, 44). 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem... which killest... them that are sent to thee!' He said a little earlier, 'how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and yet would not!' (Luke 13.34). What would have happened if the Jews at that decisive moment had accepted the true Messiah? Israel would have become the spiritual head of the whole world, the beloved guide of mankind. At that very time Philo of Alexandria wrote that 'the Israelites have received the mission to serve as priests and prophets for the whole world, to instruct it in the truth, and in particular the pure knowledge of God'. If they had recognized this truth in full measure, then the coming of the Saviour would have confirmed forever that great mission. But 'the spirit of the prophets' turned out to be by no means so strong in Jewry, and its leaders repeated the role of Esau: they gave away the right of the firstborn for a mess of pottage.

"Nevertheless we must not forget that if the nationalist hatred for the Kingdom of God, manifested outside tribal conditions, was expressed in the murder of the

⁴² Faulkner, "The great Jewish revolt against Rome, 66-73 CE", *History Today*, vol. 52 (10), October, 2002, pp. 50, 51.

⁴³ Mueller, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-59.

Saviour of the world, all His disciples who brought the good news of the Kingdom, all His first followers and a multitude of the first members of the Church to all the ends of the Roman empire were Jews by nationality. The greatest interpreter of the spiritual meaning of the idea of 'the children of Abraham' was the pure-blooded Jew and Pharisee, the Apostle Paul. He was a Jew by blood, but through the prophetic spirit turned out to be the ideological director of the world to that place where 'there is neither Jew nor Greek'."⁴⁴

⁴⁴ Tikhomirov, *Religiozno-Filosofskie Osnovy Istorii*, p. 142.

III. THE CAPTIVITY OF ISRAEL

9. THE JEWS, THE ROMANS AND THE CHRISTIANS

The Fall of Jerusalem and the exile of the Jews throughout the Roman empire was an act of epochal significance, both for the Jews themselves and for the nations who received them into exile. Not only was their political autonomy, and the false messianic dream of the zealots destroyed: the religion itself underwent a profound transformation. The Jews had long ceased to have any true king or prophet (if we except John the Baptist). Now they had no Temple or priesthood either, which meant that they could not follow the many commandments of the Mosaic Law relating to Temple worship. The one religious tendency that remained was Pharisaism, with its emphasis on the rabbinical reinterpretation of the Law. And this tendency now became dominant. As the Jewish Professor Norman Cantor writes: "Even though in A.D. 100 (as today), the majority of Jews, probably a great majority, in the world were not full adherents or strict practitioners of Pharisaic-rabbinical-Orthodox Judaism, it is right to call this mainstream Judaism."⁴⁵

However, if we exclude Christianity, which many considered to be simply a Jewish sect, "at least two alternative forms of Hebrew faith existed alongside rabbinic orthodoxy: Essenic, apocalyptic, and mystical Judaism (as in the religion of Qumran, of the Dead Sea Scrolls), advocated vehemently by very small but intense minorities and a culture that in the Middle Ages and early modern times occasionally sought to unite with and embrace the Orthodox tradition; and the philosophic, Hellenistic, assimilating Judaism of the Alexandrian and other great eastern Mediterranean communities. Hellenistic Judaism resembles the liberal and Reform Judaism of today.

"The threefold split in Jewish religious culture, which was to prevail into modern times, was already evident in the first century B.C. We call rabbinical Judaism mainstream because it... has a closely held, deeply textured, continuous history down through the centuries, and it flourishes today again in Jerusalem as well as in New York. In the first six centuries of the Common Era it generated the Talmud, and it became the dominant religious faith and practice of the great Eastern European communities from the seventeenth century into the twentieth century."⁴⁶

We shall come to the Talmud later. But let us first examine the cultural context in which the new religion of rabbinical or Talmudic Judaism lived in the period of the pagan Roman Empire.

The Jews were different from the other conquered nations of the Roman Empire in three major ways.

First, their faith was exclusive; they claimed to worship the one and only True God, and rejected the ecumenist tolerance of each other's faiths and gods practised by the other peoples of the empire. As a consequence, secondly, they could never reconcile themselves with their conquered status, or delight in the achievements of the pax Romana like most of the other conquered nations. And thirdly, they were

⁴⁵ Cantor, *The Sacred Chain*, London: Fontana, 1996, p. 38.

⁴⁶ Cantor, *op. cit.* p. 38.

unique in that, although their homeland was Palestine, most Jews, even before the Fall of Jerusalem, lived abroad, in the diaspora, which providentially allowed them exert an important influence on the whole of the Roman Empire.

“Jewish colonies,” writes Alexander Dvorkin, “could be found in any corner of the Mediterranean world – from Cadiz to the Crimea. In all there lived up to 4 million Jews in the diaspora out of a general population of the Roman Empire of 50 million, while the Jewish population of Palestine consisted of not more than one million people.”⁴⁷

“In the first century after Christ there were 11 or 12 synagogues in Rome. But the highest percentage of Jewish settlement was in Alexandria: throughout Egypt (including Alexandria) there lived about a million Jews. The municipal authorities had to reckon with them, although the social isolation of the Jews did not allow them to form their own kind of ‘lobby’ for participation in the local power structures.⁴⁸ Everywhere that they lived they refused to be merged into the life of their pagan surroundings, but unfailingly kept to their own religion and customs. Every Saturday they gathered to chant psalms and to read the Scriptures, after which there followed a sermon on the subject of the Biblical extract read and common prayers.

“Although scattered throughout the world, the Jews preserved the feeling of unity with the land of their fathers: they carried out private pilgrimages to the holy city of Zion and every year sent contributions to the Temple. Sometimes this export of currency from the provinces with its numerous Jewish population created definite difficulties for the Roman tax authorities. However, the Romans understood that in this question – as, however, in all questions connected with the basic principles of Judaism, – it was much more peaceful not to stop the Jews from acting in their own way. The Jews were not excluded from a single sphere of public life in which they themselves wanted to take part. But, of course, not all Jews observed their native customs as strictly as their religious leaders would have liked, and many of them experienced a powerful temptation to give in to seduction and live no differently from their neighbours.

“But the Jews for their part also exerted a noticeable influence on the inhabitants of the Empire. Although both the Greeks and the Romans saw circumcision as a disgusting anti-aesthetic custom, very many of the pagans were attracted to Judaism by its strict monotheism, the purity of its moral life and the antiquity (if not the style) of its Sacred Scriptures. There was no teaching on asceticism in Judaism (if you don’t count some marginal groups), but it spoke out for chastity, constancy and faithfulness in family life. In their communities the Jews constantly practised charity, visiting the sick and giving alms to the poor.

⁴⁷ Paul Johnson has a somewhat higher estimate: “The number of Jews, both born and converts, expanded everywhere, so that, according to one medieval tradition, there were at the time of the Claudian recensus in 48 AD some 6,944,000 Jews within the confines of the empire, plus what Josephus calls the ‘myriads and myriads’ in Babylonia and elsewhere beyond it. One calculation is that during the Herodian period there were about eight million Jews in the world, of whom 2,350,000 to 2,500,000 lived in Palestine, the Jews thus constituting about 10 per cent of the Roman empire.” (*op. cit.*, p. 112) (V.M.)

⁴⁸ Contrast this with the power of the Jewish lobby in the United States today (V.M.).

“Around many of the synagogues in the diaspora there formed groups of pious pagans whom the Jews usually called ‘God-fearers’ (in general this term was applied to every pious member of the synagogue). A pagan could pass through circumcision and ritual washing (immersion from the head down in a basin of water, which was required for the reception of converts into Judaism), but this did not often take place. As a rule, the Hellenized Jews of the diaspora, who were much more open to the external world than their rigorist Palestinian brethren, to the chagrin of the latter accepted converts from the pagans into their circle without insisting that circumcision was necessary for their salvation.

“The net of synagogues covering the empire turned out to be providential, a preparatory path for the Christian preaching. Through it Christianity penetrated into the midst of those who were drawing near to Judaism. Among these groups of former pagans the Christian missionaries found their own first uncircumcised followers. One could liken them to a ripe fruit, for they had the advantage not only of a lofty morality but also a knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures. From them the first Christian communities were formed. They consisted of the most varied people, not only from the proletarians and lower levels of society who had despaired of finding justice in this life, as the Marxist historians and those with them affirmed. St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans gives a greeting to Erastus, a city guardian of the general purse; in Athens a member of the Areopagus (the city council), Dionysius, was converted; and in Thessalonica there were ‘quite a few noble women’ (Acts 17.4). The governor of Bithynia, Pliny the Younger, in his letter to the Emperor Trajan (111-113) writes about the multitude ‘of Christians of various classes’. The majority of these people were educated pagans who came to Christianity from circles attached to the Jews.”⁴⁹

The Jews displayed two apparently contradictory characteristics. On the one hand, they strictly separated themselves off from the other peoples of the empire, treating them with a disdain that was noted by many ancient writers. On the other hand, they acquired great influence in the higher reaches of the imperial administration, especially in financial and economic matters. The Jews who acquired this influence used it in order to support their fellow-countrymen in many ways. This international solidarity of Jewry throughout the inhabited world has, of course, continued to this day.⁵⁰

In spite of the important differences between the Jews and the other peoples of the empire, the Emperors treated them with tolerance, and even gave them privileges. This benefited the Church, which in the beginning was seen as simply a sect of the Jews and lived, in Tertullian’s phrase, “under the cover of Judaism”.

For their part, the Christians tried to live in peace with both the Jews and the Romans. The Apostles were all Jews, and in spite of persecution from the Jewish authorities did not break definitively with the Jewish community in Jerusalem, continuing to worship in the Temple, to read the Holy Scriptures of the Old

⁴⁹ Dvorkin, *Ocherki po Istorii Vselenskoj Pravoslavnoj Tserkvi* (Sketches on the History of the Universal Orthodox Church), Nizhni-Novogorod, 2006, pp. 41-42.

⁵⁰ Igor Shafarevich, *Trekhtysiachiletnaia Zagadka* (A Three-Thousand-Year-Old Riddle), chapter 2, <http://shafarevich.voskres.ru/05.htm>

Testament, which they saw as fulfilled in Jesus Christ, and to practise Jewish dietary laws and circumcision. True, the first Council of Jerusalem established that pagan converts to Christianity did not have to practise Old Testament rites: faith in Christ and baptism was all that was required to become a fully-entitled member of the Church. But the Jewish Christian community in Palestine retained its outward semblance to Judaism, partly in order to facilitate the conversion of the Jews to Christianity. And this approach bore fruit, in that, at least in the first two generations, there was a steady trickle of converts from the Jews into the Church of Jerusalem, headed by the much-revered St. James the Just. Of course, the Christians differed fundamentally from the Jews in their worship of Christ as the Messiah and God; and the specifically Christian rite of the Eucharist was restricted only to those – both Jews and Gentiles – who believed in Christ and accepted baptism. Nevertheless, for the first forty years or so after the Resurrection the Church did not hasten to break its bonds with the Synagogue, hoping that as many Jews as possible could be converted.

However, the condemnation and execution of St. James, followed soon after by the rebellion of the Jews against Rome and the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD, changed the situation for the Christians – first in relation to the Jews, who saw the Christians as traitors to the national cause, and consequently also with the Romans, who now had to treat the Christians as a separate religion. Since the Christians had not taken part in the rebellion, and always, unlike the Jews, stressed their civic loyalty to the Roman Emperor, one would have thought that the Romans would have had no problems in treating the Christians as tolerantly as they treated the Jews. But the matter was not as simple as that...

“The Roman government in practice was tolerant to any cult if only it did not incite to rebellion and did not undermine morality. Moreover, the Romans thought that one of the reasons for their military successes was the fact that while other peoples worshipped only their own local gods, the Romans showed marks of honour to all the gods without exception and for that were rewarded for their special piety. All cults not established by the state were allowed, but theoretically did not have the right to propagandize in Rome, although their gods also entered into the Roman pantheon. In the first century after Christ religions already known to the contemporary Roman were not, as a rule, persecuted for propagandizing. However, the law retained its prior force and theoretically the possibility of applying it remained. The permitted religions had to satisfy two criteria: place and time. Religion was always a local matter – that is, it was linked to a definite people living in a definite locality, – and also an ancient matter, linked to the history of this people. It was more complicated to assimilate the God of the Jews, Who had no representation and did not accept sacrifices in any place except Jerusalem, into their pantheon. The Jews themselves did not allow His representation to be placed anywhere and stubbornly declined to worship the Roman gods. The Jews were monotheists and theoretically understood that their faith in principle excluded all other forms of religion. Nevertheless, in spite of all the complications with the Jews and the strangeness of their religion, it was still tolerated: the religion of the Jews was a national one and, besides, ancient, and it was considered sacrilege to encroach on it. Moreover, the Jews occupied an important political niche that was for the Romans a stronghold of their eastern conquests. In view of all these considerations,

the Romans gritted their teeth and recognized the Jewish religion to be permitted. Privileges were given to the Jewish people also because their rites seemed strange and dirty. The Romans thought that the Jews simply could not have proselytes among other peoples and would rather repel the haughty Roman aristocrat. Therefore the Jews were given the right to confess their belief in one God. Until the rebellion of 66-70 the Roman authorities treated them with studied tolerance. Augustus gave the Jews significant privileges, which, after the crisis under Caligula, who wanted to put his statue in the Jerusalem Temple (cf. Mark 13.14 and II Thessalonians 2.3-4), were again renewed by Claudius.

“The circumstances changed when Christianity appeared. Having examined it, the Romans classified the Christians as apostates from the Jewish faith. It was precisely the traits that distinguished the Christians from the Jews that made them still lower in the eyes of the Romans even than the Judaism they had little sympathy for. Christianity did not have the right belonging to historical antiquity – it was the ‘new religion’ so displeasing to the Roman conservative. It was not the religion of one people, but on the contrary, lived only through proselytes from other religions. If the propagandizing of other cults by their servers was seen rather as a chance violation, for Christians missionary work was their only modus vivendi – a necessity of their very position in history. Christians were always reproached for a lack of historical and national character in their religion. Celsius, for example, saw in Christians a party that had separated from Judaism and inherited from it its inclination for disputes.

“The Christians could demand tolerance either in the name of the truth or in the name of freedom of conscience. But since for the Romans one of the criteria of truth was antiquity, Christianity, a new religion, automatically became a false religion. The right of freedom of conscience that is so important for contemporary man was not even mentioned at that time. Only the state, and not individuals, had the right to establish and legalize religious cults. In rising up against state religion, the Christians became guilty of a state crime – they became in principle enemies of the state. And with such a view of Christianity it was possible to interpret a series of features of their life in a particular way: their nocturnal gatherings, their waiting for a certain king that was to come, the declining of some of them from military service and above all their refusal to offer sacrifices to the emperor.

“The Christians refused to carry out this self-evident, most simple of state duties. Beginning with the Apostle Paul, they affirmed their loyalty, referring to the prayers they said for the emperor, for the authorities and for the homeland. But they refused to recognize the emperor as ‘Lord’ and to carry out even an external worship of the idols, for they knew only one Lord, Jesus Christ. The Christians accepted both the state and society, but only to the degree that they did not limit the Lordship of Christ, did not drown out the confession of the Kingdom.

“The Kingdom of God had come and been revealed in the world, and from now on became the single measure of history and human life. In essence, the Christians by their refusal showed that they – almost alone in the whole of what was then an exceptionally religious world – believed in the reality of the idols. Honouring the idols meant recognizing the power of the devil, who had torn the world away from

the knowledge of the only true god and forced it to worship statues. But Christ had come to free the world from this power. Paganism came to life in its true religious significance as the kingdom of evil, as a demonic invasion, with which the Christians had entered into a duel to the death.

“Christianity came as a revolution in the history of the world: it was the appearance in it of the Lord for the struggle with that which had usurped His power. The Church had become the witness of His coming and presence. It was precisely this witness that it proclaimed to the whole world...”⁵¹

And it was precisely this witness that the Jews, above all nations, saw it as their duty to reject...

⁵¹ Dvorkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 79-81.

10. THE TALMUD

Norman Cantor writes: "In the middle of the ill-fated Jewish wars against the Romans in the first and early second centuries A.D., the austere Orthodox rabbis, led by Yochanan Ben Zakkai, secured from the accommodating Romans permission to set up religious schools elsewhere in Judea even as the Romans assaulted Jerusalem, destroyed the Temple, and dispersed the population.

"This withdrawal of the rabbis from the political fate of the homeland was the end result of what was already clear in the first century B.C. Pharisaic Judaism was a self-subsisting culture and a kind of mobile religious and moral tabernacle that could function autonomously and perpetually almost anywhere that the Jews had a modicum of physical security and economic opportunity. This was to be the single most continuous and important theme in Jewish history until modern times, the sacred chain that binds the generations together..."⁵²

The teaching of the Pharisees came to be embodied in a book called the Talmud, which purports to record a secret oral tradition going back to Moses and representing the true interpretation of the Torah, the first five books of the Bible. In fact, it bears only the most strained and perverse relation to the Torah, often completely corrupting the true meaning of the Holy Scriptures. It even asserts its own superiority over the Scriptures. As it declares: "The Law is water, but the Mishna [the first form of the Talmud] is wine." And again: "The words of the elders are more important than the words of the Prophets." Pharisaic-Talmudic Judaism did not contain a formal creed in the manner of Christianity; but it did contain 613 commandments that all Jews were expected to fulfill. As we have seen, it was the Pharisees who incited Christ's death because He preached a spiritual, universalist Kingdom that was opposed to their nationalist dreams. This opposition between the God-inspired Tradition of the Holy Scriptures and the man-made traditions of the Pharisees was pointed out to them by Christ when He said: "Thus have ye made the commandment of no effect by your tradition" (Matthew 15.6). "Ye blind guides," He said, "who strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel" (Matthew 23.24). Let us look at some of these traditions...

Douglas Reed wrote: "The Talmudic Law governed every imaginable action of a Jew's life anywhere in the world: marriage, divorce, property settlements, commercial transactions, down to the pettiest details of dress and toilet. As unforeseen things frequently crop up in daily life, the question of what is legal or illegal (not what is right or wrong) in all manner of novel circumstances had incessantly to be debated, and this produced the immense records of rabbinical dispute and decisions in which the Talmud abounds.

"Was it much a crime to crush a flea as to kill a camel on a sacred day? One learned rabbi allowed that the flea might be gently squeezed, and another thought its feet might even be cut off. How many white hairs might a sacrificial red cow have and yet remain a red cow? What sort of scabs required this or that ritual of purification? At which end of an animal should the operation of slaughter be performed? Ought

⁵² Cantor, op. cit., p. 50.

the high priest to put on his shirt or his hose first? Methods of putting apostates to death were debated; they must be strangled, said the elders, until they opened their mouths, into which boiling lead must be poured. Thereon a pious rabbi urged that the victim's mouth be held open with pincers so that he not suffocate before the molten lead enter and consume his soul with his body. The word 'pious' is here not sardonically used; this scholar sought to discover the precise intention of 'the Law'."⁵³

A dominant feature of these Jewish "holy" books was their hatred of Christ and Christianity. "The *Jewish Encyclopaedia* says: 'It is the tendency of Jewish legends in the Talmud, the Midrash... and in the Life of Jesus (*Toledoth Jeshua*) that originated in the Middle Ages to belittle the person of Jesus by ascribing to him an illegitimate birth, magic and a shameful death'. He is generally alluded to as 'that anonymous one', 'liar', 'imposter' or 'bastard' (the attribution of bastardy is intended to bring him under the Law as stated in Deuteronomy 23.3: 'A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord'). Mention of the name, Jesus, is prohibited in Jewish households.

"The work cited by the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* as having 'originated in the Middle Ages' is not merely a discreditable memory of an ancient past, as that allusion might suggest; it is used in Hebrew schools today. It was a rabbinical production of the Talmudic era and repeated all the ritual of mockery of Calvary itself in a different form. Jesus is depicted as the illegitimate son of Mary, a hairdresser's wife, and of a Roman soldier called Panthera. Jesus himself is referred to by a name which might be translated 'Joey Virgo'. He is shown as being taken by his stepfather to Egypt and there learning sorcery.

"The significant thing about this bogus life-story (the only information about Jesus which Jews were supposed to read) is that in it Jesus is not crucified by Romans. After his appearance in Jerusalem and his arrest there as an agitator and a sorcerer he is turned over to the Sanhedrin and spends forty days in the pillory before being stoned and hanged at the Feast of Passover; this form of death exactly fulfils the Law laid down in Deuteronomy 21.22 and 17.5, whereas crucifixion would not have been in compliance with that *Judaic* law. The book then states that in hell he suffers the torture of boiling mud.

"The Talmud also refers to Jesus as 'Fool', 'sorcerer', 'profane person', 'idolator', 'dog', 'child of lust' and the like more; the effect of this teaching over a period of centuries, is shown by the book of the Spanish Jew Mose de Leon, republished in 1880, which speaks of Jesus as a 'dead dog' that lies 'buried in a dunghill'. The original Hebrew texts of these Talmudic allusions appear in Laible's *Jesus Christ in Talmud*. This scholar says that during the period of the Talmudists hatred of Jesus became 'the most national trait of Judaism', that 'at the approach of Christianity the Jews were seized over and again with a fury and hatred that were akin to madness', that 'the hatred and scorn of the Jews was always directed in the first place against the person of Jesus' and that 'the Jesus-hatred of the Jews is a firmly-established fact, but they want to show it as little as possible'.

⁵³ Reed, *The Controversy of Zion*, Durban, South Africa, 1978, p. 93.

“This wish to conceal from the outer world that which was taught behind the Talmudic hedge led to the censoring of the above-quoted passages during the seventeenth century. Knowledge of the Talmud became fairly widespread then (it was frequently denounced by remonstrant Jews) and the embarrassment thus caused to the Talmudic elders led to the following edict (quoted in the original Hebrew and in translation by P.L.B. Drach, who was brought up in a Talmudic school and later became converted to Christianity):

“This is why we enjoin you, under pain of excommunication major, to print nothing in future editions, whether of the Mishna or of the Gemara, which relates whether for good or for evil to the acts of Jesus the Nazarene, and to substitute instead a circle like this: O, which will warn the rabbis and schoolmasters to teach the young these passages only viva voce. By means of this precaution the savants among the Nazarenes will have no further pretext to attack us on this subject’ (decree of the Judaist Synod which sat in Poland in 1631). At the present time, when public enquiry into such matters, or objection to them, has been virtually forbidden by Gentile governments, these passages, according to report, have been restored in the Hebrew editions of the Talmud...

“The Talmud sets out to widen and heighten the barrier between the Jews and others. An example of the different language which the Torah spoke, for Jews and for Gentiles, has previously been given: the obscure and apparently harmless allusion to ‘a foolish nation’ (Deuteronomy 32.21). According to the article on *Discrimination against Gentiles in the Jewish Encyclopaedia* the allusion in the original Hebrew is to ‘vile and vicious Gentiles’, so that Jew and Gentile received very different meanings from the same passage in the original and in the translation. The Talmud, however, which was to reach only Jewish eyes, removed any doubt that might have been caused in Jewish minds by perusal of the milder translation; it specifically related the passage in Deuteronomy to one in Ezekiel 23.20, and by so doing defined Gentiles as those ‘whose flesh is as the flesh of asses and whose issue is like the issue of horses’! In this spirit was the ‘interpretation’ of the Law continued by the Talmudites.

“The Talmudic edicts were all to similar effect. The Law (the Talmud laid down) allowed the restoration of a lost article to its owner if ‘a brother or neighbour’, but not if a Gentile. Book-burning (of Gentile books) was recommended... The benediction, ‘Blessed be Thou... who hast not made me a goi [Gentile]’ was to be recited daily. Eclipses were of bad augury for Gentiles only. Rabbi Lei laid down that the injunction not to take revenge (Leviticus 19.18) did not apply to Gentiles, and apparently invoked Ecclesiastes 8.4 in support of his ruling (a discriminatory interpretation then being given to a passage in which the Gentile could not suspect any such intention).

“The Jews who sells to a Gentile landed property bordering on the land of another Jew is to be excommunicated. A Gentile cannot be trusted as witness in a criminal or civil suit because he could not be depended on to keep his word like a Jew. A Jew testifying in a petty Gentile civil court as a single witness against a Jew must be excommunicated. Adultery committed with a non-Jewish woman is not adultery ‘for

the heathen have no lawfully wedded wife, they are not really their wives'. The Gentiles are as such precluded from admission to a future world..."⁵⁴

Of particular importance for the future history of the Jews was their attitude towards usury. Now the Old Testament forbids the lending of money for interest to brothers, but allows it to strangers (Exodus 22.25; Leviticus 25.36; Deuteronomy 23.24). The Talmud exploited the letter of this law to justify outright exploitation of the Christians. According to Oleg Platonov, it "teaches the Jew to consider the property of all non-Jews as 'gefker', which means free, belonging to no one. 'The property of all non-Jews has the same significance as if it had been found in the desert: it belongs to the first who seizes it'. In the Talmud there is a decree according to which open theft and stealing are forbidden, but anything can be acquired by deceit or cunning..."

"From this it follows that all the resources and wealth of the non-Jews must belong to representatives of the 'chosen people'. 'According to the Talmud,' wrote the Russian historian S.S. Gromeka, "God gave all the peoples into the hands of the Jews" (Baba-Katta, 38); "the whole of Israel are children of kings; those who offend a Jew offend God himself" (Sikhab 67, 1) and "are subject to execution, as for lèse-majesté" (Sanhedrin 58, 2); pious people of other nations, who are counted worthy of participating in the kingdom of the Messiah, will take the role of slaves to the Jews' (Sanhedrin 91, 21, 1051). From this point of view, ... all the property in the world belongs to the Jews, and the Christians who possess it are only temporary, 'unlawful' possessors, usurpers, and this property will be confiscated by the Jews from them sooner or later. When the Jews are exalted above all the other peoples, God will hand over all the nations to the Jews for final extermination.'

"The historian of Judaism I. Lyutostansky cites examples from the ancient editions of the Talmud, which teaches the Jews that it is pleasing to God that they appropriate the property of the goyim [Gentiles]. In particular, he expounds the teaching of Samuel that deceiving a goy is not a sin..."

"Rabbi Moses said: 'If a goy makes a mistake in counting, then the Jew, noticing this, must say that he knows nothing about it.' Rabbi Brentz says: 'If some Jews, after exhausting themselves by running around all week to deceive Christians in various places, come together at the Sabbath and boast of their deceptions to each other, they say: "We must take the hearts out of the goyim and kill even the best of them." - of course, if they succeed in doing this.' Rabbi Moses teaches: 'Jews sin when they return lost things to apostates and pagans, or anyone who doesn't reverence the Sabbath.'..."

"To attain the final goal laid down in the Talmud for Jews - to become masters of the property of the goyim - one of the best means, in the rabbis' opinion, is usury. According to the Talmud, 'God ordered that money be lent to the goyim, but only on interest; so instead of helping them in this way, we must harm them, even if they

⁵⁴ Reed, *op. cit.*, pp. 89-91. The Zohar also says: "Tradition tells us that the best of the Gentiles deserves death" (Section Vaiqra, folio 14b, quoted in Webster, *op. cit.* p. 407). For a more detailed exposé of the Talmud and the religion founded upon it, see Michael Hoffman, *Judaism Discovered*, Independent History and Research, 2008.

can be useful for us.' The tract *Baba Metsiya* insists on the necessity of lending money on interest and advises Jews to teach their children to lend money on interest, 'so that they can from childhood taste the sweetness of usury and learn to use it in good time.'"⁵⁵

⁵⁵ Platonov, *Ternovij Venets Rossii (Russia's Crown of Thorns)*, Moscow, 1998,

11. THE JEWS IN BYZANTIUM

The Talmud placed a kind of insulating shield around the Jews; for in order to fulfill it, the Jews had to live a separate life more or less isolated from the surrounding culture. But this did not mean that they were indifferent to the fate of the Gentiles surrounding them, or of the government of the Roman empire. On the contrary, the Talmud taught them an attitude of irreconcilable hostility to Rome and all it stood for – especially when Rome became Christian under St. Constantine...

Cyril Mango writes: “By virtue of a long tradition in Roman law, Jews enjoyed a peculiar status: they were a licit sect, their synagogues were protected from seizure, they appointed their own clergy and had recourse in civil cases to their own courts of law. At the same time they were forbidden to proselytise, to own Christian slaves or to build new synagogues.”⁵⁶ However, they continually strove to undermine the Empire. Alone among all the nations of the Mediterranean basin, they refused to benefit from, or join in, the Pax Romana. Having asserted, at the Crucifixion of Christ, that they had no king but Caesar, they nevertheless constantly rebelled against the Caesars and slaughtered thousands of Christians. Thus in 115-117, in Alexandria, whose population was about one-third Jewish, civil war broke out between the Jews and the Christians. And in 150 the Jews killed 240,000 Greeks in Cyrenaica and 100,000 in Cyprus.⁵⁷

The Jews’ fierce anti-Christianity is admitted by Cantor: “Insofar as they thought about the Christians in the first seven or eight decades after the Nazarene’s death, the rabbis considered them only a desperate underclass of heretics, at best pathetic, more evidently contemptible and damnable. They made jokes about Mary. She was a whore, they cackled, and Jesus was the offspring of one of her sloppy unions...”⁵⁸

The Christian emperors from St. Constantine onwards did not remove the Jews’ protected status, only imposing a few restrictions on them in order to protect the Christians. Nevertheless, the Jews called the Roman empire, both before and after its conversion to Christianity, “the kingdom of the Edomites”. Rabbi David Kimchi writes as follows in *Obadiah*: “What the Prophets foretold about the destruction of Edom in the last days was intended for Rome, as Isaiah explains (34.1)... For when Rome is destroyed, Israel shall be redeemed.” And Rabbi Abraham in his book *Tseror Hammor* writes: “Immediately after Rome is destroyed, we shall be redeemed.”⁵⁹

Sergius and Tamara Fomin write: “To the prayer ‘birkam za-minim’ which was read everyday against heretics and apostates there was added the ‘curse’ against ‘the proud state’ (of Rome) and against all the enemies of Israel, in particular the Christians... [The Christians were also identified with] the scapegoat, on which the sins of the Jews were laid and which was then driven into the wilderness as a gift to

⁵⁶ Mango, *Byzantium*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1980, p. 91.

⁵⁷ I. Antonopoulos, *Agapi kai synomosia*, Athens, 1979, pp. 36-37 (in Greek).

⁵⁸ Cantor, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

⁵⁹ Quoted in Rev. I.B. Pranaitis, *The Talmud Unmasked*, St. Petersburg, 1892, Bloomfield Books, Sudbury, Suffolk, pp. 43, 80, 81.

the devil. According to rabbinic teaching, the goat signified Esau and his descendants, who at the present time were the Christians.”⁶⁰

In 135 the Emperor Hadrian forbade the Jews to return to Jerusalem. However, Julian the Apostate (361-363) reversed this decision. Moreover, he permitted the Jews to rebuild the Temple, in defiance of the Lord’s prophecy that “there shall be left not one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down” (Mark 13.2). By a miracle of God the rebuilding of the Temple was forcibly stopped. St. Gregory the Theologian tells how the Jews enthusiastically set about the rebuilding. But “suddenly they were driven from their work by a violent earthquake and whirlwind, and they rushed together for refuge to a neighbouring church... There are some who say that the church doors were closed against them by an invisible hand although these doors had been wide open a moment before... It is, moreover, affirmed and believed by all that as they strove to force their way in by violence, the fire, which burst from the foundation of the Temple, met and stopped them; some it burnt and destroyed, others it injured seriously... But the most wonderful thing was that a light, as of a cross within a circle, appeared in the heavens... and the mark of the cross was impressed on their garments... a mark which in art and elegance surpassed all painting and embroidery.”⁶¹

Not surprisingly, the Christian Holy Fathers were uncompromising in their condemnation of the Jews, proving from the Scriptures that Christ was God and that the Jews had crucified their own Messiah...

In 388 some Christians burned down the synagogue in Callinicum on the Euphrates. The Emperor Theodosius I ordered its rebuilding at the Christians’ expense. However, St. Ambrose, the famous Bishop of Milan, wrote to him: “When a report was made by the military Count of the East that a synagogue had been burnt down, and that this was done at the instigation of the bishop, you gave command that the others should be punished, and the synagogue be rebuilt by the bishop himself... The bishop’s account ought to have been waited for, for priests are the calmers of disturbances, and anxious for peace, except when even they are moved by some offence against God, or insult to the Church. Let us suppose that the bishop burned down the synagogue... It will evidently be necessary for him to take back his act or become a martyr. Both the one and the other are foreign to your rule: if he turns out to be a hero, then fear lest he end his life in martyrdom; but if he turns out to be unworthy, then fear lest you become the cause of his fall, for the seducer bears the greater responsibility. And what if others are cowardly and agree to construct the synagogue? Then... you can write on the front of the building: ‘This temple of impiety was built on contributions taken from Christians’. You are motivated by considerations of public order. But what is the order from on high? Religion was always bound to have the main significance in the State, which is why the severity of the laws must be modified here. Remember Julian, who wanted to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem: the builders were then burned by the fire of God.

⁶⁰ Fomin and Fomina, *Rossia pered Vtroym Prishestviem* (Russia before the Second Coming), Moscow, 1994, vol. 1, pp. 201-202.

⁶¹ Quoted in Marjorie Strachey, *Saints and Sinners of the Fourth Century*, London: William Kimber, 1958, p. 78). St. Ambrose of Milan and the fifth-century Church historians Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret and Rufinus all confirm St. Gregory’s story.

Do you not take fright at what happened then?... And how many temples did the Jews not burn down under Julian at Gaza, Askalon, Beirut and other places? You did not take revenge for the churches, but now you take revenge for the synagogue!"⁶²

"What is more important," he asked, "the parade of discipline or the cause of religion? The maintenance of civil law is secondary to religious interest."⁶³ Ambrose refused to celebrate the Liturgy until the imperial decree had been revoked. The emperor backed down...

Perhaps the most famous scourge of the Jews (in words) was St. John Chrysostom, who said: "The Jews say they, too, worship God. God forbid that I say that. No Jew worships God! Who says? The Son of God says so. For He said: 'If you knew my Father, you would also know Me. But you neither know Me nor My Father.' Could I produce a witness more trustworthy than the Son of God?"⁶⁴

The teaching of the Talmud incited the Jews to terrible crimes against Gentiles, especially Christians. Thus "under Theodosius II," writes L.A. Tikhomirov, "it was discovered that the Jews, on the day of the feast of the execution of Haman [Purim], had introduced the practice of burning the Cross. The government had to undertake repressions against the blasphemy, but the Jews were not pacified. Under the same Theodosius II, in the city of Imma, the Jews during one of their feasts took hold of a Christian child, crucified him on a cross and with scourges cut him into pieces. The disturbed Christians took to arms, and a bloody battle took place. This incident, as they said, was not unique. The Christian historian Socrates relates that the Jews more than once crucified Christian children. At that time it was not a matter of 'ritual killings', and in such acts only the hatred of the Jews for Christians and mockery of them was seen. In the given case Theodosius II executed those guilty of the murder, but at the same time the government began to take measures to weaken Jewry. Theodosius destroyed the Jewish patriarchate in Palestine and confiscated the sums collected throughout Jewry for the patriarchate. But all these repressions did not quickly pacify the Jews. Under the same Theodosius II there took place in 415 the well-known brawl in Alexandria elicited by the killing of Christians by the Jews. All this boldness of the Jews in the face of a power that was evidently incomparably greater than theirs seems improbable. But we must bear in mind that this was an age of terrible Messianic fanaticism on the part of the Jews. It often drove them to acts that were senseless, in which pure psychosis was operating. Here, for example, is a purely internal incident having no relation to the Christians. At about the same time, in 432, on the island of Cyprus there took place an event which shows to what an inflamed condition the Jews of that time could come. On the island there appeared a man who was evidently mad, called Moses, the same who had led the people out of Egypt through the Red Sea. He declared that he now had an order from the Lord to lead the Jews out of Cyprus into Palestine through the Mediterranean Sea. His preaching attracted crowds of Jews who did not hesitate to follow the prophet. These hordes went to the sea and, at a sign from Moses, began to hurl themselves from a lofty cliff into the water. Many crashed against the rocks, others drowned, and only

⁶² St. Ambrose, *Letter 40*, in Fomin and Fomina, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 69.

⁶³ Paul Johnson, *A History of the Jews*, London: Phoenix, 1987, 1995, p. 164.

⁶⁴ St. John Chrysostom, *First Homily against the Jews*.

the forcible intervention of the Christians saved the rest: fishermen dragged them from the water, while other inhabitants forcibly drove the Jews from the shore. This mass psychosis shows to what lengths the Jews could go in the name of the idea of the re-establishment of the Kingdom of Israel...

"The [Western] Church had already quite early, in the sixth century, begun to take measures to protect Christians from the influence of the Jews. Councils in Orleans in 538 and 545 decreed the suppression of relations between Christians and Jews and, moreover, forbade the Jews from publicly showing themselves during the Christian Pascha, doubtless to cut off the possibility of any blasphemous outrages. But we can understand why these measures could not be maintained, nor were they systematic, and relations inevitably continued, having two kinds of consequences: some they spiritually cut off from Christianity and drew them into heresy, and others they filled with hatred for the Jews."⁶⁵

In about 520, 4000 Christians were martyred by the Jewish ruler of the South Arabian land of Omir (or Himyar), Dû-Nuwâs, for their refusal to renounce Christ.⁶⁶

Again, in 555 the Jews supported the Samaritan rebellion against Byzantium.

Later, during the Time of Troubles that began for Byzantium with the murder of the Emperor Maurice in 602, Jewish anti-Romanism reached a new peak of frenzy. David Keys writes: "The Jews viewed the apparently imminent collapse of the Roman Empire in the first quarter of the seventh century as evidence that the 'beast' (the formerly pagan but now Christian empire) was doomed, that the Devil in the guise of the last Roman emperor or Christian pope would be killed by the (imminently expected) Messiah. They saw the Persians (and a few years later, the Arabs) as the agents who would help destroy the 'Roman beast'. Violent and often Messianic Jewish revolutionary attitudes had been increasing throughout the second half of the sixth century and went into overdrive as the Empire began to totter in the first quarter of the seventh. In Antioch in AD 608, Christian attempts at forced conversion, as the Persians threatened the city, triggered a major revolt in the Jewish quarter. At first the Jewish rebels were successful, and their community's arch-enemy, the city's powerful Christian patriarch, Anastasius, was captured, killed and mutilated. But the revolt was soon put down - and the 800-year-old Antiochian Jewish community was almost totally extinguished."⁶⁷

The situation was no better in the Holy Land. The Jews appealed to all the Jews of Palestine to join the Persians, and Jewish crowds killed the Bishop of Tiberias and 90,000 Christians in one day. When the Persians conquered Jerusalem, most of the Christians were sent into captivity to Persia. However, "the Jews distinguished themselves at this point with a beastly cruelty unique in the history of the world. They spared no money to buy many Christians from the Persians with one purpose only - to gain enjoyment in killing them. They say that in this way they bought and

⁶⁵ Tikhomirov, *Religiozno-Filosofskie Osnovy Istorii*, pp. 340-341, 350.

⁶⁶ See the life of the Holy Martyr Al-Harith, in St. Demetrius of Rostov, *The Great Collection of the Lives of the Saints*, House Springs, MO; Chrysostom Press, 1995, vol. II, pp. 351-376; Mango, *op. cit.*, p. 92; Tikhomirov, *Religio-Filosofskie Osnovy Istorii*, chapters 41 and 42.

⁶⁷ Keys, *Catastrophe*, London: Arrow books, 2000, pp. 91-92.

destroyed 80,000 people. The Jewish historian G. Graetz glides silently over this terrible fact, saying only: 'Filled with rage, the Jews of course did not spare the Christians' and 'did not spare the holy things of the Christians'. Graetz reduces the number of Christians killed to 19,000."⁶⁸

The Persians were defeated by the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius, who banished the Jews of Jerusalem to a distance of three miles from the city, and decreed that all the Jews of the empire should be baptized. But the pendulum swung again when the Byzantines were defeated by the new power of the Arab Muslims. Thus in 638 Caliph Omar entered the Holy Sepulchre, while Patriarch Sophronius of Jerusalem remarked: "Surely this is the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the Prophet standing in the holy place."

The Jews, however, were delighted; many thought that Mohammed was a prophet who had come to prepare the way for the Messiah. And "even when the Messiah failed to arrive," writes Karen Armstrong, "Jews continued to look favourably on Islamic rule in Jerusalem. In a letter written in the eleventh century, the Jerusalem rabbis recalled the 'mercy' God had shown his people when he allowed the 'Kingdom of Ishmael' to conquer Palestine. They were glad to remember that when the Muslims arrived in Jerusalem, 'there were people from the children of Israel with them; they showed the spot of the Temple and they settled with them until this very day.'"⁶⁹

The Jews supported the Muslims against the Christians in other parts of Europe. Thus in 710 they opened the gates of the cities of Spain to the Moorish invaders, helping to destroy Spanish Orthodox civilization.

Meanwhile, in what remained of the Byzantine Empire there were intermittent attempts to return to the policy of Phocas and Heraclius. Thus Cyril Mango writes that "Leo III ordered once again the baptism of Jews and those who complied were given the title of 'new citizens', but they did so in bad faith, while others, it seems, fled to the Arabs. The failure of this measure was acknowledged by the Council of 787 which decreed that insincere converts should not be accepted; it was preferable to let them live according to their customs while remaining subject to the old disabilities. A fresh attempt was made by Basil I: Jews were summoned to disputations and if they were unable to demonstrate the truth of their religion, they were to be baptized. Remission of taxes and the grant of dignities were offered as rewards; even so, after the emperor's death, most of the converts 'returned like dogs to their own vomit'. The last recorded case of forced conversion was under Romanus I, but it only resulted in driving many Jews to the land of Khazaria north of the Black Sea. From then on such Jews as remained were left to live in relative peace; there was even a reverse migration of them from Egypt into the Empire in the late tenth and eleventh centuries..."⁷⁰

⁶⁸ Tikhomirov, *op. cit.*, p. 343. Graetz, a Jewish historian, admits that the Jews took a greater part in the destruction of Christian churches and monasteries than the Persians themselves (*Istoria Evreev* (A History of the Jews), Odessa, 1908, vol. 1, pp. 28-32).

⁶⁹ Armstrong, *A History of Jerusalem*, London: HarperCollins, 1996, p. 233.

⁷⁰ Mango, *op. cit.*, pp 92-93.

Insofar as it was the Russians, and not the Byzantines, who had to deal with the problem of Jewish Khazaria, we now turn to them...

12. THE JEWS IN MEDIEVAL RUSSIA

The Khazars were a Turkic tribe, whose elite had converted to Judaism, thus becoming “the thirteenth tribe” of Israel.⁷¹

“The first Russo-Jewish contact,” writes A.I. Solzhenitsyn, “could be considered to be the war between Kievan Rus’ and the Khazars [in the time of St. Vladimir’s father, Sviatoslav] – but this is not quite accurate, for only the elite of the Khazars were of Jewish blood, and they themselves were Turks who had accepted the Jewish confession of faith.

“If we follow the exposition of the solid Jewish author of the middle of our century, Yu. D. Brutskus, a part of the Jews from Persia moved to the lower Volga across the Derbent passage. There, in about 724 A.D., there grew the city of Itil, the capital of the Khazar kaganate. The leaders of the Turco-Khazar tribes (at that time still idol-worshippers) did not want Mohammedanism, so as not to submit to the Baghdad caliph, nor Christianity, so as to avoid the suzerainty of the Byzantine emperor; and so in about 732 they converted to the Jewish religion. There was a Jewish colony in the Bosporian kingdom (Crimea, the Taman peninsula), where the emperor Hadrian had resettled some Jewish captives in 137, after the crushing of Bar-Kochba. Later the Jewish population in the Crimea held out stubbornly both under the Goths and under the Huns, and Kafa (Kerch) especially remained Jewish. In 933 Prince Igor [of Kiev] took Kerch for a time, while Sviatoslav Igorevich conquered the mouth of the Don from the Khazars. In 969 the Rossi were already in control of the whole of the Volga, with Itil, and Russian ships had appeared at Semender (the Derbent coast). The remains of the Khazars were the Kumiks in the Caucasus, while in the Crimea they together with the Polovtsians constituted the Crimean Tatars. (However, the Karaites and the Jews of the Crimea did not convert to Mohammedanism.) The Khazars were finished off by Tamerlane...”⁷²

In 965-969 Russian pagan armies under Great Prince Sviatoslav destroyed the Khazar capital at Itil. His victory propelled the Khazars westwards towards what is now Belorussia and Poland, where they were joined, at the beginning of the

⁷¹ Koestler, *The Thirteenth Tribe*, London: Pan Books, 1980, pp. 125-26. Koestler claimed that about 82% of the present-day Jews were in fact of Turkic Khazar, that is, non-semitic, descent. This conclusion was supported by B. Freedman (*The Truth about the Khazars*, Los Angeles, 1954).

However, recent genetic research by Michael Hammer on the male Y chromosome has indicated that modern Jews are truly Semitic, being related to the Arabs and descended, with them, from one man. As Jonathan Sarfati writes, Koestler’s “theory presupposes lots of gentiles assimilating into Jewish society, the exact opposite of what normally happens where Jew/Gentile intermarriage occurs. In reality only a tiny number of Khazars converted to Judaism, while far more converted to Islam and also some to Russian Orthodoxy. The Khazar converts to Judaism had disappeared by the 14th century, largely by being incorporated into already existing Jewish communities in Poland. There is also a problem of what happened to the real Jews who are supposed to have mass-evangelised the Khazars, then disappeared without trace out of history... The studies by Hammer et al. shows that the Ashkenazi Jews really are the same people group as the other [Sephardic] Jews, and that there is a common ancestry for the Cohanim from Ashkenazi and Sephardic Jews, so [these] are the last nails in the coffin for Koestler’s idea.” (“Genesis correctly predicts Y Chromosome pattern”, <http://creation.com/genesis-correctly-predicts-y-chromosomepattern>)

⁷² Solzhenitsyn, *Dvesti let vmeste (1795-1995) (Two Hundred Years Together)*, Moscow: Russkij Put’, 2001, pp. 13-14.

sixteenth century, by large numbers of Ashkenazi Jews fleeing persecution in Italy, Provence and Germany.⁷³ From this time the Jewish community in Poland and the Russian territories under Polish dominion in Ukraine and Belorussia began to multiply rapidly...

So the first independent Jewish kingdom since the fall of Jerusalem was crushed by the Russians just before their conversion to Christianity... Consequently, "the Jews migrated in some numbers in a westerly and north-westerly direction through the southern Russian space. Thus the expert on the East and the Semites, Avrakham Garkavi, writes that the Jewish community in the future Russia 'was formed by Jews who had migrated from the shores of the Black Sea and the Caucasus, where their forefathers had lived after the Assyrian and Babylonian captivity.' Yu. D. Brutskus is sympathetic to this view. (There is also an opinion that these were the remnants of the ten 'lost' tribes of Israel.) This move may have come to an end after the fall of Tmutarakan to the Polovtsians in 1097. In the opinion of Garkavi, the conversational language of these Jews, at least from the 9th century, was Slavonic, and only in the 17th century, when the Ukrainian Jews fled from the pogroms of Khmel'nitsky into Poland, did their language become Yiddish, which the Jews in Poland spoke...

"Thus at the end of the 10th century, by the time of Vladimir's choice of a new faith for the Rossi, there was no lack of Jews in Kiev, and learned men were found among them who proposed the Jewish faith. But the choice took place in a different way from in Khazaria 250 years before. Karamzin retells the story as follows: 'Having heard out the Jews, [Vladimir] asked: where was their fatherland? "In Jerusalem,' replied the preachers, "but God in His anger scattered us in foreign lands." "And how do you, being punished by God, dare to teach others?" said Vladimir. "We do not want to be like you, and be deprived of our fatherland."'"⁷⁴

In 1113 there was a pogrom of the Jews in Kiev caused by the exorbitant rates of interest that their money-lenders charged (up to 50%). When Prince Vladimir Monomakh arrived on the scene, the Kievans "asked him publicly for satisfaction from the Jews. They said that they had taken over all the trades from the Christians and under Sviatopolk had enjoyed great freedom and power... And they had enticed many into their faith."⁷⁵

Vladimir summoned a council of the Princes, at which it was decided to restrict interest rates and to expel all the Jews from Kiev. However, they crept back in, and according to Oleg Platonov, the Jews Anbal and Ofrem Moizovich played a leading part in the murder of Prince Andrew of Bogolyubovo in the twelfth century.

Platonov writes: "The transformation of Russia into the spiritual centre of Christian civilisation almost exactly coincided in time with the establishment of a secret Jewish Talmudic centre in the West Russian lands, which were occupied at that time by Poland and Lithuania. Although the entrance of Jews into Russia was cut off by a temporary frontier, their gradual secret assault on the stronghold of the

⁷³ Paul Johnson, *A History of the Jews*, London: Phoenix, 1987, 1995, pp. 231.

⁷⁴ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 14, 15.

⁷⁵ V.N. Tatischev, *Istoria Rossijskaia* (History of Russia), Moscow and Leningrad, 1962, vol. 2, p. 129; in Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

Christian world was realised inexorably through the appearance of various Jewish heretical movements."⁷⁶

The most important of these was the heresy of the Judaizers, when "the whole Russian Church," as General A. Nechvolodov writes, "had at her head a Judaizer, and the immediate entourage of the sovereign... were also Judaizers."⁷⁷

The roots of this heresy, writes a publication of the Moscow Patriarchate, "go deeper than is usually imagined. The part played by national elements in the heresy, which exploded like epidemics onto medieval Europe, has not yet been sufficiently clarified. The acts of the inquisition demonstrate that most of the sects were Judeo-Christian in character with a more or less pronounced Manichaeian colouring. The flourishing of the Albigensian heresy in France has been directly linked by historians with the rise of Jewish influence in that country. The heresy of the Templars, 'the knights of the Temple', who were condemned in 1314, was linked with esoterical Judaism and blasphemy against Christ...

"Judaizers were also known in the Orthodox East. In Salonica in the first third of the 14th century 'there existed a heretical Judaizing society in the heart of the Greek population' which had an influence on 'the Bulgarian Judaizers of the 40s and 50s of the same century'. In 1354 a debate took place in Gallipoli between the famous theologian and hierarch of the Eastern Church Gregory Palamas, on the one hand, and the Turks and the Chionians, i.e the Judaizers, on the other. In 1360 a council meeting in Trnovo, the then capital of the Bulgarian patriarchate, condemned both the opponents of Hesychasm (the Barlaamites) and those who philosophize from the Jewish heresies.

"The successes of the heresy in Russia could be attributed to the same cause as its success in France in the 14th century. Jews streamed into the young state of the Ottomans from the whole of Western Europe.⁷⁸ Thereafter they were able to penetrate without hindrance into the Genoan colonies of the Crimea and the Azov Sea, and into the region of what had been Khazaria, where the Jewish sect of the Karaites had a large influence; for they had many adherents in the Crimea and Lithuania and were closely linked with Palestine. As the inscriptions on the Jewish cemetery of Chuft-Kale show, colonies of Karaites existed in the Crimea from the 2nd to the 18th centuries. The Karaites were brought to Lithuania by Prince Vitovt, the hero of the battle of Grunwald (1410) and great-grandfather of Ivan III Vasilievich. From there they spread throughout Western Russia.

"... One has to admit that the beginning of the polemic between the Orthodox and the heretics was made, not in Byzantium, but in Russia. Besides, the polemic began... in the time of Metropolitan Peter (+1326), the founder of the Muscovite ecclesiastical centre. In the life of St. Peter it is mentioned among his other exploits for the good

⁷⁶ O.A. Platonov, *Ternovij Venets Rossii* (Russia's Crown of Thorns), Moscow, 1998, pp. 74-76, 87.

⁷⁷ Nechvolodov, *L'Empereur Nicolas II et les Juifs* (Nicholas II and the Jews), Paris, 1924, p. 183.

⁷⁸ Another cause was the introduction into Russian service-books of several materials that were read in the cycle of synagogue feasts and readings. Also in the 15th century the five books of Moses and the Book of Daniel were translated from Jewish (non-Greek) texts. See Platonov, *op. cit.*, p. 91. (V.M.)

of the Russian Church that he 'overcame the heretic Seit in debate and anathematized him.' The hypothesis concerning the Karaite origin of the 'Judaizers' allows us to see in Seit a Karaite preacher.

"... The heresy did not disappear but smouldered under a facade of church life in certain circles of the Orthodox urban population, and the Russian church, under the leadership of her hierarchs, raised herself to an unceasing battle with the false teachings. The landmarks of this battle were: Metropolitan Peter's victory over Seit in debate (between 1312 and 1326), the unmasking and condemnation of the strigolniki in Novgorod in the time of Metropolitan Alexis (1370s), the overcoming of this heresy in the time of Metropolitan Photius (+1431), and of the heresy of the Judaizers - in the time of Archbishop Gennadius of Novgorod (+1505) and St. Joseph of Volotsk (+1515).

"From the time of the holy Prince Vladimir, the Baptizer of Rus', who rejected the solicitations of the Khazar Rabbis, wrote St. Joseph of Volotsk, 'the great Russian land has for 500 years remained in the Orthodox Faith, until the enemy of salvation, the devil, introduced the foul Jew to Great Novgorod. On St. Michael's day, 1470, there arrived from Kiev in the suite of Prince Michael Olelkovich, who had been invited by the veche [the Novgorodian parliament], 'the Jew Scharia' and Zachariah, prince of Taman. Later the Lithuanian Rabbis Joseph Smoilo Skaryavei and Moses Khanush also arrived.

"The heresy began to spread quickly. However, 'in the strict sense of the word this was not merely heresy, but complete apostasy from the Christian faith and the acceptance of the Jewish faith. Using the weaknesses of certain clerics, Scharia and his assistants began to instil distrust of the Church hierarchy into the faint-hearted, inclining them to rebellion against spiritual authority, tempting them with 'self-rule', the personal choice of each person in the spheres of faith and salvation, inciting the deceived to renounce their Mother-Church, blaspheme against the holy icons⁷⁹ and reject veneration of the saints - the foundations of popular morality - and, finally, to a complete denial of the saving Sacraments and dogmas of Orthodoxy concerning the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation. So they went so far as to conduct a Jewish war against God and the substitution of Christ the Saviour by the false messiah and antichrist.

"The false teaching spread in secret. Archbishop Gennadius of Novgorod first heard about the heresy in 1487; four members of a secret society, while abusing each other in a drunken frenzy, revealed the existence of the heresy in front of some Orthodox. The zealous archpastor quickly conducted an investigation and with sorrow became convinced that not only Novgorod, but also the very capital of Russian Orthodoxy, Moscow, was threatened. In September 1487 he sent Metropolitan Gerontius in Moscow the records of the whole investigation in the original. Igumen Joseph (Sanin) of the Dormition monastery of Volotsk, who had an unassailable reputation in Russian society at the end of the 15th and beginning of the 16th centuries, also spoke out against the heresy.

⁷⁹ According to St. Joseph of Volotsk, "they said: we are mocking these icons just as the Jews mocked Christ" (Platonov, op. cit., opposite page 320). (V.M.)

"But the battle with the heresy turned out to be no simple matter, for the heretics had enlisted the support of powerful people in Moscow. Great Prince Ivan III, who had been deceived by the Judaizers, invited them to Moscow, and made the two leading heretics protopriests - one in the Dormition, and the other in the Archangels cathedrals in the Kremlin. Some of those close to the Tsar, such as Theodore Kurytsyn, who headed the government, and whose brother became the heretics' leader, were co-opted into the heresy. The Great Prince's bride, Helen Voloshanka, was converted to Judaism. In 1483 a correspondence between Ivan III and the heresiarch Scharia himself was established through diplomatic channels between Moscow and Bakhchisarai. Finally, the heretic Zosimus was raised to the see of the great hierarchs of Moscow Peter, Alexis and Jonah."⁸⁰

This was a pivotal, even eschatological moment in Russian and Orthodox history: a practicing Jew at the head of the Church...

"Under [Metropolitan Zosima's] protection," continues A.P. Dobroklonsky, "the heretics in Moscow began to act more boldly. Priest Dionysius supposedly even allowed himself to dance behind the altar and mock the cross; a circle of the more active heretics gathered at the house of Theodore Kurytsyn. Many heretics, on hearing that their comrades were living peacefully in Moscow, fled there from Novgorod; Gennadius was suspected of heterodoxy: the metropolitan demanded a confession of faith from him; the monk Zakhar spread leaflets against him everywhere. In Novgorod itself the heretics, hoping for impunity, again began to blaspheme openly. Gennadius considered it necessary to write epistles to Metropolitan Zosimus, to Archbishop Tikhon of Rostov, and to the bishops: Bassian of Tver, Niphon of Suzdal, Prochorus of Sarsk and Philotheus of Perm. He tried to persuade them to review the question of the heretics in council and take decisive measures against them: to execute, burn, hang and curse them. In 1490 a council did indeed take place, but without the participation of Gennadius. At it several heretics were accused of spreading Judaism and of trying to destroy Orthodox Christianity, of celebrating Pascha in the Jewish style, of breaking the weekly fasts, of celebrating the Liturgy after receiving food and drink, etc.⁸¹ They were cursed, defrocked and imprisoned. Some of them, on the orders of the Great Prince, were sent to Gennadius in Novgorod. He ordered them to be met 40 versts from the city, to be clothed in garments turned inside-out and to be seated on pack-horses with their faces turned to the tail. Pointed birch-bark helmets were put on their heads with bast brushes and straw crowns with the inscription: 'this is the army of Satan'. In such a form they were led into the city; those who met them, on the orders of the bishop, spat on them and said: 'these are the enemies of God and Christian blasphemers'. Then the helmets on their heads were burned. All this was done with the aim of frightening the heretics and cautioning the Orthodox.

⁸⁰ *Russkaia Pravoslavnaia Tserkov'* (The Russian Orthodox Church), Publication of the Moscow Patriarchate, 1988, pp. 25-26.

⁸¹ "From the [conciliar] verdict," writes the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, "it is evident that the Judaizers did not recognise Jesus Christ to be the Son of God... [and] taught that the Messiah had not yet appeared... They venerated the Old-Testament Sabbath 'more than the Resurrection of Christ'" (St. Petersburg, 1906-1913, vol. 7, p. 580; in Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 21) (V.M.).

“But the triumph of Orthodoxy was short-lived and not complete. The cruder and more ignorant of the heretics were punished, those who allowed themselves openly to mock the Orthodox holy things; but the intelligentsia, which had power in the heretical party, was not touched: Zosimus remained on the metropolitan see, Theodore Kuritsyn and Helena reigned in society and at the court, the brother of Kuritsyn Ivan the wolf, Klenov and others acted as before in Moscow. Therefore the heretical movement was bound to appear again even after the Council of 1490. One chance circumstance strengthened this movement. In the 15th century there was a widespread opinion in Russia and Greece that with the end of the seventh thousand of years (from the creation of the world) there would come the end of the world and the Coming of Jesus Christ. The Paschalia we had at the time ended at the year 7000, after which there was the addition: ‘Here is fear, here is sorrow; this year has at last appeared and in it we expect Thy universal Coming’. This year fell in 1492 (from the Birth of Christ). But then, contrary to the universal expectation, 1492 passed without incident, and the end of the world did not follow. The heretics began to laugh at them and say: ‘7000 years have passed, and your Paschalia has passed; why has Christ not appeared? That means the writings both of your Apostles and of your Fathers, which (supposedly) announced the glorious Coming of Christ after 7000 years are false’. A great ‘disturbance among the Christians’ appeared, as well as a critical attitude towards the patristic and sacred literature and ‘many departed from Orthodoxy’. Thus the heresy was again strengthened; the blasphemous scenes were repeated. Metropolitan Zosimus himself supposedly mocked the crosses and icons, blasphemed Jesus Christ, led a debauched life and even openly denied life after death. Those Orthodox who reproached him he excommunicated from Holy Communion, defrocked, and even, by means of slander, obtained their detention in monasteries and prisons. Archbishop Gennadius, seeing that his practical activity in the former spirit was bearing little fruit, started writing. He composed the paschalia for 70 years into the eighth millenium, showing in a foreword that the former opinions concerning the end of the world and the method of calculating the paschalia were baseless. Then he devoted his efforts to collecting the sacred books into one Bible, so as to give the Orthodox the necessary means of struggling with heresy and protecting the Orthodox faith that had been lacking for many. Into the arena of active struggle with the Judaizers there stepped St. Joseph of Volokolamsk. In his epistle to Niphon of Suzdal, a very influential bishop of the time (1493), he told him about the licentious behaviour and apostasy from the faith of Metropolitan Zosimus, about the bad religio-moral condition of Orthodox society, and asked him to overthrow Zosimus and save the Russian Church.⁸² At about this time he gave his final edition to his first sermons against the Judaizers and, prefacing them with a history of the heresy to 1490, he published them in a special book for general use; in it he also did not spare Metropolitan Zosimus, calling him a Judas-traitor, a forerunner of the Antichrist, a first-born son of Satan, etc. Zosimus was forced to abandon his see and depart into retirement (1494). His place was taken (1495) by Simon, abbot of the Trinity-St. Sergius monastery, an indecisive and compromising man, albeit disposed against the heretics. Under the protection of Theodore Kuritsyn and Helena the heretics were able to act boldly. They wanted to organize a heretical community in Novgorod as well as in Moscow; on their insistence the tsar appointed Cassian, a supporter of the Judaizers, as archimandrite of the

⁸² “If this second Judas is not rooted out,” he wrote, “little by little the apostasy will encompass everybody”. (V.M.)

Novgorod Yuriev monastery. With his arrival the heretical movement was strengthened in Novgorod, and the Yuriev monastery became the centre and den of the heretics: here they held meetings, here they acted in an extremely blasphemous manner. Gennadius could do nothing with the heretics, who were supported in Moscow. Their triumph was aided by the fact that after the open plot against the tsar's grandson, Demetrius Ivanovich, the son of Helena, he was declared the heir to the throne and married to a Great Princess. In this way Helena's party, which protected the heretics, became still stronger. However, from 1499 a turn-around began to take place. Several supporters of Helena were executed; instead of Demetrius, the grandson, Basil, the son, was declared heir to the throne (1502); Helena and Demetrius were imprisoned. The blow delivered to them was at the same time a heavy blow to the heretics. Now it was easier to persuade Ivan III to take decisive measures against them. Joseph of Volokolamsk tried to do this. After the Council of 1503 he several times talked with the tsar and directly said: 'Your majesty, move against the heretics'; but he did not succeed in persuading him. The tsar was fearful of committing a sin in executing the heretics, although he did promise to conduct a search through all the cities. In 1504 Joseph wrote a letter to the tsar's spiritual father, Metrophanes, archimandrite of the Andronikov monastery, asking him to exert influence on the tsar... In December, 1504 a Council did convene in Moscow. Present were Ivan III, Basil Ivanovich, Metropolitan Simon, the bishops and many clergy. Joseph spoke out against the heretics. The guilty ones were sentenced to various punishments. Some were burned in cages in Moscow (Ivan the wolf and others); others had their tongues cut out and were exiled to Novgorod where they were burned (together with Archimandrite Cassian); others, finally, were dispersed to various monastery prisons.⁸³ The executions frightened the heretics. Many of them began to repent in order to receive clemency. Prince-Monk Bassian Patrikiev and the White Lake elders interceded for them, saying that it was necessary to receive repentant heretics into communion with the Church. But their repentance seemed insincere to Joseph; he thought it was necessary to keep the repentant heretics in prison and not allow them to receive Communion and communion with the Church; he expressed this view in his epistles and the last sermons of *The Enlightener*. In his private letters to Basil Ivanovich, who had taken the place of his father (1505), he demanded that searches for the heretics should continue and that they should be severely punished. An impassioned literary struggle began between the Josephites and the White Lake elders, which was expressed in works composed on both sides, especially by Joseph and Bassian Patrikiev. Bassian was so embittered that he called Joseph a misanthrope, a teacher of lawlessness and a breaker of the law of God, and those of the Judaizers who had been subjected to execution in spite of their late repentance, he glorified as martyrs. However, Joseph's views prevailed. Basil Ivanovich 'ordered that all the heretics should be cast into prison and kept there without coming out until the end of their lives'. On the death of Joseph (1515), the Judaizers for a time revived. Isaac the Jew seduced and drew away the Orthodox, so that in about 1520 a special Council was convened, Maximus the Greek wrote his 'advice' to the Fathers of this Council that they should move with zeal for Orthodoxy and give Isaac over to be executed. Joseph's disciple Daniel [the future metropolitan] and Maximus the Greek considered it necessary to write works against the remnants of the heresy..."⁸⁴

⁸³ Others fled to Lithuania, "where they formally accepted Judaism" (V.M.).

⁸⁴ Dobroklonsky, *Rukovodstvo po istorii russkoj tserkvi* (A Guide to the History of the Russian Church),

This episode represents one of the very few clear-cut cases in Orthodox history when heretics have been executed precisely for their heresy, although such a penalty was on the statute books of both the Byzantine and the Russian empires. There is no doubt that the predominant tradition in the Orthodox Church with regard to the treatment of heretics was represented here by the gentler tradition of the White Lake Elders, and not by the harsher Josephites. Some have speculated that such harshness betrayed the influence of the contemporary Spanish Inquisition, which was also directed primarily at those suspected of being Judaizing heretics. Be that as it may, St. Joseph claimed apostolic and patristic authority for the Great Prince's severe treatment of the heretics. He pointed out that the holy apostles and fathers did not seek the punishment of heretics when they kept themselves to themselves, but only when they sought to corrupt others to their false teachings.⁸⁵ Therefore the Muscovite Great Prince's treatment of the Judaizing heretics, though severe and exceptional, was not without precedent or justification. The Judaizers were enemies both of the Faith and the State of Russia, and their triumph would have led to the extinction of Russian Orthodox civilization. In this way, they were forerunners of that other Jewish-led movement which did lead to the virtual extinction of Russia – Bolshevism...

Moscow, 2001, pp. 189-192. S. F. Platonov writes: "The heresy was condemned; its preachers suffered, but the atmosphere of criticism in relation to dogma and Church order created by them did not die" (*Short Jewish Encyclopaedia*, Jerusalem, 1982, vol. 2, p. 509; in Solzhenitsyn, op. cit., p. 22). (V.M.).

⁸⁵ St. Joseph, "Slovo ob Osuzhdenii Eretikov" (Sermon on the Condemnation of Heretics).

13. THE JEWS IN MEDIEVAL EUROPE

The Jews of the West, the “Ashkenaz”, began to become influential during the reign of Charlemagne, who protected them and gave them the freedom of the empire, much to the dismay of the bishops. With the decline of the Carolingian empire, Jewish merchants made Rouen, the capital of Normandy, their own capital in the West (excluding Spain, which was called “Sepharad”, literally “the East”), and they were also well-established in Mainz and other Rhineland towns. After the Norman conquest of England, the Jews penetrated there as well, and the Norman kings of England came to rely on them financially...⁸⁶

The Jews were propelled westward by two disasters they suffered in the East: the destruction of the Jewish Khazar kingdom by the Russians in the tenth century, which was followed by their being banned from Russia under Vladimir Monomakh in the twelfth century, and their expulsion from Mesopotamia by the Muslims in 1040. Mesopotamia had been their homeland for many generations, the seat of their government-in-exile and the place where the Babylonian Talmud received its finished form. But in the West, no less than in the East, the Jews were an “alien, apparently indigestible element in society”; they were “always and everywhere *in* society and in the state, but never properly *of* either one or the other”.⁸⁷

The reasons given for this alienation of the Jews in the course of history have basically been of two diametrically opposing kinds. According to the Christians and those who are called by the Jews “anti-semites”, the Jews were alien because they *wanted* to be alien, because their law, the Talmud, which has only the most strained and tangential relationship to God’s true revelation in the Old Testament, *ordered* them to be alien and hostile to all non-Jews, whom they exploited through their money-lending activities and against whose political authorities they very often rebelled. In other words, Christian anti-semitism was the regrettable but fully understandable consequence of Jewish anti-Gentilism. According to the Jewish and pro-semitic view, on the other hand, it was the Christians who imposed this alienation upon the Jews, forcing them to live in ghettos, to take up money-lending as a profession, to rebel out of self-defence.

Platonov writes: “The history of the Jews amidst the Christian peoples is a story of constant conflicts with them. This usually took place as follows. Having settled in this or that country, the Jewish communities strove to bribe, and sometimes simply to buy some of the powers that be. In France, Italy, Germany and other countries the Jews provided all the notables with money, and each feudal lord had his own Jew. For this the Jews received definite privileges that allowed them to exploit the simple people. Attracted by gain, the followers of the Talmud lost the sense of proportion and elicited hatred against themselves, as a result of which there were rebellions against them. In some case the higher authorities, in order to avoid the beating up of Jews, expelled them from the country.”⁸⁸

The main complaints against the Jews were: extortionate money-lending (with

⁸⁶ Norman Cantor, *The Sacred Chain*, London: Fontana, 1995, chapter six.

⁸⁷ David Vital, *A People Apart: The Jews in Europe, 1789-1939*, Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 32.

⁸⁸ Platonov, *Ternovij Venets Rossii* (Russia’s Crown of Thorns), Moscow, 1998.

rates up to 170%), the export of slaves to the Muslims (the first such accusation goes back to 630, in France), the ritual slaughter of Christian children (about which more later) and the theft of the sacramental gifts for ritual defilement. They were not continually persecuted: the pattern was usually that long periods of prosperity, during which they were protected and promoted by kings and popes, were followed by periods of persecution, when the popular anger of the lower classes against them exploded.⁸⁹ Thus they were expelled from England in 1290, from France in 1306, from Saxony in 1349, from Hungary in 1360, from Belgium in 1370, from Bohemia in 1380, from Austria in 1480, from the Netherlands in 1444, from Spain in 1492, from Lithuania in 1493, from Portugal in 1497, from Salzburg, Würtemberg and Nuremburg in 1498, from Sardinia and Naples in 1540 and from Bavaria in 1551.

In fact, as L.A. Tikhomorov writes, “the Jews were well organized in every country, and Jewish organizations in all countries were in constant contact with each other, warning about dangers, preparing refuges in case of persecution and helping each other internationally in respect of trade and industry. This gave Jewry an exceptional power. Wherever a Jew went with a view to practising trade and industry, he found ready support. But the dominance that flowed from this in trade and industry placed a heavy burden on the non-Jewish population. The rulers of the countries – kings, dukes, landowning princes – greatly valued the Jews for their ability to get for them money and think up all kinds of financial operations. Even during times of persecution of the Jews generally, people with property and even town magistrates each wanted ‘to have his own Jew’ for himself, as a consequence of which the persecutions lost their systematic character. But for the population their financial talents were very burdensome, and dissatisfaction and hatred continued to grow against the Jews. This was felt everywhere. In Portugal, for example, where there prevailed the firmest and most exceptional goodwill towards the Jews, the masses of the people hated them. Also, the Jews’ disdain for Christianity could not fail to irritate the Christians. This disdain the Jews did not try to hide in the least. The most broad-minded Jews, such as Judah Halevy [1075-1140] who, of course, had the most superficial understanding of Christianity, and of Islam too, put the one and the other on a level with paganism. Judah Halevy said that although Christianity and Islam ‘in their original form’ were institutions for the purification and ennoblement of the non-Jews (their preparation for Judaism), nevertheless they had turned into paganism: the Christians worshipped the Cross, and the Muslims – the stone of the Kaaba. The Jews expressed their criticisms wherever they could. Undermining Christianity became part of their mission. And meanwhile they occupied the most prominent position in such dark sciences as alchemy, astrology and every kind of theurgy. Their mysticism and cabalistic theories had a great influence on Christian society. All kinds of magic and witchcraft, to which the superstitious Middle Ages was avidly drawn, were closely linked with Jewish elements. An example of the degree to which Jewish influence could go is presented by the south of France, which was called French Judaea. The Jews exhibited constant close links with all the enemies of Christianity, with the Arabs, with the heretics of the most disgusting sects, such as Manichaeism. Michelet, in evaluating the Albigensians [the Cathari, or Manichaeans, of Southern

⁸⁹ Shafarevich, *op. cit.*, chapter 3.

France], says: 'The southern nobility was overflowing with the children of Jews and Saracens [*Histoire de France (A History of France)*, vol. II, p. 159].' They were more developed people, in Michelet's opinion, than the northern nobility. However it was here that there developed a terrible opposition to religion, and a collapse of morality. The more eminent women were just as debauched as their husbands and fathers, and the poetry of the troubadours was completely filled with blasphemies against God and the stories of lovers. 'This French Judaea, as Languedoc was called, was reminiscent of the Judaea in the East not only because of its olive groves and aromas: *it had its own Sodom and Gomorrha...* The local scholars openly taught the philosophy of Aristotle, while the Arabs and Jews in secret taught the pantheism of Averroes and the subtleties of the Cabala.' [Michelet, *op. cit.*, pp. 393-404].

"The Jewish historian G. Graetz confirms the essence of this characterisation. 'The Albigensians,' he says, 'especially energetically protested against the papacy, and their opposition was partly owing to their *relations with the educated Jews and knowledge of Jewish works*. Amidst the Albigensians there existed a sect that directly said that *the Jewish Law is better than the Christian*. Those princes who protected the Albigensians also protected the Jews.'

"We can see what a socially demoralising influence this was from the same Albigensians. We are accustomed to speak only about the persecutions against the Albigensians. But we must also remember what was being done in those levels of the population that are labelled by the general name of 'Albigensians'. They were overflowing with people having no social restraint. 'The heroes of the great highways,' writes Michelet, 'together with the peasants... dressed their wives in sacred vestments, beat up the priests and mockingly forced them to sing mass. One of their entertainments consisted in disfiguring representations of the Saviour, cutting out the hands and legs. These trouble-makers were dear to the landowning princes precisely for their godlessness. Unbelievers, like our contemporaries, and as savage as barbarians, they lay as a heavy burden on the country, stealing, blackmailing and killing whoever came to hand, carrying out a terrible war' ...

"From the ninth century in France children began to disappear, and rumour began to accuse the Jews of stealing them. First they said it was for selling into slavery, then there appeared rumours that the Jews were killing them. In the twelfth century the Jews were accused of crucifying Christians. It appears that at that time they were not talking about the Jews' use of Christian blood for ritualistic ends. This accusation appeared only in the thirteenth century. The constant friendship of the Jews with the Saracens elicited suspicion and hatred that was the stronger the more intense became the struggle with Islam.

"So the era of the crusades elicited stormy pogroms of the Jews. Before the crusades themselves, in 1014, in France, killing of Jews for such reasons took place everywhere. The Jews of Orleans sent an ambassador to Sultan Hakim in Jerusalem, advising him to destroy the Church of Sepulchre of the Lord. Hakim (Fatimid) did indeed destroy the Church. But for that Jews were killed throughout France, while their ambassador, on his return from Jerusalem, was burned in Orleans.

"The first crusade began in 1096, and if the correct crusading armies did not

touch the Jews, the motley crowds of people drawn to the liberation of the Holy Sepulchre beat up Jews along the way and forced them to be baptized against their will. Against this there sounded the voices of the Roman popes, but they remained powerless in face of the excited masses. Pogroms began to become a common phenomenon. Even in England, where nobody had touched the Jews before, in 1189 the first pogrom broke out, while one hundred years later, in 1290, the kings decided to expel them completely from England. Thus the Jews had no access to England for 350 years until Cromwell, who again allowed them to live in the country. On the continent a terrible pogrom broke out in Fulda, where on the occasion of the killing of some Christian children a crowd burned several tens of Jews, although it remained unclear who had killed the children. In the fourteenth century Europe began to be devastated by the so-called 'Black Death' (the plague), and the general voice of the peoples accused the Jews of poisoning the water and supplies set aside for the use of the Christians. The year 1348 was a fatal date for the Jews. In 1453 the Jews suffered universal extinction in Silesia. It goes without saying that the persecuted Jews everywhere sought salvation in new emigrations to such places where they were not killing them at the given moment, although after a certain time the refugees perhaps had to seek a new refuge. During this period there were countless accusations that they had committed ritual killings. Moreover, in a majority of processes – even, perhaps, in all of them – there were Jews who confessed to the crime, and even described the details of how they did it. But the trials of the time took place with the help of tortures, whose horrors we can hardly imagine. In the same period there were many trials of magicians and witches, who were compelled to make confessions by the same tortures. Looking objectively, there is no possibility of reaching an exact conclusion about what these magicians and witches were, and in exactly the same way whether there were cases of ritual killings among the Jews.

“In the interesting collection of I.O. Kuzmin [*Materialy k voprosu ob obvineniakh evreev v ritual'nykh ubijstvakh* (*Materials on the question of the accusations against Jews of ritual murders*), St. Petersburg, 1913] there is a long list of trials (mainly Polish) on ritual killings. And it is impossible even to understand what amount of truth there could be in the depositions and confessions extracted by tortures, which make one's hair stand on end. Dr. Frank [*Ritual'nie ubijstva pered sudom istiny i spravedlivosti* (*Ritual murders before the court of truth and justice*), Kiev, 1912, p. 50] cites the conclusion of the Jesuit Friedrich von Sprey, who said: 'I swear that amidst the many women sentenced to burning for supposed sorcery, whom I accompanied to the fire, there was not one whose guilt was established. Apply this kind of tortures to judges, to spiritual fathers, to me – and you would recognize all of us to be sorcerers.' We could say the same about the confessions of ritual murders. But on the other hand the centuries we are talking about did indeed constitute the peak of various kinds of sorcery and 'black magic', combined with the most disgusting crimes. Moreover, blood was considered to be one of the most important materials used in magic. It is said that the sacrifice of a child and the drinking of his blood was part of the so-called 'black mass' [S. Tukholk, *Okkul'tizm i magia* (*Occultism and Magic*), St. Petersburg, 1911, p. 92]. The translator of the Russian edition of the book of the Monk Neophytus [*O tajne krovi u evreev* (*On the Mystery of Blood among the Jews*), St. Petersburg, 1914] adduces in the foreword examples of the murder of children with the aim of making incantations among people belonging by blood and birth-

certificate to the Christians. Thus in 1440 the Marshal of France Giles de Laval was condemned and burned; he tortured and killed many children to find the philosopher's stone. The remains of the tortured children were found in a cellar. 'From their blood, brains and bones,' says the translator, 'they prepared some kind of magical liquid.'

"Since among the Jews various kinds of sorcery and magic were as well developed as among the Christian peoples, and in this respect the Jews were even rather the teachers of the others since the time of the Babylonian captivity, then one can, of course, imagine that some among them were capable of such evils. But the accusers among the people spread this slander on the whole of Jewry."⁹⁰

Stories of ritual murder of Christian children by Jews have surfaced in many countries in many ages, leading to many formal trials and convictions. These are completely dismissed by western authors, who speak about the "blood libel" against the Jews, and who point out that many convictions were obtained through torture. However, the general fanaticism and hatred of the Jews against the Christians is well-documented. Moreover, the Orthodox Church has canonized at least one victim of such a murder, Child-Martyr Gabriel of Zverki, Belorussia, and Orthodox writers in general are much more inclined to give credence to these stories. Thus over a hundred well-documented cases of the murder of Christian children by the Jews for ritual purposes in various countries are cited by Oleg Platonov, who goes on to cite the detailed account of the Monk Neophytus, who until the age of 38 was a Jewish rabbi, as giving especially valuable evidence, not only of the real existence of this horrific practice, but also of the religious rationale behind it.

More recently, even a Jewish academic has given credence to the ritual killings. Thus Lisa Palmieri-Billig writes: "An Israeli historian of Italian origin has revived 'blood libel' in an historical study set to hit Italian bookstores on Thursday. Ariel Toaff, son of Rabbi Elio Toaff, claims that there is some historic truth in the accusation that for centuries provided incentives for pogroms against Jews throughout Europe.

"Toaff's tome, *Bloody Passovers: The Jews of Europe of Ritual Murders*, received high praise from another Italian Jewish historian, Sergio Luzzatto, in an article in the *Corriere della Serra* entitled 'Those Bloody Passovers'.

"Luzzatto describes Toaff's work as a 'magnificent book of history... Toaff holds that from 1100 to about 1500... several crucifixions of Christian children really happened, bringing about retaliations against entire Jewish communities – punitive massacres of men, women, children. Neither in Trent in 1475 nor in other areas of Europe in the late Middle Ages were Jews always innocent victims.'

"A minority of fundamentalist Ashkenazis... carried out human sacrifices,' Luzzatto continued.

⁹⁰ Tikhomirov, *Religioznie-Filosofskie Osnovy Istorii* (The Religio-Philosophical Foundations of History), Moscow, 1997, pp. 348-353.

“Toaff offers as an example the case of Saint Simonino of Trent in March 1475, shortly after a child’s body was found in a canal near the Jewish area of Trent, the city’s Jews were accused of murdering Simonino and using his blood to make mazot.

“After a medieval trial in which confessions were extracted by torture, 16 members of Trent’s Jewish community were hanged.

“Toaff reveals that the accusations against the Jews of Trent ‘might have been true’.

“Toaff refers to kabbalistic descriptions of the therapeutic uses of blood and asserts that ‘a black market flourished on both sides of the Alps, with Jewish merchants selling human blood, complete with rabbinic certification of the product – kosher blood.’”⁹¹

⁹¹ Palmieri-Billig, “Historian gives credence to blood libel”, *The Jerusalem Post*, February 7 and 8, 2007.

14. THE CABALA

“The Byzantine emperors,” writes Oleg Platonov, “were unconditional opponents of the Talmud, forbidding the Talmud on their territory. In this policy the Russian sovereigns followed the Byzantine emperors. Right until the end of the 17th century the import of the Talmud into Russia was forbidden under pain of death.

“The tradition of the non-allowance of the Talmud onto the territory of Christian states was broken after the falling away of the Western church from Orthodoxy and the strengthening of papism. The mercenary Roman popes and cardinals for the sake of gain often entered into agreements with the Jews and looked through their fingers at the widespread distribution of the Talmud in Europe. Nevertheless, amidst the Roman popes there were found those who tried to fight with this ‘book worthy of being cursed’, from the reading of which ‘every kind of evil flows’.

“Popes Gregory IX in 1230 and Innocent IV in 1244 ordered all Talmudic books to be burned. In England in 1272 during the expulsion of the Jews searches for copies of the Talmud were carried out in their homes and they were handed over to be burned...”⁹²

As regards the Cabala, Nesta Webster writes: “The modern Jewish Cabala presents a dual aspect – theoretical and practical; the former concerned with theosophical speculations, the latter with magical practices. It would be impossible here to give an idea of Cabalistic theosophy with its extraordinary imaginings on the Sephiroths, the attributes and functions of good and bad angels, dissertations on the nature of demons, and minute details on the appearance of God under the name of the Ancient of Ancients, from whose head 400,000 worlds receive the light. ‘The length of this face from the top of the head is three hundred and seventy times ten thousand worlds. It is called the “Long Face”, for such is the name of the Ancient of Ancients.’ The description of the hair and beard alone belonging to this gigantic countenance occupies a large place in the Zoharic treatise, *Idra Raba*.

“According to the Cabala, every letter in the Scriptures contains a mystery only to be solved by the initiated. By means of this system of interpretation passages of the Old Testament are shown to bear meanings totally unapparent to the ordinary reader. Thus the Zohar explains that Noah was lamed for life by the bite of a lion whilst he was in the ark, the adventures of Jonah inside the whale are related with an extraordinary wealth of imagination, whilst the beautiful story of Elisha and the Shunamite woman is travestied in the most grotesque manner.

“In the practical Cabala this method of ‘decoding’ is reduced to a theurgic or magical system in which the healing of diseases plays an important part and is effected by means of the mystical arrangement of numbers and letters, by the pronunciation of the Ineffable Name, by the use of amulets and talismans, or by compounds supposed to contain certain occult properties.

⁹² Platonov, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

“All these ideas derived from very ancient cults; even the art of working miracles by the use of the Divine Name, which after the appropriation of the Cabala by the Jews became the particular practice of Jewish miracle-workers, appears to have originated in Chaldea...”⁹³

How could this paganism ever have entered the rigorously anti-pagan religion of Judaism? The pro-semitic author Paul Johnson writes: “The sages were both fascinated and repelled by this egregious superstition. The anthropomorphism of God’s bodily measurements went against basic Judaic teaching that God is non-created and unknowable. The sages advised Jews to keep their eyes firmly fixed on the law and not to probe dangerous mysteries... But they then proceeded to do just that themselves; and, being elitists, they tended to fall in with the idea of special knowledge conveyed to the elect: ‘The story of creation should not be expounded before two persons, and the chapter on the chariot [Ezekiel 1] before even one person, unless he is a sage, and already has an independent understanding of the matter.’ That was the Talmud; indeed the Talmud and other holy writings contained a good deal of this suspect material...”⁹⁴

L.A. Tikhomirov writes that the mysticism of the Cabala “was based on the idea of the self-sufficiency of nature, on the substitution of nature for the idea of God the Creator, the Personal God Whose essence was beyond the whole of creation created by Him.

“Therefore the Cabala undermined both the Mosaic faith and the Christian.

“In social relations it also undermined that order which was based on the law given by God, for it made *man* the independent orderer of his own social relations. This side of the Cabala aroused alarm in Jewish society, too, exciting it sometimes to struggle against Kabbalism by force. And indeed, in, for example, its newest manifestation, Hassidism, the Kabbalistic idea undermined the authority both of the rabbis and of Jewish society itself and opposed to it the ‘Tsadiks’ – a power that was, so to speak, independent by dint of the mystical link it presupposed with the Divine principle. The Jews therefore found in Kabbalism a kinship with Christianity, where, as they supposed, ‘Christ made himself God’. In exactly the same way in the triads of the Sephiroth they saw a similarity with the Christian idea of the consubstantial Trinity. But if Kabbalism excited the alarm of the Jewish world, they still were able to deal with it there, since the Kabbalists in general were also penetrated by Jewish national patriotism, and, in all probability, it was precisely Kabbalist influences that served as the basis for that original form of messianism which sees in the Messiah not a special ambassador of God, but the Jewish people itself, and understands the coming kingdom of the Messiah as the universal kingdom of the people of Israel.

“But the Cabala had a more destructive impact on Christian society.

⁹³ Webster, *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, The Christian Book Club of America, 1924, pp. 12-13. Further evidence for paganism in modern Judaism is the adoption of the Babylonian Fast of Tammuz as one of the two main fasts of the synagogue year, though condemned by the Prophet Ezekiel (Elizabeth Dilling, *The Jewish Religion: Its Influence Today*, The Noontide Press, 1963).

⁹⁴ Johnson, *A History of the Jews*, London: Phoenix, 1987, 1995, p. 196.

“In the Christian world Kabbalism was also supposed to be closer to Christianity than Talmudism, so that the Kabbalists were sometimes protected even by the Roman popes. But if there were cases of the conversion of Kabbalists to Christianity, in general Kabbalism has the same relationship to Christianity as Gnosticism, that is, it can give birth only to heretical teachings. And that is how it worked in history, undermining Christian ideas about God, Christ, the Church and, finally, the whole order of Christian society through its ability to join up with all and sundry. The survivals of Gnosticism and the heresies went hand in hand with Kabbalism right from the Middle Ages. It undermined the same things, and first of all the Church; and it gave birth to the same ideals of public life.

“This does not mean that Kabbalism whenever it appeared put forward political or social programmes. It had nothing of the kind, as there was nothing of the kind in occultism. Like occultism, Kabbalism was always only a well-known *religio-philosophical* world-view. If it had politico-social consequences, then only because this world-view undermined the Christian-ecclesiastical world-view, and through it also the order founded upon it, and those forms of discipline which it held to.

“That intellectual-social movement, a constituent part of which in its religio-philosophical aspect was Kabbalism, together with occultism and Gnosticism undermined the bases of the Christian order confirmed in the middle ages. It was in fact reformist, emancipatory and revolutionary, since it opposed to the social discipline of old Europe the democratic idea. The democratic idea in itself, through its internal logic, was put forward in opposition to the hierarchical idea, when the idea of submission to the will of God was substituted by the idea of human autonomy. It was for that reason that the secret societies and tendencies, in whose world-view the Cabala found its place, played, together with Gnosticism and occultism, a reformist and revolutionary role. Such, especially, was the role of Freemasonry.

“But we must not conclude from this that the Kabbalistic idea was in essence ‘emancipatory’ and democratic. Quite the opposite. If Kabbalism, like occultism, will at any time begin to introduce into the ordering of society *its own ideas*, they will give birth to a society that is in an idiosyncratic way aristocratic and very despotic. We see this in part in the social order of Kabbalistic Hasidism, in which the Tsadiks are absolute masters to whom the whole of their community submits unconditionally. And that is understandable.

“According to the idea of Kabbalism, people have by no means equal rights, they are not identical. Over humanity *in general* there is no authority higher than human authority, and human authority goes back even to the heavens. But people are not all identical, authority does not belong to all of them, because they are not equally powerful. Some people are rich in occult abilities, whose power can be developed by exercise to an infinite degree. But other people are weak in this respect or even nothing. And these weak people must naturally be in the hands of the strong, receive directions from them and be under their administration. This power of the mystical aristocracy is incomparably more powerful than the power of hereditary aristocracy, because the latter is not united with great personal power, while the

mystical aristocracy has an invincible *personal power*. It possesses the ability to rule over the whole of nature, over the angelic powers, over the souls of men, not because such a rule was given to it by some human law or 'constitution', but because these higher men are incomparably more powerful than others, while the weak cannot oppose them. Moreover, there is no need to oppose them, because the higher nature will be able to construct a life that is much better for the weak than they can build themselves.

"On this basis heredity can arise. Among the Tsadik hassidim there soon arose 'dynasties' in which power was passed down by inheritance.

"And so in itself the Kabbalistic idea by no means leads to democracy...

"As is well-known, in Freemasonry, too, in spite of the external democratism and elective nature of its institutions, in actual fact the secret power of the 'higher degrees' is exceptionally great. It is noteworthy that a man of the 'higher degrees', when placed among people of the lower degrees, does not receive any external power. He seems to be equal to all his co-members, but is obliged to direct them in the direction indicated to him from above. He must do this by means of influence. What kind of influence is this? In all probability, as they say, he must possess the ability of a hypnotist and magnetist. It is also thought that reception into the higher degrees of Masonry takes place on the basis of the degree to which these 'occult' abilities are revealed and proved in a man.

"Concerning Kabbalism, we must further note the possibility of its *national* role. From ancient times there has existed in Jewry the conviction that the 'Godchosenness' of Israel is defined by special 'prophetic abilities' of the descendants of Abraham. One can well imagine that the special abilities necessary for Kabbalism belong in the highest degree only to the Jews. With this presupposition we can understand why 'the Jewish Cabala' stands separate from 'the European', and if the time for the influence of the Kabbalists were ever to come, it would probably coincide with the world influence of Jewry. We can also suppose that this is linked to the preponderance of Jewry in the highest centre of Freemasonry, about which the investigators of the latter speak. But so little is known both about the Kabbalistic organizations and about the higher organizations of Freemasonry, and all ideas about them have so little basis in fact, that one should not attach any serious significance to hypotheses of this sort..."⁹⁵

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries a conflict arose between the rationalists, led by Maimonides, who rejected the paganism of the Cabala, and the "mystics", led by Nahmanides, who accepted it. The work of Moses Maimonides (1135-1204) is to Judaism what the Spanish Arab philosopher Averroës is to Islam and Thomas Aquinas is to Christianity – the first to attempt to reconcile the faith of his fathers with scientific knowledge, and in particular the science of Aristotle which was becoming known again in Spain and Western Europe. For this rationalist project Maimonides was criticized by many of the rabbis of his time. But in his opposition to the Cabala he showed himself faithful to the monotheistic roots of Judaism.

⁹⁵ Tikhomirov, *op. cit.*, pp. 241-243.

“Nahmanides,” however, as Johnson writes, “made it possible for kabbalists to pose as the conservatives, tracing the origin of their ideas back to the Bible and Talmud, and upholding the best and most ancient Jewish traditions. It was the rationalists who were the innovators, bringing to the study of the Torah the pagan ideas of the ancient Greeks. In this respect, the campaign against the works of Maimonides could be described as the last squeak of the anti-Hellenists.

“Nahmanides himself never joined the witch-hunt against rationalism – on the contrary, he opposed it – but he made it possible for the kabbalists to escape similar charges of heresy, which in fact would have been much better grounded. For Cabalah not only introduced gnostic concepts which were totally alien to the ethical monotheism of the Bible, it was in a sense a completely different religion: pantheism. Both its cosmogony – its account of how creation was conceived in God’s words – and its theory of divine emanations led to the logical deduction that all things contain a divine element. In the 1280s, a leading Spanish kabbalist, Moses ben Shem Tov of Guadalajara, produced a summa of kabbalistic lore, the *Sefer-ha-Zohar*, generally known as the *Zohar*, which became the best-known treatise on the subject. Much of this work is explicitly pantheist: it insists repeatedly that God ‘is everything’ and everything is united in Him, ‘as is known to the mystics’. But if God is everything, and everything is in God, how can God be a single, specific being, non-created and absolutely separate from creation, as orthodox Judaism has always emphatically insisted? There is no answer to this question, except the plain one that *Zohar-Cabalah* is heresy of the most pernicious kind...”⁹⁶

“Heresy of the most pernicious kind...” And yet, during the Renaissance this heresy was to penetrate the intellectual life of Western Europe, undermining what was left of the Christian faith...

⁹⁶ Johnson, op. cit., pp. 198-199.

15. THE JEWS IN SPAIN AND HOLLAND

The Spanish re-conquest of Muslim Spain brought them up against the problem of what to do with the large number of Jews who had occupied important posts under the Moors.

In general, the Spaniards were much less tolerant of the Jews than the Moors had been. Thus in 1391, during a civil war in Castile, both sides had accused the Jews, and hundreds, perhaps thousands, were killed. During this period many Jews converted to Christianity to avoid persecution. Many of these conversos - or, as they were less politely known, marranos ("pigs") - did well under their new rulers. One became Bishop of Burgos; another was King Ferdinand's treasurer; the five top administrative posts in Aragon were occupied by them.

However, these converts were suspected by many of continuing to practise the Jewish faith in secret, which led to riots by the "old" Christians against the "new". It came to be thought that only those of non-Jewish blood could be real Christians; and in 1449 a law was introduced decreeing that people of Jewish blood could not hold public office.⁹⁷ In 1480 the Inquisition was called in to determine the truth of an individual's convictions by means of torture.

Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh write: "From the outset of its creation, the Spanish Inquisition had cast covetous eyes on Judaic wealth. It also regarded Jews themselves with implacable antipathy, simply because they lay outside its official legal jurisdiction. According to its original brief, the Inquisition was authorised to deal with heretics - that is, with Christians who had deviated from orthodox formulations of the faith. It had no powers, however, over adherents of altogether different religions, such as Jews and Muslims. Judaic and Islamic communities in Spain were large. In consequence, a considerable portion of the population remained exempt from the Inquisition's control; and for an institution that sought to exercise total control, such a situation was deemed intolerable.

"The Inquisition's first step was to act against so-called 'Judaizers'. A converso who returned to Judaism after having embraced Christianity could conveniently be labelled a heretic. By extension, so could anyone who encouraged him in his heresy - and this transgression could be further extended to include, by implication, all Jews. But the Inquisition was still handicapped because it had to produce - or

⁹⁷ As Andrew Wheatcroft writes: "During the fifteenth century, the dominant Christian states in Spain began to develop a new theory of the infidel. In this view, Judaism and, by extension, Islam, carried a genetic taint and thus no convert of Jewish or Muslim stock could ever carry the True Faith purely, as could someone of 'untainted' Christian descent..."

"This latent tendency within Hispanic society was elaborated into a body of law from the mid fifteenth century, but emerging from below rather than by royal decree. The first instance was in 1449, when Pero Sarmiento - the leader of a rebellion in Toledo against royal support for Jewish converts - issued a declaration that no one except an Old Christian of untainted blood could ever hold public office... Over the next forty years, more and more institutions adopted requirements that 'purity of blood' (limpieza de sangre) should be a prerequisite for membership of a guild or any similar body. The vocabulary that was used is particularly significant: the 'Old Christians' described themselves as the 'pure' (limpios); they were 'fine Christians', and the assumption was that the converts were impure and coarse." (*Infidels*, London: Penguin Books, 2004, pp. 104-105).

concoct – evidence for each case it sought to prosecute; and this was not always easy to do.

“The Inquisition enthusiastically endorsed the virulent anti-Semitism already being promulgated by a notorious preacher, Alonso de Espina, who hated both Jews and conversos alike. Mobilising popular support behind him, Alonso had advocated the complete extirpation of Judaism from Spain – either by expulsion or by extermination. Embracing Alonso’s programme, the Inquisition embarked on its own assiduous anti-Semitic propaganda... Citing the anti-Semitism it had thus contrived to provoke in the populace at large, the Inquisition petitioned the Crown to adopt ‘appropriate’ measures. The proposal to expel all Jews from Spain stemmed directly from the Inquisition...”

“King Ferdinand recognised that persecution of Jews and conversos would inevitably have adverse economic repercussions for the country. Neither he nor Queen Isabella, however, could resist the combined pressure of the Inquisition and the popular sentiment it had invoked. In a letter to his most influential nobles and courtiers, the king wrote: ‘The Holy Office of the Inquisition, seeing how some Christians are endangered by contact and communication with the Jews, has provided that the Jews be expelled from all our realms and territories, and has persuaded us to give our support and agreement to this... we do so despite the great harm to ourselves, seeking and preferring the salvation of our souls above our own profit...’

“On 1 January 1483, the monarchs wrote to appease the Inquisition in Andalusia, announcing that all Jews living in the region were to be expelled. On 12 May 1486, all Jews were driven from large tracts of Aragon. But wholesale expulsion had to be deferred for the moment because money and other forms of support from Jews and conversos were urgently needed for the ongoing campaign against the Muslims, pushed back into their ever-contracting Kingdom of Granada.”⁹⁸

In 1492 Ferdinand and Isabella, having united Aragon and Castile by their marriage, conquered Granada in the south to complete the reconquest of Spain for the Cross. “With deep emotion,” writes Karen Armstrong, “the crowd watched the Christian banner raised ceremonially upon the city walls and, as the news broke, bells pealed triumphantly all over Europe, for Granada was the last Muslim stronghold in [Western] Christendom. The Crusades against Islam in the Middle East had failed, but at least the Muslims had been flushed out of Europe. In 1499, the Muslim inhabitants of Spain were given the option of conversion to Christianity or deportation, after which, for a few centuries, Europe would become Muslim-free.”⁹⁹

Three months after the conquest of Granada the Edict of Expulsion of the Jews was issued. “Spanish Jewry was destroyed,” writes Armstrong. “About 70,000 Jews converted to Christianity, and stayed on to be plagued by the Inquisition; the

⁹⁸ Baigent and Leigh, *The Inquisition*, London: Penguin Books, 2000, pp. 76-78.

⁹⁹ Armstrong, *The Battle for God: a History of Fundamentalism*, New York: Ballantine Books, 2001, pp. 3-4.

remaining 130,000... went into exile."¹⁰⁰

The Jews who were expelled – called the Sephardic Jews after their word for Spain, “Sepharad” – spread throughout the West, especially Portugal and Amsterdam, and the Ottoman empire. They brought with them ideas and influences that were to be of enormous importance in the development of the West and in the eventual destruction of its Christian character. The influence of Greco-Latin paganism on the West has been well documented and recognized, largely because it came from above, with the official sanction of leaders in both Church and State. The influence of Jewish paganism in the form, especially, of the Cabala, has been less recognized, largely because it came from below, from the underground, and entered in spite of the resistance of the powers that be.¹⁰¹

Many of the conversos who remained in Spain voluntarily accepted Catholicism – for example, Teresa of Avila.¹⁰² However, there were many who both lost touch with Judaism and could not adapt to Catholicism. “In consequence,” writes Armstrong, “they had no real allegiance to any faith. Long before secularism, atheism, and religious indifference became common in the rest of Europe, we find instances of these essentially modern attitudes among the Marrano Jews of the Iberian peninsula”.¹⁰³

As Cantor writes, “a rationalist, scientific, antitraditional frame of mind, sceptical about the core of religious culture, arose among some Marrano families in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The emergence of a post-Christian commonwealth secular mentality can be traced to a handful of Marrano families who found themselves caught between Judaism and Christianity, bouncing back and forth between the two faiths and cultures, until they became disoriented and disenchanting equally with priests and rabbis.

“We can see this secularisation with the Spanish New Christian Fernando de Rojas, the creator of the subversive picaresque novel (*La Celestina*) in the early sixteenth century, and the forerunner of Cervantes’s critique of decaying medieval culture. We can see it in the sceptical human of the French humanist Montaigne, who was also of Marrano lineage. We can see it in the writings of two Dutch Jews of Portuguese extraction in the third quarter of the seventeenth century – Uriel de Costa, who condemned rabbinical Judaism and was excommunicated by the Jewish community of Amsterdam, and Baruch (Benedict) Spinoza, who turned away from

¹⁰⁰ Armstrong, *op. cit.*, p. 7. However the Jewish Professor Norman Cantor disputes this figure, giving the true figure as “only around forty thousand, about half the practicing Jews left the country in 1492” (*The Sacred Chain*, London: Fontana, 1996, pp. 189-190).

¹⁰¹ Thus through contact with Jewish bankers interested in art and literature, writes Dan Cohn-Sherbok, “the Florentine Christian philosopher Pico della Mirandola was able to engage in kabbalistic study, making use of the concept of the *sefirot* in his compositions. He and other Christian humanists believed that the *Zohar* [the Kabbala] contained doctrines which support the Christian faith. In this milieu Judah Abravanel composed a Neoplatonic work which had an important impact on Italian humanism.” (*Atlas of Jewish History*, London & New York: Routledge, 1996, p. 112)

¹⁰² Indeed, “it is not an exaggeration,” writes Norman Cantor, “to see the role of scions of converted Jewish families as central to the Spanish Renaissance of the early sixteenth century, as were Jews in the modernist cultural revolution of the early twentieth century. In both cases complete access to general culture induced an explosion of intellectual creativity.” (*op. cit.*, p. 189).

¹⁰³ Armstrong, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

the whole theistic tradition toward a new kind of scientific naturalism and universalism and was also excommunicated from the Jewish community.

“The Marrano descendants who were buffeted about in the sixteenth century from one religion to another became alienated from both, and turned first to money-making in international mercantilist capitalism and then secular, scientific rationalism. They were immensely successful in these endeavours.”¹⁰⁴

Spinoza was born of Jewish parents, but in 1655 he left the synagogue. Pointing to seeming contradictions in the text of Holy Scripture, and expressing doubts about its Divine origins, he denied the very possibility of revelation. His basic teaching was pantheism. For “God is in the world and the world is in God.” Nature “is a particular way in which God himself exists.” Human consciousness “is a particular way in which God himself thinks.” As for freewill, Spinoza denied it, redefining it as the knowledge of the fact that one is determined.

“In his concentration on this world,” writes Armstrong, “and in his denial of the supernatural, Spinoza became one of the first secularists of Europe. Like many modern people, Spinoza regarded all formal religion with distaste... He dismissed the revealed faiths as a ‘compound of credulity and prejudices’, and ‘a tissue of meaningless mysteries’. He had found ecstasy in the untrammelled use of reason, not by immersing himself in the biblical text... Instead of experiencing it as a revelation of the divine, Spinoza insisted that the Bible be read like any other text. He was one of the first to study the Bible scientifically, examining the historical background, the literary genres, and the question of authorship. He also used the Bible to explore his political ideas. Spinoza was one of the first people in Europe to promote the ideal of a secular, democratic state which would become one of the hallmarks of Western modernity. He argued that once the priests had acquired more power than the kings of Israel, the laws of the state became punitive and restrictive. Originally, the kingdom of Israel had been theocratic but because, in Spinoza’s view, God and the people were one and the same, the voice of the people had been supreme. Once the priests seized control, the voice of God could no longer be heard. But Spinoza was no populist. Like most pre-modern philosophers, he was an elitist who believed the masses to be incapable of rational thought. They would need some form of religion to give them a modicum of enlightenment, but this religion must be reformed, based not on so-called revealed law but on the natural principles of justice, fraternity, and liberty.”¹⁰⁵

Spinoza denied he was an atheist, had a profound admiration for Christ, and may even have been a Mennonite. But he rejected the main dogmas of Christianity, emphasising His moral teaching. His “spiritual Christianity” anticipated modern ecumenism. Thus he wrote: “As regards the Turks and the other (non-Christian) peoples, I suppose that if they honour God by cultivating justice and love for one’s neighbour, then they have in themselves the spirit of Christ, and receive salvation, whatever convictions they may have out of ignorance regarding Mohammed and

¹⁰⁴ Cantor, *op. cit.*, pp. 192-193.

¹⁰⁵ Armstrong, *op. cit.*, pp. 22, 23-24.

the oracles".¹⁰⁶ Spinoza's rationalist creed was summed up as follows: "Let everyone believe what seems to him to be consonant with reason"¹⁰⁷ – by which he meant a reason not in any way informed or guided by Divine revelation.

This was revolutionary teaching by any standards, and it is not surprising that on July 27, 1656, the rabbis excommunicated him. Now a sentence of excommunication destroyed the lives of many who rebelled against the Jewish rabbinate. But Spinoza was fortunate: he lived in liberal Holland...

¹⁰⁶ Spinoza, *Letter 43*, in Archimandrite Ambrose (Pogodin), "Ateistichno li mirovozzrenie Venedikta Spinozy?" ("Was Benedict Spinoza's world-view atheist?"), *Pravoslavnij Put'* (The Orthodox Way), p. 58.

¹⁰⁷ Spinoza, quoted in V.F. Ivanov, *Russkaia Intelligentsia i Masonstvo: ot Petra I do Nashikh Dnej* (The Russian Intelligentsia and Masonry: from Peter I to our Days), Harbin, 1934, Moscow: "Moskva", 1997, p. 75.

16. THE JEWS, THE POLES AND THE COSSACKS

Persecutions in Western Europe had gradually pushed the Ashkenazi Jews further and further east, until they arrived in Poland. Norman Cantor writes: "The Polish king and nobility held vast lands and ruled millions of newly enserfed [Russian] peasants and could make varied use of the Jews. Hence the Jews were welcomed into Poland in the sixteenth century from Germany and Western Europe. Even Jews exiled from Spain in 1492 and those tired of the ghettos of northern Italy under the oppressive eye of the papacy found their way to Poland. Its green, fruitful, and underpopulated land seemed wonderful to the Jews. By the end of the sixteenth century Poland was being hailed as the new golden land of the Jews..."¹⁰⁸

Ivan the Terrible banned the entry of Jewish merchants into Moscow. This "Russian barrier to further eastern penetration", writes Paul Johnson, "led to intensive Jewish settlement in Poland, Lithuania and the Ukraine... By 1575, while the total population [of Poland] had risen to seven million, the number of Jews had jumped to 150,000, and thereafter the rise was still more rapid. In 1503 the Polish monarchy appointed Rabbi Jacob Polak 'Rabbi of Poland', and the emergence of a chief rabbinate, backed by the crown, allowed the development of a form of self-government which the Jews had not known since the end of the exilarchate. From 1551 the chief rabbi was elected by the Jews themselves. This was, to be sure, oligarchic rather than democratic rule. The rabbinate had wide powers over law and finances, appointing judges and a great variety of other officials... The royal purpose in devolving power on the Jews was, of course, self-interested. There was a great deal of Polish hostility to the Jews. In Cracow, for instance, where the local merchant class was strong, Jews were usually kept out. The kings found out they could make money out of the Jews by selling to certain cities and towns, such as Warsaw, the privilege de non tolerandis Judaeis. But they could make even more by allowing Jewish communities to grow up, and milking them. The rabbinate and local Jewish councils were primarily tax-raising agencies. Only 30 per cent of what they raised went on welfare and official salaries; all the rest was handed over to the crown in return for protection.

"The association of the rabbinate with communal finance and so with the business affairs of those who had to provide it led the eastern or Ashkenazi Jews to go even further than the early-sixteenth-century Italians in giving halakhic approval to new methods of credit-finance. Polish Jews operating near the frontiers of civilization [!] had links with Jewish family firms in the Netherlands and Germany. A new kind of credit instrument, the mamram, emerged and got rabbinical approval. In 1607 Jewish communities in Poland and Lithuania were also authorized to use heter iskah, an inter-Jewish borrowing system which allowed one Jew to finance another in return for a percentage. This rationalization of the law eventually led even conservative authorities, like the famous Rabbi Judah Loew, the Maharal of Prague, to sanction lending at interest.

"With easy access to credit, Jewish pioneer settlers played a leading part in developing eastern Poland, the interior of Lithuania, and the Ukraine, especially

¹⁰⁸ Cantor, *The Sacred Chain*, London: Fontana, 1996, p. 182.

from the 1560s onwards. The population of Western Europe was expanding fast. It needed to import growing quantities of grain. Ambitious Polish landowners, anxious to meet the need, went into partnership with Jewish entrepreneurs to create new wheat-growing areas to supply the market, take the grain down-river to the Baltic ports, and then ship it west. The Polish magnates – Radziwills, Sovieskis, Zamojskis, Ostrojskis, Lubomirskis – owned or conquered the land. The ports were run by German Lutherans. The Dutch Calvinists owned most of the ships. But the Jews did the rest. They not only managed the estates but in some cases held the deeds as pledges in return for working capital. Sometimes they leased the estates themselves. They ran the tolls. They built and ran mills and distilleries. They owned the river boats, taking out the wheat and bringing back in return wine, cloth and luxury goods, which they sold in their shops. They were in soap, glazing, tanning and furs. They created entire villages and townships (shtetls), where they lived in the centre, while peasants (Catholics in Poland and Lithuania, Orthodox in the Ukraine) occupied the suburbs.

“Before 1569 [recte: 1596] when the Union of Brest-Litovsk made the Polish settlement of the Ukraine possible, there were only twenty-four Jewish settlements there with 4,000 inhabitants; by 1648 there were 115, with a numbered population of 51,325, the total being much greater. Most of these places were owned by Polish nobles, absentee-landlords, the Jews acting as middlemen and intermediaries with the peasants – a role fraught with future danger. Often Jews were effectively the magnates too. At the end of the sixteenth century Israel of Zloczew, for instance, leased an entire region of hundreds of square miles from a consortium of nobles to whom he paid the enormous sum of 4,500 zlotys. He sub-let tolls, taverns and mills to his poorer relatives. Jews from all over Europe arrived to take part in this colonizing process. In many settlements they constituted the majority of the inhabitants, so that for the first time outside Palestine they dominated the local culture. But there were important at every level of society and administration. They farmed the taxes and the customs. They advised government. And every Polish magnate had a Jewish counsellor in his castle, keeping the books, writing letters, running the economic show...

“In 1648-49, the Jews of south-eastern Poland and the Ukraine were struck by catastrophe. This episode was of great importance in Jewish history for several reasons... The Thirty Years War had put growing pressure on the food-exporting resources of Poland. It was because of their Polish networks that Jewish contractors to the various armies had been so successful in supplying them. But the chief beneficiaries had been the Polish landlords; and the chief losers had been the Polish and Ukrainian peasants, who had seen an ever-increasing proportion of the crops they raised marketed and sold at huge profit to the ravenous armies. Under the *Arenda* system, whereby the Polish nobility leased not only land but all fixed assets such as mills, breweries, distilleries, inns and tolls to Jews, in return for fixed payments, the Jews had flourished and their population had grown rapidly. But the system was inherently unstable and unjust. The landlords, absentee and often spendthrift, put continual pressure on the Jews by raising the price each time a lease was renewed; the Jews in turn put pressure on the peasants....

“The Ukrainian peasants finally rose in the late spring of 1648, led by a petty

aristocrat called Bogdan Chmielnicki, with the help of Dnieper Cossack and Tartars from the Crimea. His rising was fundamentally aimed at Polish rule and the Catholic church, and many Polish nobles and clergy were among the victims. But the principal animus was directed against Jews, with whom peasants had the most contact, and when it came to the point the Poles always abandoned their Jewish allies to save themselves. Thousands of Jews from villages and shtetls scrambled for safety to the big fortified towns, which turned into death-traps for them. At Tulchin the Polish troops handed over the Jews to the Cossacks in exchange for their own lives¹⁰⁹; at Tarnopol, the garrison refused to let the Jews in at all. At Bar, the fortress fell and all the Jews were massacred. There was another fierce slaughter at Narol. At Nemirov, the Cossacks got into the fortress by dressing as Poles, 'and they killed about 6,000 souls in the town', according to the Jewish chronicle; 'they drowned several hundreds in the water and by all kinds of cruel torments'. In the synagogue they used the ritual knives to kill Jews, then burned the building down, tore up the sacred books, and trampled them underfoot, and used the leather covers for sandals."¹¹⁰

Cantor writes that "the Ukrainians had a right to resent the Jews, if not to kill them. The Jews were the immediate instrument of the Ukrainians' subjection and degradation. The Halakic rabbis never considered the Jewish role in oppression of the Ukrainian peasants in relation to the Hebrew prophets' ideas of social justice. Isaiah and Amos were dead texts from the past in rabbinical mentality.

"Or perhaps the Jews were so moved by racist contempt for the Ukrainian and Polish peasantry as to regard them as subhuman and unworthy of consideration under biblical categories of justice and humanity..."¹¹¹

In 1690 a six-year-old Orthodox child by the name of Gabriel, who lived in Grodno province, was kidnapped by a Jew and ritually slaughtered, "as was confirmed by a judicial investigation. St. Gabriel was crucified, his side was pierced and he was punctured by various instruments until all his blood came out and he died. The body of the child was cast into a field, but was soon discovered and given over to a Christian burial, while his tormentors received their due reward. 30 years later, in 1720, the relics of St. Gabriel were uncovered and found to be incorrupt."¹¹²

¹⁰⁹ At Tulchin the Cossacks said to the Poles: "We will spare you as long as you pay a ransom, then we will leave. But we will not have mercy on the Jews for any money. They are our accursed enemies; they have insulted our faith, and we have sworn to destroy their tribe. Expel them from the city and be in agreement with us" (O. Platonov, *Ternovij Venets Rossii* (Russia's Crown of Thorns), Moscow, 1998, p. 228 (V.M.).

¹¹⁰ Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 250-252, 258-260.

¹¹¹ Cantor, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

¹¹² Archimandrite Nikon (Ivanov), Protopriest Nicholas (Likhomanov), *Zhitia Russkikh Sviatykh* (Lives of the Russian Saints), Tutaev, 2000, vol. I, p. 392

17. THE MESSIAH IN TURKEY

After the Edict of Expulsion in 1492, the Jews of Spain were invited to the Muslim lands by the promise of economic concessions and political protection. Speaking Ladano, they settled throughout the Eastern Mediterranean, but especially in Constantinople and Thessalonica. Thus the Jews had 44 synagogues and 30,000 people in Constantinople, which may have been the seat of their secret government, or exilarchate, which had been abolished by the Arabs of Baghdad in the tenth century. Again, in Thessalonica, which was called the New Jerusalem, there were 36,000 Jews. Their grip on trade was so powerful that in 1568 they appealed to the Sublime Porte to have their tax bill reduced.¹¹³ Powerful though they were these Sephardic Jews still pined for their former life in Andalusia, and it was through them that the Kabbala received an important theoretical and practical development that reflected their longings.¹¹⁴

“The most important person,” writes Tikhomirov, “who gave an impulse to the Kabbalistic movement here was Issak Lourié Levi [or Luria], a native of Jerusalem, who had a mystical, passionate nature that devoted itself entirely to the idea. He lived for a very short time on the earth (from 1534 to 1572) and died at the age of 38 from the plague. But in the short period of his activity he exerted a powerful influence on the development of Kabbalism. In Jerusalem he founded a kabbalistic circle in which they discussed the Kabbala and practised incantations and the calling up of spirits. He had an enormous influence on those around him, and the movement of Kabbalism continued also after his death.”¹¹⁵

“Like most kabbalists,” writes Johnson, “he believed that the actual letters of the Torah, and the numbers which they symbolized, offered means of direct access to God. It is a very potent brew once swallowed. However, Luria also had a cosmic theory which had an immediate direct bearing on belief in the Messiah, and which remains the most influential of all Jewish mystical ideas. The kabbalah listed the various layers of the cosmos. Luria postulated the thought that Jewish miseries were a symptom of the breakdown of the cosmos. Its shattered husks, or klippot, which are vile, none the less contain tiny sparks, tikkim, of the divine light. This imprisoned light is the Exile of the Jews. Even the divine Shekinah itself is part of the trapped light, subject to evil influences. The Jewish people have a dual significance in this broken cosmos, both as symbols and as active agents. As symbols, the injuries inflicted on them by the gentiles show how evil hurts the light. But as agents they have the task of restoring the cosmos. By the strictest observance of the Law, they can release the sparks of light trapped in the cosmic husks. When this restitution has been made, the Exile of the Light will end, the Messiah will come and Redemption will take place.”¹¹⁶

¹¹³ Mark Mazower, *Salonica, City of Ghosts: Christians, Muslims and Jews 1430-1950*, London: HarperCollins, 2004; Tikhomirov, *op. cit.*, p. 356.

¹¹⁴ Armstrong, *The Battle for God: a History of Fundamentalism*, New York: Ballantine, 2001, pp. 13-14.

¹¹⁵ Tikhomirov, *op. cit.*, p. 358. According to Armstrong (*op. cit.*, p. 11), “by 1650, Lurianic Kabbalah had become a mass movement, the only theological system to win such general acceptance among Jews at this time.”

¹¹⁶ Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 260-261.

Luria also believed in reincarnation, writing: "If the soul was not purified entirely the first time, and it left this world, that soul must come back in a reincarnation, even a few times, until it is entirely purified."¹¹⁷

This motif was to receive a fateful development in the thought of one of his disciples, Shabbatai Zevi, who "was educated on the Kabbala and declared himself to be the Messiah. Shabbatai Zevi was born in 1626 and died in 1676, and stirred up the whole Jewish world from the east to the extreme west. His father was from the Morea, and he himself began his activity in Smyrna. Possessing a huge ability to exert influence on those around him, he, while basing himself on Kabbalistic works (especially the Zohar), gave his own teaching, whose outlines, however, are not at all clearly known. In this period, both among Christians and among Jews there was an expectation of extraordinary events in 1666: among Christians – the Second Coming, among Jews – the coming of their Messiah. In Shabbatai Zevi those round him had already for a long time supposed to see something great, and in 1648 he finally declared that he was the Messiah. For this he was excommunicated from the synagogue and exiled from Smyrna. Then he began to preach in various other cities, including Constantinople. His fellow-labourer Nathan [Benjamin Levi], who played the role of the resurrected Prophet Elijah, announced that in 1666 the Messiah would appear, would liberate the Jews from the Turks and would take the Sultan into captivity. In 1665 Shabbatai Zevi did indeed triumphantly enter into Jerusalem, where the majority of the Jewish population believed in him. Then with the same pomp he appeared in Smyrna. A psychopathological inspiration that had not been seen for a long time took hold of the Jews. Everywhere the Jews gave themselves over to unrestrained joy, while others – to exploits of fasting and repentance with self-flagellation, giving alms and organizing feasts in honour of the Messiah, who was triumphantly announced in the synagogue. News of this reached Europe, where the same scenes began en masse, while the rabbis declared Shabbatai to be a liar and in every way opposed the movement. Meanwhile, the worried Turks arrested Shabbatai in 1666 and imprisoned him in Abydos, where crowds of worshippers continued to surround the Messiah in expectation that he would finally be released and liberate the Jews. The Turkish government decided to put an end this and declared Shabbatai Zevi an ultimatum: either accept Islam or be annihilated. Shabbatai Zevi accepted Islam, but still continued his role, until finally they exiled him to Dulcinea, where he died."¹¹⁸

¹¹⁷ Recently Rabbi Ovadia Yosef, the ultra-orthodox leader known as the "Moses of the Sephardic world" has applied this theory to the Holocaust, declaring that the Jewish victims of Nazism were "the reincarnation of earlier souls who sinned [and who] returned... to atone for their sins" (Lisa Beyer, Eric Silver, "Heresy and Holocaust", *Time*, August 21, 2000, p. 74).

¹¹⁸ Dan Cohn-Sherbok writes that Nathan "sent letters to Jews throughout the diaspora requesting that they repent and recognize Shabbatai Zevi as their deliverer. According to Nathan, Shabbatai would bring back the lost tribes and inaugurate the period of messianic redemption. After a short period in Jerusalem, Shabbatai travelled to Smyrna, where he encountered fierce opposition from various local rabbis. In response he declared that he was the Anointed of the God of Jacob and criticized those who refused to accept him. This act provoked hysterical response from his followers: a number fell into trances and had visions of him crowned on a royal throne as the King of Israel.

"In 1666 he went to Istanbul, where he was arrested and put into prison. Soon the prison quarters were transformed into a messianic court, and pilgrims from throughout the Jewish world travelled to Constantinople to join in messianic rituals and ascetic activities. Hymns were composed in Shabbatai's honour and new festivals introduced. The same year Shabbatai met the Polish kabbalist Nehemiah ha-Kohen, who denounced him to the Turkish authorities. When Shabbatai was brought

“However, Shabbataism did not disappear even after that. Up to now [the early twentieth century] there exists in Thessalonica a small sect of his followers, about 4000 souls, who call themselves the maiminim (that is, believers). Although their teaching is preserved in the strictest secrecy, nevertheless its Catechism is known. Both from this Catechism and from a work attributed to Shabbatai Zevi, it is evident that Shabbatai Zevi and the Messiah in general is periodically incarnated. Adam, Abraham, Moses, etc. are only parts of the soul of Shabbatai Zevi. The maiminim affirm that Shabbatai Zevi has been incarnate 18 times.

“After the death of Shabbatai Zevi there were several continuers of his work, who were generally looked upon as incarnations of the original soul of the Messiah, that is, as the Divinity having taken on human form. This incarnation of the Divinity constitutes one of the main points of the teaching of Shabbatai Zevi, and although his followers present several different schools, in this respect they all agree. It is noteworthy that Shabbatai Levi rebuked the Jews for their murder of Jesus Christ and intended to declare Him a prophet. In the work attributed to Shabbatai and which at the same time a certain Nehemiah Hia Hojon (in Graetz’ opinion, a simple rogue) called his own, the religious history of the world is expounded. This world-view should be compared, for clarity’s sake, with the teaching of Hojon on the trihypostacy of the Divinity. It is very possible that this was also Shabbatai’s idea. According to the teaching of Hojon, the Divinity is trinitarian, but not in the same sense as is taught by Christians. In the Divinity there are three Partsefim (persons): 1) the Holy Pre-Eternal Elder, who is the soul of all souls, 2) the Holy King, who is the incarnation of God, and 3) a female essence, the Shehinah. In the above-indicated work of Shabbatai it is explained that the creation of the world by Ayn-Sof (from the Kabbala) turned out to be unsuccessful. Neither the world, nor God himself were able to realize its ideal character. Only with the incarnation of Shabbatai Zevi – the Messiah, Christ, the Holy King – was the world renewed and attained perfection. Then also ‘the unknown hidden Holy Elder’ became knowable, and attained his development and realization. The Messiah, the highest man, constitutes one whole with God. He is the true creator and founder, for he brings order into the shaken-up structure of the world. Thus Shabbatai Zevi was the incarnation of the Divinity and one of the Partsefim. But we must note that in this theory the highest man, or Holy King, unites in himself the masculine and feminine principles. Consequently, in him is also included the Shehinah, although, perhaps, the trihypostacy is not thereby destroyed.

“In all this we clearly see a variation on what is undoubtedly the Kabbala. But apparently Shabbatai said about the Jews contemporary to him that they worshipped, not God, but the Metatron. In the teaching of the maiminim the Jews, although predestined for salvation, must now be numbered among the unbelievers, and for their salvation they must admit that Shabbatai Zevi is the Messiah.

“The sects of the Hassidim and Frankists in Poland, Russia and Austria are

to the Turkish court, he was given the choice between conversion and death. Given this alternative, Shabbatai converted to Islam...” (*Atlas of Jewish History*, London & New York: Routledge, 1996, p. 119) (V.M.)

considered offshoots of Shabbataism. But the founder of Hassidism in Poland at that time, Israel Besht (1698-1760), had no relations of any kind with the Shabbataists, and was extremely negatively disposed to Shabbatai Zevi. One presents in his teaching several other Kabbalistic variations. As regards Yankel Leibovich, who accepted the name of Jacob Frankel, he truly recognized the Messianic status of Shabbatai. According to his teaching, there were many Messiahs and there are all incarnations of one and the same Messianic soul, among whom are King David, Elijah the Prophet, Jesus Christ, Mahomet and Shabbatai Zevi. Jacob Frank composed his teaching in Thessalonica after entering into close relations with the Shabbataists...¹¹⁹

¹¹⁹ Tikhomirov, *op. cit.*, pp. 358-360.

18. THE JEWS AND THE RISE OF CAPITALISM

The Jews have influenced modern Europe through three major channels: religious, political and economic. In the religious sphere, as we have seen, Cabbalistic Judaism greatly influenced a whole series of heretical sects and magical practices that flooded Western Europe from the time of the Templars. From the beginning of the eighteenth century these sects and practices began to converge into the movement known as Freemasonry, which from the beginning displayed the decisive influence of Talmudic Judaism. From the second half of the eighteenth century the Jews began to harness the religious power they wielded through the Masonic lodges, to assist their political ends - the infiltration and ultimate overthrow of Christian society. However, none of this would have been possible without their *economic* power...

Capitalism on the grand scale is the product of avarice, the love of money, which St. Paul called "the root of all kinds of evil" (I Timothy 6.10). Of course, avarice was not invented by the Jews or the modern capitalists, but has been a trait of fallen man since the beginning. However, in most historical societies, while many men might dream of great wealth, only very few could have a realistic hope of acquiring it. Or rather, those few who had great wealth did not acquire it so much as *inherit* it. For they were the sons of the great landowning aristocratic families. Most ordinary people, on the other hand, were born as peasants. A peasant might dream of wealth, but his bondage to his landowning master and the necessity of spending all his time tilling the soil and bringing in the harvest, condemned his dreams to remain no more than that - dreams. This was especially the case in the feudal society of the medieval West - and indeed in almost all societies before the sixteenth century, insofar as almost all societies were based on a rural economy.

However, the growth of towns in the Renaissance, and especially the growth of *capitalism* and *banking*, made a certain measure of wealth a real possibility for a rapidly increasing proportion of the population. And it was the Jews who very quickly came to dominate the burgeoning capitalism of the West. The reason for this was that the Talmud has a specific economic doctrine that favours the most ruthless kind of capitalist exploitation.

According to Platonov, the Talmud "teaches the Jew to consider the property of all non-Jews as 'gefker', which means free, belonging to no one. 'The property of all non-Jews has the same significance as if it had been found in the desert: it belongs to the first who seizes it'. In the Talmud there is a decree according to which open theft and stealing are forbidden, but anything can be acquired by deceit or cunning..."

"From this it follows that all the resources and wealth of the non-Jews must belong to representatives of the 'chosen people'. 'According to the Talmud,' wrote the Russian historian S.S. Gromeka, "God gave all the peoples into the hands of the Jews" (Baba-Katta, 38); "the whole of Israel are children of kings; those who offend a Jew offend God himself" (Sikhab 67, 1) and "are subject to execution, as for lèse-majesté" (Sanhedrin 58, 2); pious people of other nations, who are counted worthy of participating in the kingdom of the Messiah, will take the role of slaves to the

Jews' (Sanhedrin 91, 21, 1051). From this point of view, ... all the property in the world belongs to the Jews, and the Christians who possess it are only temporary, 'unlawful' possessors, usurpers, and this property will be confiscated by the Jews from them sooner or later. When the Jews are exalted above all the other peoples, God will hand over all the nations to the Jews for final extermination.'¹²⁰

"The historian of Judaism I. Lyutostansky cites examples from the ancient editions of the Talmud, which teaches the Jews that it is pleasing to God that they appropriate the property of the goyim. In particular, he expounds the teaching of Samuel that deceiving a goy is not a sin...

"Rabbi Moses said: 'If a goy makes a mistake in counting, then the Jew, noticing this, must say that he knows nothing about it.' Rabbi Brentz says: 'If some Jews, after exhausting themselves by running around all week to deceive Christians in various places, come together at the Sabbath and boast of their deceptions to each other, they say: "We must take the hearts out of the goyim and kill even the best of them." - of course, if they succeed in doing this.' Rabbi Moses teaches: 'Jews sin when they return lost things to apostates and pagans, or anyone who doesn't reverence the Sabbath.'...

"To attain the final goal laid down in the Talmud for Jews - to become masters of the property of the goyim - one of the best means, in the opinion of the rabbis, is usury. According to the Talmud, 'God ordered that money be lent to the goyim, but only on interest; consequently, instead of helping them in this way, we must harm them, even if they can be useful for us.' The tract Baba Metsiya insists on the necessity of lending money on interest and advises Jews to teach their children to lend money on interest, 'so that they can from childhood taste the sweetness of usury and learn to use it in good time.'"¹²¹

Now the Old Testament forbade usury to brothers, but allowed it to strangers (Exodus 22.25; Leviticus 25.36; Deuteronomy 23.24). This provided the Jews' practice of usury with a certain justification according to the letter of the Mosaic law - although David commends the man "who hath not lent his money on usury" (Psalms 14.5). However, as the above quotations make clear, the Talmud exploited the letter of the law to make it a justification for outright exploitation of the Christians and Muslims.

Johnson, while admitting that some Talmudic texts encouraged exploitation of Gentiles, nevertheless argues that the Jews had no choice: "A midrash on the Deuteronomy text [about usury], probably written by the nationalistic Rabbi Akiva, seemed to say that Jews were obliged to charge interest to foreigners. The fourteenth-century French Jew Levi ben Gershom agreed: it was a positive commandment to burden the gentile with interest 'because one should not benefit an idolater... and cause him as much damage as possible without deviating from

¹²⁰ Israel Shahak writes that many Israeli-Palestinian negotiations have failed because "displaying the flag of a 'non-Jewish state' within the Land of Israel contradicts the sacred principle which states that all this land 'belongs' to the Jews" ("Jewish History, Jewish Religion, Political Consequences", <http://www.ptimes.com/current/articles.html>).

¹²¹ Platonov, op. cit., pp. 144-145, 147.

righteousness'; others took this line. But the most common justification was economic necessity:

“If we nowadays allow interest to be taken from non-Jews it is because there is no end of the yoke and the burden kings and ministers impose upon us, and everything we take is the minimum for our subsistence; and anyhow we are condemned to live in the midst of the nations and cannot earn our living in any other manner except by money dealings with them; therefore the taking of interest is not to be prohibited.’

“This was the most dangerous argument of all because financial oppression of Jews tended to occur in areas where they were most disliked, and if Jews reacted by concentrating on moneylending to gentiles, the unpopularity – and so, of course, the pressure – would increase. Thus the Jews became an element in a vicious circle. The Christians, on the basis of the Biblical rulings, condemned interest-taking absolutely, and from 1179 those who practised it were excommunicated. But the Christians also imposed the harshest financial burdens on the Jews. The Jews reacted by engaging in the one business where Christian laws actually discriminated in their favour, and so became identified with the hated trade of moneylending. Rabbi Joseph Colon, who knew both France and Italy in the second half of the fifteenth century, wrote that the Jews of both countries hardly engaged in any other profession...”¹²²

Whichever was the original cause – the Talmud’s encouragement of usury, or the Christians’ financial restrictions on the Jews – the fact was that it was through usury that the Jews came to dominate the Christians economically.

“Therefore,” writes Platonov, “already in the Middle Ages the Jews, using the Christians’ prejudice against profit, the amassing of wealth and usury, seized many of the most important positions in the trade and industry of Europe. Practising trade and usury and exploiting the simple people, they amassed huge wealth, which allowed them to become the richest stratum of medieval society. The main object of the trade of Jewish merchants was slave-trading. Slaves were acquired mainly in the Slavic lands¹²³, whence they were exported to Spain and the countries of the East. On the borders between the Germanic and Slavic lands, in Meysen, Magdeburg and Prague, Jewish settlements were formed, which were constantly occupied in the slave trade. In Spain Jewish merchants organized hunts for Andalusian girls, selling them into slavery into the harems of the East. The slave markets of the Crimea were served, as a rule, by Jews. With the opening of America and the penetration into the depths of Africa it was precisely the Jews who became suppliers of black slaves to the New World.

“From commercial operations, the Jews passed to financial ones, to mortgages and usury, often all of these at once. Already from the 15th century very large Jewish fortunes were being formed. We can judge how big their resources were from the fact that in Spain merchants kept almost a whole army of mercenaries who protected their dubious operations – 25,000 horsemen and 20,000 infantry.

¹²² Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 174. At the Third Lateran Council in 1179 usurers were excommunicated...

¹²³ Hence the English word “slave”, and the French “esclave”, come from “Slav”.

“‘The great universal historical event,’ wrote the Jewish historian V. Zombardt, author of the book *The Jews and Economic Life*, ‘was the expulsion of the Jews from Spain and Portugal (1492 and 1497). It must not be forgotten that on the very day that Columbus sailed from Palos to discover America (August 3, 1492), 300,000 Jews were expelled to Navarra, France, Portugal and the East¹²⁴, and that in the years in which Vasco da Gama was discovering the sea route to East India, the Jews were also being expelled from other parts of the Pyrenean peninsula.’ According to Zombardt’s calculations, already in the 15th century the Jews constituted one third of the numbers of the world’s bourgeoisie and capitalists.

“In the 16th to 18th centuries the centre of Jewish economics became Amsterdam, which the Jews called ‘the new, great Jerusalem’... In Holland, the Jews became key figures in government finance. The significance of the Jewish financial world in this country went beyond its borders, for during the 17th and 18th centuries it was the main reservoir out of which all monarchs drew when they needed money...”¹²⁵

The Jews of Venice, made famous in the character of Shylock in Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice*, began providing commercial credit around the beginning of the 16th century, and it was from their places of business that the word “bank” derives. “They did their business,” writes Niall Ferguson, “in front of the building once known as the Banco Rosso, sitting behind their tables – their tavule – and on their benches, their banci. But the Banco Rosso was located in a cramped ghetto some distance away from the centre of the city...

“At first the city’s government was reluctant to accept the refugees [they came from Spain and Portugal via Constantinople and the Ottoman Empire], but it soon became apparent that they might prove a useful source of money and financial services, since they could be taxed as well as borrowed from. In 1516 the Venetian authorities designated a special area of the city for Jews on the site of an old iron foundry which became known as the ghetto nuovo (getto literally means casting). There they were to be confined every night and on Christian holidays. Those who stayed in Venice for more than two weeks were supposed to wear a yellow O on their backs or a yellow (later scarlet) hat or turban. Residence was limited to a stipulated period on the basis of condotte (charters) renewed every five years. A similar arrangement was reached in 1541 with some Jews from Romania, who were accorded the right to live in another enclave, the ghetto vecchio. By 1590 there were around 1500 Jews in Venice. Buildings in the ghetto grew seven storeys high to accommodate the newcomers.

“Throughout the sixteenth century, the position of the Venetian Jews remained conditional and vulnerable. In 1537, when war broke out between Venice and the Ottoman Empire, the Venetian Senate ordered the sequestration of the property of ‘Turks, Jews and other Turkish subjects’. Another war from 1570 to 1573 led to the arrest of all Jews and the seizure of their property, though they were freed and had their assets returned after peace had been restored. To avoid a repetition of this

¹²⁴ As we have seen, these figures are considered vastly exaggerated by Norman Cantor, *The Sacred Chain*, London: Fontana, 1996, p. 189 (V.M.)

¹²⁵ Platonov, op. cit., pp. 148-149, 154.

experience, the Jews petitioned the Venetian government to be allowed to remain free during any future war. They were fortunate to be represented by Daniel Rodriga, a Jewish merchant of Spanish origin who proved to be a highly effective negotiator. The charter he succeeded in obtaining in 1589 granted all Jews the status of Venetian subjects, permitted them to engage in the Levant trade – a valuable privilege – and allowed them to practise their religion openly. Nevertheless, important restrictions remained. They were not allowed to join guilds or to engage in retail trade, hence restricting them to financial services, and their privileges were subject to revocation at eighteen months' notice. As citizens, Jews now stood more chance of success than Shylock in the Venetian law courts..."¹²⁶

Jews also became influential in Germany, in spite of Luther's strong opposition to Judaism. Thus "in the seventeenth century," writes Dan Cohn-Sherbok, "the court Jew came to play a crucial role in state affairs. Each royal or princely court had its own Jewish auxiliary. Throughout the country court Jews administered finances, provisioned armies, raised money, provided textiles and precious stones to the court... Such court Jews stood at the pinnacle of the social scale, forming an elite class."¹²⁷

"Beginning from the 17th century, the bankers of the Viennese Court were only Jews.¹²⁸ The same situation could be observed in many German principalities. And "in France under Louis XIV and XV the leading position in the financial world was occupied by the Jewish banker Samuel Bernard, about whose help to France contemporaries said that 'his whole merit consisted in the fact that he supported the State, as a string supports that which hangs on it.'"¹²⁹

Thus in the 18th century the Jewish banker Jean Lo (Levi) founded a huge "Mississippi company" in Paris, which gave him monopoly rights to trade with China, India, the islands of the southern seas, Canada and all the colonies of France in America, and which "guaranteed" dividends of 120% a year to investors. However, the paper he issued was founded on nothing, the company collapsed, "millions of Frenchmen were ruined and for many years the finances of the country were hopelessly disordered. At the same time many representatives of the Jewish community of Paris amassed huge fortunes on this misery."¹³⁰

Jewish power increased during the three great wars of the seventeenth century: the Thirty Years War in Germany, during which Jews supplied both the Catholics and the Protestants; the Austrian wars against France and then Turkey, during which Samuel Oppenheimer was the Imperial War Purveyor to the Austrians; and the wars against Louis XIV, when Oppenheimer was again the chief organizer of the finances of the anti-French coalition.¹³¹

¹²⁶ Ferguson, *The Ascent of Money*, New York: Penguin Press, 2008, pp. 34, 36-37.

¹²⁷ Cohn-Sherbok, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

¹²⁸ Thus "by 1694 the Austrian state debt to Oppenheimer alone amounted to no less than 3 million florins. At his death, by Emmanuel's estimate, it had reached double that figure." (David Vital, *A People Apart: The Jews in Europe, 1789-1939*, Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 14).

¹²⁹ Platonov, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

¹³⁰ Platonov, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

¹³¹ Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 256-258.

“William of Orange,” notes Johnson, “later William III of England, who led the coalition from 1672 to 1702, was financed and provisioned by a group of Dutch Sephardic Jews operating chiefly from the Hague.”¹³² But William’s enemy, Louis XIV, was also served by a Jewish banker. So the Jews profited whichever side won... Thus, as the well-known Jewish publicist Hannah Arendt writes, with the rise of capitalism, “Jewish banking capital became international. It was united by means of cross-marriages, and a truly international caste arose,” the consciousness of which engendered “a feeling of power and pride”.¹³³

After centuries of exile, the Jews were back at the heart of the Gentile world, a position they have not surrendered to the present day...

Nor was it only in the West that Jewish money ruled. In the sixteenth century, a French diplomat who lived in Constantinople under Suleyman the Magnificent, Nicolas de Nicolay, wrote: “They now have in their hands the most and greatest traffic of merchandise and ready money that is conducted in all the Levant. The shops and stalls best stocked with all the varieties of goods which can be found in Constantinople are those of the Jews. They also have among them very excellent practitioners of all the arts and manufactures, especially the Marranos not long since banished and expelled from Spain and Portugal who to the great detriment and injury of Christianity have taught the Turks several inventions, artifices and machines of war such as how to make artillery, arquebuses, gunpowder, cannon-balls and other arms.”¹³⁴

Protected by the Turks from the attacks of the Christians, the Constantinopolitan Jews intrigued against the West European States. Thus Joseph Nasi, a banker and entrepreneur, through contacts in western Europe was able, according to Philip Mansel, “to maintain an international network which helped him obtain revenge on Spain and France. It is possible that, from the banks of the Bosphorus, he encouraged the revolt of the Netherlands against Philip II of Spain. An envoy from the rebel leader, the Prince of Orange, came to see him in 1569. The historian Famianus Strada wrote: ‘As regards the Flemings, Miches’s [i.e. Nasi’s] letters and persuasions had no little influence on them.’ However no letters have come to light.”¹³⁵

A more pro-semitic interpretation is given to Jewish success by Paul Johnson, who writes: “The dynamic impulse to national economies, especially in England and the Netherlands, and later in North America and Germany, was provided not only by Calvinists, but by Lutherans, Catholics from north Italy and, not least, by Jews.

“What these moving communities shared was not theology but an unwillingness to live under the state regimentation of religious and moral ideas at the behest of the clerical establishments. All of them repudiated clerical hierarchies, favouring religious government by the congregation and the private conscience. In all these

¹³² Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 281.

¹³³ Arendt, “On Totalitarianism”, in Mikhail Nazarov, *Tajna Rossii* (The Mystery of Russia), Moscow: “Russkaia idea”, 1999, p. 394.

¹³⁴ Quoted in Philip Mansel, *Constantinople*, London: Penguin Books, 1997, p. 124.

¹³⁵ Mansel, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

respects the Jews were the most characteristic of the various denominations of emigrants...

“Capitalism, at all its stages of development, has advanced by rationalizing and so improving the chaos of existing methods. The Jews could do this because, while intensely conservative (as a rule) within their own narrow and isolated world, they had no share in or emotional commitment to society as a whole and so could watch its old traditions, methods and institutions being demolished without a pang – could, indeed, play a leading role in the process of destruction. They were thus natural capitalist entrepreneurs...

“It was the unconscious collective instinct of the Jews both to depersonalize finance and to rationalize the general economic process. Any property known to be Jewish, or clearly identifiable as such, was always at risk in medieval and early modern times, especially in the Mediterranean, which was then the chief international trading area. As the Spanish navy and the Knights of Malta treated Jewish-chartered ships and goods as legitimate booty, fictitious Christian names were used in the paperwork of international transactions, including marine insurance. These developed into impersonal formulae. As well as developing letters of credit, the Jews invented bearer-bonds, another impersonal way of moving money. For an underprivileged community whose property was always under threat, and who might be forced to move at short notice, the emergence of reliable, impersonal paper money, whether bills of exchange or, above all, valid banknotes, was an enormous blessing.

“Hence the whole thrust of Jewish activity in the early modern period was to refine these devices and bring them into universal use. They strongly supported the emergence of the institutions which promoted paper values: the central banks, led by the Bank of England (1694) with its statutory right to issue notes, and the stock exchanges...

“In general, financial innovations which Jews pioneered in the eighteenth century, and which aroused much criticism then, became acceptable in the nineteenth.

“...Jews were in the vanguard in stressing the importance of the selling function... [and] were among the leaders in display, advertising and promotion...

“They aimed for the widest possible market. They appreciated the importance of economies of scale...

“Above all, Jews were more inclined than others in commerce to accept that businesses flourished by serving consumer interests rather than guild interests. The customer was always right. The market was the final judge. These axioms were not necessarily coined by Jews or exclusively observed by Jews, but Jews were quicker than most to apply them.

“Finally, Jews were exceptionally adept at gathering and making use of commercial intelligence. As the market became the dominant factor in all kinds of

trading, and as it expanded into a series of global systems, news became of prime importance. This was perhaps the biggest single factor in Jewish trading and financial success..."¹³⁶

¹³⁶ Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 245-246, 247, 283, 285, 286.

19. THE JEWS AND ENGLAND

The Jews arrived in England shortly after the Norman Conquest of 1066, and soon made themselves indispensable to the Norman kings through their financial talents. However, in 1290 King Edward I of England expelled them – the first of many western rulers to do so. For nearly four hundred years there were no Jews in England...

The migration of the Sephardic Jews from Spain and Portugal to Holland and England marked the beginning both of the ascent of these latter states to the status of world powers, and of the fall of Spain and Portugal from their position of power. For, as R.H. Tawney writes: "Portugal and Spain held the keys of the treasure house of the east and the west. But it was neither Portugal with her tiny population, and her empire that was little more than a line of forts and factories 10,000 miles long, nor Spain, for centuries an army on the march and now staggering beneath the responsibilities of her vast and scattered empire, devout to fanaticism, and with an incapacity for economic affairs which seemed almost inspired, which reaped the material harvest of the empires into which they had stepped, the one by patient toil, the other by luck. Gathering spoils which they could not retain, and amassing wealth which slipped through their fingers, they were little more than the political agents of minds more astute and characters better versed in the arts of peace... The economic capital of the new civilization was Antwerp... its typical figure, the paymaster of princes, was the international financier"¹³⁷ – that is, the Jew. And when the Jews began to move from Antwerp to London, the economic leadership of the world moved to England...

Thus in September, 1653 Menasseh Ben Israel came to London from Amsterdam to plead the case for Jewish readmission to England. At that time, writes Rabbi Jeremy Gordon, "England was in the grip of Messianic excitement. Cromwell had opened Parliament that July with the announcement that 'this may be the door to usher in the things that God has promised... You are at the edge of the promises and prophecies.'

"Ben Israel lost no time stoking the messianic fervour for his own purposes. In 'A Humble Adresse to the Lord Protector' he notes: 'The opinion of many Christians and mine doe concurre herin, in that we both believe the restoring time of our Nation into their Native Country is very near at hand; I believing that this restauration cannot be before the words of Daniel be first accomplished, And when the dispersion of the Holy people shall be completed in all places, then shall all these things be completed. Signifying therewith, that all be fulfilled, the People of God must be first dispersed into all places of the World. Now we know how our Nation is spread all about, and hath its seat and dwellings in the most flourishing Kingdomes of the World except only this considerable and mighty Island [Britain]. And therefore this remains onely in my judgements before the MESSIA come.'

¹³⁷ Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, 1926, 1937, p. 78; in M.J. Cohen and John Major, *History in Quotations*, London: Cassel, 2004, p. 323.

“It is fascinating to observe Ben Israel’s theological partnering with the Puritans. He is tempting Christians to let Jews into Britain in order to bring the second coming of Jesus! The ‘Adresse’ is a masterful work of flattery, requesting a ‘free and publick Synagogue’ in order that Jews may, ‘sue also for a blessing upon this [British] Nation and People of England for receiving us into their bosoms and comforting Sion in her distresse.’ But it also reminded Cromwell that no ruler, ‘hath ever afflicted [the Jews] who hath not been, by some ominous Exit, most heavily punished of God Almighty; as is manifest from the Histories of the Kings; Pharaoh, Nebuchadnezer & others.’

“Ben Israel also marshals less spiritual arguments, devoting several pages to a survey of the profitability of ‘The Nation of Jewes’ in a range of states that have seen fit to let in Jews. This might have been particularly interesting to Cromwell, seeking to find ways to keep Britain ahead of the Dutch economy.

“Suitably inspired, Cromwell called a conference of merchants and clergymen but didn’t get the support he was looking for. Admitting the Jews would be a blasphemy, some claimed. Others spread rumours of child murder... There were also fears, if re-admission were formalised, that ‘every Vagabond Jew may purchase the Liberties and Immunities of free-born Englishmen’.

“Not everyone, and least of all the guilds, were anxious to see the Jews’ economic nous and power in competition with the existing British mercantile classes. Perhaps in the face of such opposition, Cromwell disbanded the conference before it could report.”¹³⁸

The Venetian ambassador to England, Giovanni Sagredo describes these events as follows: “A Jew came from Antwerp and... when introduced to his highness [Oliver Cromwell] he began not only to kiss but to press his hands and touch... his whole body with the most exact care. When asked why he behaved so, he replied that he had come from Antwerp solely to see if his highness was of flesh and blood, since his superhuman deeds indicated that he was more than a man... The Protector ordered [i.e. set up] a congregation of divines, who discussed in the presence of himself and his council whether a Christian country could receive the Jews. Opinions were very divided. Some thought they might be received under various restrictions and very strict obligations. Others, including some of the leading ministers of the laws, maintained that under no circumstances and in no manner could they receive the Jewish sect in a Christian kingdom without very grave sin. After long disputes and late at night the meeting dissolved without any conclusion...”¹³⁹

Eventually, in 1656, the Jews got their way. Their success, continues Gordon, “owes its origin to the imprisonment of a converso merchant, Antonio Rodrigues Robles, on the charge of being a papist. Robles was threatened with sequestration of his assets and escaped punishment only when he claimed that, rather than being

¹³⁸ Gordon, “Flaw of Return”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, March 31, 2006, Weekly Review, p. 38; Christopher Hale, “Oliver Cromwell and the Readmission of the Jews”, *BBC History Magazine*, vol. 7, no. 11, pp. 44-47.

¹³⁹ Sagredo, in M.J. Cohen and John Major, *History in Quotations*, London: Cassell, 2004, p. 184.

a papist, he was Jewish. Cromwell intervened, Robles escaped punishment and, as the historian Heinrich Graetz remarked, Jews 'made no mistake over the significance of this ruling, [and threw] off the mask of Christianity.'

"It was, in Cromwell's England, far safer to be an avowed Jew than a closeted pseudo-Puritan who might harbour papist tendencies.¹⁴⁰ Devoid of constitutional upheaval, legislation or fanfare, the Jews got on with the day-to-day business of establishing a community on this 'considerable and mighty Island'."¹⁴¹

Jewish influence now increased on the political and religious, no less than the economic life of England. Eliane Glaser writes: "In 1653... the radical Fifth Monarchist preacher John Rogers suggested a plan to model the new parliament on the Sanhedrin. Rogers, like other members of the millenarian sect, believed that this would hasten Christ's coming, and the idea appeared in the manifesto of the Fifth Monarchy rebels in 1657. In fact the use of the Jewish court as a template for the English religious and political constitution is one of the most startling aspects of Christian discourse in the 17th century.

"In 1653, the legal scholar John Selden wrote a lengthy tract on the Sanhedrin; and Selden's Jewish ideas greatly influenced John Milton. Utopian visions of the English constitution, such as James Harrington's *The Commonwealth of Oceana* (1656) and Thomas Hobbes's *Leviathan* (1656), contain numerous references to ancient Israel. The Sanhedrin was at the centre of debates about the place of religious minorities and the relationship between religious and civil law, because Christian commentaries could never agree on whether the Sanhedrin had arbitrated in secular as well as sacred affairs..."¹⁴²

Very soon, also, the Jews were once more in control of the finances of England. The decisive event, as we have seen, was King William III's decision to borrow from the Jews in order to finance his campaigns against France. N. Bogoliubov writes: "With the help of the agent William Paterson [the king] succeeded in persuading the British Treasury to borrow 1.25 million British pounds from Jewish bankers. This strengthened his position. Insofar as the state debt had already, even without this, attained improbable heights, the government could do nothing but agree to the conditions presented:

"1. The name of the creditor will remain in secret: he is allowed to found 'The Bank of England' (a Central Bank).

¹⁴⁰ Another reason for this, as R.A. York points out, is that "quite a strong philo-semitic tendency was developing in English Puritanism at this time. Puritanism encouraged the return to the text of the Bible, in particular to the Old Testament. This in turn encouraged greater interest in the study of Hebrew and the Jews themselves.

"Part of the reason for this interest was proselytising. The Jews had long been resistant to Christianity, but they might be more attracted to a purer, more Judaic form..." (Letters, *History Today*, vol. 50 (12), December, 2000, p. 61) (V.M.)

¹⁴¹ Gordon, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

¹⁴² Glaser, "Napoleon's Jews: A Law unto Themselves", *BBC History Magazine*, vol. 8, no. 8, August, 2007, p. 37.

"2. The directors of the above-mentioned bank are given the right to establish the gold support of paper money.

"3. They are given the right to give credits to the extent of ten pounds in paper money to every pound kept in gold.

"4. They are given the right to accumulate a national debt and collect the necessary sum by means of direct taxation of the people.

"Thus there appeared the first private central bank – 'the Bank of England'. By means of these operations banking procedures were able to produce a 50% profit on the Bank's capital deposits at 5%. It was the English people who had to pay for this. The creditors were not concerned that the debt should be paid, since in conditions of indebtedness they were able to exert influence also on the political processes in the country. The national debt of England rose from £1,250,000 in 1694 to £16,000,000 in 1698..."¹⁴³

In the opinion of financial experts, it is this passing over of the power to issue paper money from governments to private banks, which then lend this money at interest, that constitutes the crucial innovation that created the capitalist system in its contemporary form. Thus according to the Orthodox scholar George Knupfer, there are two radically different kinds of capital. On the one hand, there is "real" capital – "land, buildings, machinery, personal credit and ability. The personal ownership of all these factors has been since the beginning of mankind a part of the natural law." And on the other hand, there is "pseudo-capital", "money-out-of-nothing", which came into existence... only around the time of the "Glorious Revolution" in England through the influence of Jewish banks and their agents. This pseudo-capital is created literally out of nothing, but is lent out to businesses and individuals at interest as if it were real money.¹⁴⁴

The political consequences of the creation of the private, Jewish-run Bank of England, and its possession of the power to issue "money-out-of-nothing", were enormous. For most of the next century and a quarter, during the so-called "Second Hundred Years War" that ended with the battle of Waterloo in 1815, France and Britain waged a ferocious battle for world supremacy. Although France had far greater "real capital" in terms of population, land and men, and although her opponent suffered hammer blows during the period such as the loss of the American colonies, she finally lost because her opponent could borrow more...

Of course, there were other factors, such as superior British naval technology. But high tech, too, has to be paid for. And so, as Robert and Isabelle Tombs write, "What would previously have seemed incredible had been done: £1,500 million was spent on finally defeating France. This left a national debt of £733 million, equal to over forty times pre-war state income, or £37 for every person in Britain – the total annual earnings of a London labourer. This long accumulated financial burden was

¹⁴³ Bogoliubov, in Begunov, Yu.K. Stepanov, A.D. Dushenov, K.Yu., *Taina Bezzakonia* (The Mystery of Iniquity), St. Petersburg, 2002, pp. 381-382

¹⁴⁴ Knupfer, *The Struggle for World Power*, London: Plain-Speaker Publishing Company, 1963.

proportionately several times that left by the First World War..."¹⁴⁵

At the same time, the increased power of the Jews aroused suspicion and opposition in England. However, in 1732, as Johnson writes, "a judgement gave Jews, in effect, legal protection against generic libels which might endanger life. Hence... England became the first place in which it was possible for a modern Jewish community to emerge".¹⁴⁶ Indeed, when the Austrian Empress Maria Theresa expelled the Jews from Prague in 1744, the British government intervened, "with the Secretary of State, Lord Harrington, condemning the expulsions to her ambassador as 'detrimental and prejudicial to the true interest of the common cause' against France. These pleas initially fell on deaf ears, but Maria Theresa soon relented and the Jews ultimately returned home..."¹⁴⁷

"By the end of the eighteenth century," writes Vital, "the Jews of England had little to complain of..."¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁵ Tombs and Tombs, *That Sweet Enemy: The French and the British from the Sun King to the Present*, London: W. Heinemann, 2006.

¹⁴⁶ Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 278.

¹⁴⁷ Simms, *Europe: The Struggle for Supremacy, 1453 to the Present*, London: Allen Lane, 2013, p. 101.

¹⁴⁸ Vital, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

20. FREEMASONRY AND THE JEWS

The development of philosophical and political thought in the eighteenth century was fostered and spread especially by the secret religious movement known as *Freemasonry*. Originating in England, it spread like wildfire to the continent, where it assumed a revolutionary character that made it the principal cause of the French revolution of 1789. Almost immediately conservatives pointed to the Jews as being the real leaders of the movement, and the term "Judaeo-Masonry" was born.

Now since belief in the existence of a Judaeo-Masonic conspiracy against civilization is often taken as evidence of madness, or at any rate of political incorrectness, it is necessary to assert from the beginning that, as L.A. Tikhomirov rightly says, "it is strange to attribute to the Masons the whole complexity of the evolution of human societies. One must not have the idea that people lived happily and in a healthy state, but then the Masonic organization appeared and corrupted them all. It is necessary to know the laws of the development of societies, which would be such as they are if the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem had never taken place. In general the study of Masonry can be fruitful only on condition that it is conducted scientifically. Only such a study is capable of clarifying the true level of influence of this or that secret society on the evolution of peoples and states."¹⁴⁹

While Tikhomirov has no doubts about the existence of the Judaeo-Masonic conspiracy, he nevertheless insists that the blame for the destruction of modern society lies "most of all not on some premeditatedly evil influence of the Masons or whatever other organisation, but on the false direction of our own constructive activities."¹⁵⁰ For "there has never been a man or a society which has not been corrupted through his or its own free will."¹⁵¹ In other words, the Masons would have no power over society if society had not voluntarily abandoned its own defensive principles and institutions.

As Archpriest Lev Lebedev writes: "In evaluating the role of the Jewish core of World Masonry, two extremes are possible: the complete denial of any Judaeo-Masonic secret plot and secret leadership of world processes, and the extreme exaggeration of the degree and size of this leadership (when it seems that 'they' are everywhere and everything is ruled by 'them')... In fact, it is all not like that. The life of the world, even the development of its scientific-technical and industrial civilization is a very weird and changeable combination of elemental, ungovernable processes and planned, governable processes. In the final analysis everything is truly ruled by the Providence of God, but in such a way that the free will of man is not abolished. For that reason in their successful moments it can seem, and seems, to the Judaeo-Masons, who really are striving for ever greater subjection of the

¹⁴⁹ Tikhomirov, "K voprosu o masonakh" ("Towards the Question on the Masons"), *Khristianstvo i Politika* (Christianity and Politics), in *Kritika Demokratii* (A Criticism of Democracy), Moscow, 1997 pp. 330-331.

¹⁵⁰ Tikhomirov, "V chem nasha opasnost?" ("In What does the Danger to Us Consist?"), *Khristianstvo i Politika* (Christianity and Politics), *op. cit.*, p. 333.

¹⁵¹ Tikhomirov, "Bor'ba s Masonstvom" ("The Struggle with Masonry"), *Khristianstvo i Politika* (Christianity and Politics), *op. cit.*, p. 336.

processes of global life to themselves, that to an ever greater degree it is by their own, human powers that everything is achieved..."¹⁵²

Some have seen the origins of Freemasonry as far back as the Babylonian Exile, when the Pharisees were forced to use what came to be called Masonic symbols, gestures and handshakes in order to communicate with each other. Since there is next to no hard evidence for this, we shall not discuss it, nor any of the other theories of the very early origins of Freemasonry...

According to Masonic theory, "Free", "Speculative" or "Symbolic" Masonry began when the meeting-places, or lodges, of the "Operative" Masons, the stonemasons who built the medieval cathedrals, gradually began to decline in importance with the decline in their craft, and they were joined by intellectuals who used the lodges for their own intellectual, and often heretical or occult, activities. One of the first modern "speculative" Masons was the English antiquarian and astrologer, Elias Ashmole, who was initiated in 1646 and died in 1692.¹⁵³

Another early Mason was Sir Christopher Wren. Christopher Hodapp, a Mason, writes: "The Great London Fire had destroyed much of the city [of London] in 1666, and rebuilding it took decades. Freemason Christopher Wren had designed an astonishing number of the new buildings, and construction projects were everywhere. One of the biggest was the rebuilding of St. Paul's Cathedral. It started in 1673 and took almost 40 years to complete. Operative Masons came from all over England to work on the project, and many joined the Lodge of St. Paul. By 1710, the great cathedral was complete, and many lodges disbanded as Masons returned to their hometowns. By 1715, there were just four London city lodges left."¹⁵⁴

Even at this very early stage, Masonry aroused suspicion. Thus in 1698 a certain Mr. Winter circulated a leaflet in London warning "all godly people in the City of London of the Mischiefs and Evils practised in the Sight of God by those called Freed Masons... For this devilish Sect of Men are Meeters in secret which swear against all without their Following. They are the Anti Christ which was to come, leading Men from fear of God."¹⁵⁵

The traditional official birthday of Masonry is July 24, 1717, when the four remaining London lodges met in a pub in St. Paul's churchyard and created a Great Lodge as their ruling centre.¹⁵⁶ The first grandmaster was a nobleman, and the leaders of English Masonry to the present day have tended to be members of the royal family. Consonant with this royal connection, there was nothing revolutionary in a political sense in early English Masonry. Thus when Dr. James Anderson, a Presbyterian minister and master of Lodge number 17 of London, drew up the *Constitutions of Masonry* in 1723, great emphasis was laid on the Masons'

¹⁵² Lebedev, *Velikorossia* (Great Russia), St. Petersburg, 1999, p. 407.

¹⁵³ Jasper Ridley, *The Freemasons*, London: Constable, 1999, p. 22; G. Toppin, "Starred First", *Oxford Today*, vol. 12, No 1, Michaelmas term, 1999, pp. 32-34.

¹⁵⁴ Hodapp, *Freemasonry for Dummies*, Indianapolis: Wiley, 2005, pp. 30-31.

¹⁵⁵ Ridley, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

¹⁵⁶ The original lodges were numbers 1 to 4. However, in Scotland, the Kilwinning Lodge, which called itself "the Mother Lodge of Scotland" and claimed to go back to 1140, rejected the claims of the English Grand Lodge and called itself Lodge no. 0 (Hodapp, *op. cit.*, p. 26).

loyalty to King and country: "A mason is a peaceable subject to the civil powers, wherever he resides or works, and is never to be concerned in plots and conspiracies against the peace and welfare of the nation. If a brother should be a rebel against the state, he is not to be countenanced in his rebellion, however he may be pitied as an unhappy man; and if convicted of not other crime, though the brotherhood must and ought to dismiss his rebellion, and give no umbrage or ground of political jealousy to the government for the time being; they cannot expel him from the lodge, and his relation to it remains indefeasible."¹⁵⁷

The Masons, writes O.F. Soloviev, called themselves "men of good will, peace-lovers, builders of the future just construction of society and at the same time patriots of their own fatherlands, law-abiding subjects and citizens, as is emphasized in all the constitutional documents. They went towards the highest ideals not through the preaching of abstract truths, but by serving their own peoples. They did not wall themselves off by an invisible wall from their compatriots, but completely shared their destiny with all their woes and sufferings. They were distinguished by a striving to help those around them, to draw a middle line between extremes and introduce at any rate a little humanism into the bonds of war that have been inevitable up to now."¹⁵⁸

That was the theory. But in the order's secrecy, in the religiosity of its three degrees, and in its subversive political influence, a great danger to the powers that be was discerned; and in 1736 Pope Clement XII anathematized it. Moreover, "it was gradually revealed that the ritual humility of Symbolical Masonry had ceased to satisfy the leaders of the 'obediences', scions of the ruling dynasties and nobility, who strove to elaborate the inner decoration of the lodges and especially the rituals. The desired basis for reform was found in the specially transformed legend of the fate of the knightly order of the Templars, whose leader de Molay and his fellows had perished on the gallows in Paris in 1517 in accordance with the inquisitors' false [?] accusations of terrible heresies. The Templars began to be portrayed as the immediate forerunners of the 'free Masons', which required the introduction of several higher degrees into their order, to signify the special merits and great knowledge of individually chosen adepts. One of the initiators of the reform, the Scottish nobleman A. Ramsay, declared in 1737: 'Our forefathers the crusaders wanted to unite into one brotherhood the subjects of all states', so as in time to create 'a new people, which, representing many nations, would unite them in the bonds of virtue and science'. After the introduction of several higher degrees with luxurious rituals, a series of associations formed several systems, including the highly centralized system 'of strict observance' with rigorous discipline for its adepts, that was significantly developed in the German lands, in Russia and in Sweden."¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁷ Ridley, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

¹⁵⁸ O.F. Soloviev, *Masonstvo v Mirovoj Politike XX Veka* (Masonry in World Politics in the 20th Century), Moscow, 1998, p. 15.

¹⁵⁹ Soloviev, *op. cit.*, p. 17. Thus Piers Paul Read writes: "Andrew Ramsay, a Scottish Jacobite exiled in France who was Chancellor of the French Grand Lodge in the 1730s, claimed that the first Freemasons had been stoneMasons in the crusader states who had learned the secret rituals and gained the special wisdom of the ancient world. Ramsay made no specific claim for the Templars, probably because he did not wish to antagonise his host, the King of France; but in Germany another Scottish exile, George Frederick Johnson, concocted a myth that transformed 'the Templars... from

And so, within twenty years of its official birthday, Masonry had developed from a talking-shop for liberal intellectuals into a new religion tracing its roots to the Templars and beyond. This reinforced suspicions about its antichristian nature. At this point, however, the noble membership of the order proved useful. The Masons were saved from persecution by their success in recruiting members from the aristocracy, whose names were immediately published to show how “respectable” Masonry was. Moreover, a ban was placed on political discussions in the English lodges.

But if English Masonry by and large respected this ban, this was certainly not to be the case with its daughter lodges in Europe and America. Moreover, the *Constitutions* clearly witnessed both to Masonry’s revolutionary potential and to its religious nature. This is particularly obvious when in one and the same breath they both disclaim any interest in religion and then claim to profess “the best [religion] that ever was, or will or can be... the true primitive, catholic and universal religion agreed to be so in all times and ages.”¹⁶⁰

What was this religion? In some formulations it is like the Deism that was becoming fashionable in England, in which God, “the Great Architect of the Universe”, is seen as creating and activating the laws of nature, and then playing no further part in history. In others it is closer to Pantheism. Thus the *Constitutions* speak of “the law of Nature, which is the law of God, for God is Nature. It is to love God above all things, and our neighbour as ourself...”¹⁶¹

Closer examination reveals Masonry in its developed form to be a kind of Manichaeism, in which two gods are recognized: Christ and Satan, of whom the one, Christ, is hated, and the other, Satan, is adored. As the famous American Mason, Albert Pike, wrote: “To the crowd we must say: we worship a God, but it is the God one adores without superstition. To you, Sovereign Grand Inspectors General, we say this, that you may repeat it to the brethren of the 32nd, 31st and 30th degrees: all of us initiates of the high degrees should maintain the Masonic religion in the purity of the Luciferian doctrine. If Lucifer were not God, would Adonai, the God of the Christians, whose deeds prove his cruelty, perfidy and hatred of man, his barbarism and repulsion for science, would Adonai and his

their ostensible status of unlearned and fanatical soldier-monks to that of enlightened and wise knightly seers, who had used their sojourn in the East to recover its profoundest secrets, and to emancipate themselves from medieval Catholic credulity’.

“According to the German FreeMasons, the Grand Masters of the Order had learned the secrets and acquired the treasure of the Jewish Essenes which were handed down from one to the other. James of Molay [the last Grand Master of the Order], on the night of his execution, had sent the Count of Beaulieu to the crypt of the Temple Church in Paris to recover this treasure which included the seven-branched candelabra seized by the Emperor Titus, the crown of the Kingdom of Jerusalem and a shroud. It is undisputed that in evidence given at the trial of the Templars, a sergeant, John of Châlons, maintained that Gérard of Villiers, the Preceptor of France, had been tipped off about his imminent arrest and so had escaped on eighteen galleys with the Templars’ treasure. If this were so, what happened to this treasure? George Frederick Johnson said that it had been taken to Scotland, one of his followers specifying the Isle of Mull.” (*The Templars*, London: Phoenix Press, 2001, pp. 303-304)

¹⁶⁰ Ridley, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

¹⁶¹ Ridley, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

priests calumniate him? Yes, Lucifer is God, and unfortunately Adonai is also God... religious philosophy in its purity and youth consists in the belief in Lucifer, the equal of Adonai."¹⁶²

"We have the testimony of Copin Albancelli," wrote Tikhomirov, "whom we can in no way suspect of making up things, when he declares positively that he had genuine documents about this in his hands. I, he says, had the opportunity several years ago to find a proof that there exist certain Masonic societies which are satanic societies, not in the sense that the devil used to come personally to preside at their meetings, as that charlatan Leo Taxil says, but in the sense that their members confess the cult of Satan. They adore Lucifer as being supposedly the true God and are inspired by an irreconcilable hatred against the Christian God.' They even have a special formula casting 'curses' on Him and proclaiming the glory of and love for Lucifer..."¹⁶³

Of course, the Masons did not advertise their Satanism – and probably very few of them were initiated into these darkest of secrets. Instead, they attached themselves to the contemporary *Zeitgeist*, which was *ecumenism*. As religious passions cooled in Europe after the end of the religious wars, the Masons took the lead in preaching religious tolerance. But they went further: they said that religious differences did not matter, and that underlying all religions there was a "true, primitive, universal religion".

*

To what extent is the term "Judaeo-Masonry" appropriate? The characteristics of Masonry that we have examined so far are purely western in origin; they amount to a religious expression of Enlightenment rationalist philosophy. However, when we examine the rites and religious practices of Masonry, and especially of its later degrees, a strongly Jewish element is immediately apparent; for *most of the basic religious doctrines and rites of Freemasonry are in fact Jewish*.

For example, let us take the Masonic practice of wearing aprons. Michael Hoffman, following John L. Brooke, writes: "The Babylonian Talmud claims that the forbidden tree in the Garden, from which Adam ate was a fig: 'Rabbi Nehemiah holds that the tree of which Adam ate was the fig tree ' (BT Berakoth 40a). The Kabbalah teaches that the leaves of this fig tree conveyed powers of sorcery and magic (Zohar 1:56b Bereshit). Consequently, in the rabbinic mind, the aprons worn by Adam and Eve, being made from the leaves of the fig tree, were garments that gave the wearers magic powers. These aprons made from fig leaves had the power to give the bearer to enjoy 'the fruits of the world-to-come' (BT Bava Metzia 114b). It is with this rabbinic understanding that Freemasons and Mormons wear these aprons in their own rituals."¹⁶⁴

¹⁶² Pike, in A.C. de la Rive, *La Femme et l'Enfant dans la Franc-Maçonnerie Universelle* (The Woman and the Child in Universal Freemasonry), p. 588.

¹⁶³ Tikhomirov, *Religiozno-Filosofskie Osnovy Istorii* (The Religious-Philosophical Foundations of History), Moscow, 1997, p. 448.

¹⁶⁴ Hoffman, *Judaism Discovered*, Independent History and Research, 2008, p. 198.

Moreover, there is a significant personal input of Jewry into Masonry, especially at the highest levels. For the three symbolical degrees of Masonry are supplemented by thirty higher levels, which in turn are crowned by what has been called "invisible Masonry". And "all this impenetrably dark power is crowned, according to the conviction and affirmation of [the former Mason and investigator of Masonry] Copin Albancelli, by still another level: *the Jewish centre*, which pursues the aims of the universal lordship of Israel and holds in its hands both visible Masonry with its 33 degrees and the invisible degrees of invisible Masonry or 'Illuminism'..."¹⁶⁵

"It is true, of course," writes Bernard Lazare, "that there were Jews connected with Freemasonry from its birth, students of the Kabbala, as is shown by certain rites which survive. It is very probable, too, that in the years preceding the outbreak of the French Revolution, they entered in greater numbers than ever into the councils of the secret societies, becoming indeed themselves the founders of secret associations. There were Jews in the circle around Weishaupt, and a Jew of Portugese origin, Martinez de Pasquales, established numerous groups of illuminati in France and gathered around him a large number of disciples whom he instructed in the doctrines of re-integration. The lodges which Martinez founded were mystic in character, whereas the other orders of Freemasonry were, on the whole, rationalistic in their teachings.... There would be little difficulty in showing how these two tendencies worked in harmony; how Cazotte, Cagliostro, Martinez, Saint-Martin, the Comte de Saint Germain and Eckartshausen were practically in alliance with the Encyclopaedists and Jacobins, and how both, in spite of their seeming hostility, succeeded in arriving at the same end, the undermining, namely, of Christianity.

"This, too, then, would tend to show that though the Jews might very well have been active participants in the agitation carried on by the secret societies, it was not because they were the founders of such associations, but merely because the doctrines of the secret societies agreed so well with their own."¹⁶⁶

Thus Freemasonry was not controlled by the Jews, according to Lazare, but they had a great deal in common: Anti-Christianity (French Grand Orient Masonry to a much greater extent than English "regular" Masonry), a taste for a Kabbalistic type of mysticism, revolutionary politics and many members of Jewish blood. But this is only the beginning. It is when one enters into the details of the rites, especially the rites of the higher degrees, that the resemblances become really striking.

"The connections are more intimate," writes a Parisian Jewish review, "than one would imagine. Judaism should maintain a lively and profound sympathy for Freemasonry in general, and no matter concerning this powerful institution should be a question of indifference to it..."

"The spirit of Freemasonry is that of Judaism in its most fundamental beliefs; its ideas are Judaic, its language is Judaic, its very organisation, almost, is Judaic. Whenever I approach the sanctuary where the Masonic order accomplishes its

¹⁶⁵ Tikhomirov, *Religiozno-Filosofskie Osnovy Istorii*, p. 443.

¹⁶⁶ Lazare, *Antisemitisme* (Antisemitism), pp. 308-309; in Vicomte Léon de Poncins, *Freemasonry and the Vatican*, London: Britons Publishing Company, 1968, pp. 71-72.

works, I hear the name of Solomon ringing everywhere, and echoes of Israel. Those symbolic columns are the columns of the Temple where each Hiram's workmen received their wages; they enshrine his revered name. The whole Masonic tradition takes me back to that great epoch when the Jewish monarch, fulfilling David's promises, raised up to the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, a religious monument worthy of the creator of Heaven and earth – a tradition symbolised by powerful images which have spread outside the limits of Palestine to the whole world, but which still bear the indelible imprint of their origin.

“That Temple which must be built, since the sanctuary in Jerusalem has perished, the secret edifice at which all Masons on earth labour with one mind, with a word of command and secret rallying-points – it is the moral sanctuary, the divine asylum wherein all men who have been reconciled will re-unite one day in holy and fraternal Agapes; it is the social order which shall no longer know fratricidal wars, nor castes, nor pariahs, and where the human race will recognise and proclaim anew its original oneness. That is the work on which every initiate pledges his devotion and undertakes to lay his stone, a sublime work which has been carried on for centuries.”¹⁶⁷

This talk of universal fraternity in the rebuilding of the Temple is *deception*. “As for the final result of the messianic revolution,” writes Batault, “it will always be the same: God will overthrow the nations and the kings and will cause Israel and her king to triumph; the nations will be converted to Judaism and will obey the Law or else they will be destroyed and the Jews will be the masters of the world. The Jews' international dream is to unite the world with the Jewish law, under the direction and domination of the priestly people – a general form... of imperialism...”¹⁶⁸

However, it remains true that the main aim of Freemasonry, as of Judaism, is to rebuild the Temple of Solomon. And this alone should be enough to warn us of its Antichristianity, insofar the Lord decreed that “not one stone [of it] shall be left upon another that shall not be thrown down” (Matthew 24.2), and every attempt to rebuild it has been destroyed by the Lord, as happened in the time of Julian the Apostate. Moreover, the rites of Freemasonry themselves declare that the secret aim of the rebuilding of the Temple is *to undo the work of Christ on the Cross*.

Thus the 18th or Rosicrucian Degree¹⁶⁹ speaks of the ninth hour of the day as “the hour when the Veil of the Temple was rent in twain and darkness overspread the earth, when the true Light departed from us, the Altar was thrown down, the Blazing Star was eclipsed, the Cubic Stone poured forth Blood and Water, the Word was lost, and despair and tribulation sat heavily upon us. It goes on to exhort the Masons: “Since Masonry has experienced such dire calamities it is our duty, Princes, by renewed labours, to retrieve our loss.”

¹⁶⁷ *La Vérité Israélite* (The Israelite Truth), 1861, vol. 5, p. 74; De Poncins, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-76.

¹⁶⁸ G. Batault, *Le Problème Juif* (The Jewish Problem); De Poncins, *op. cit.*, pp. 77-78.

¹⁶⁹ On Rosicrucianism as a separate order within Masonry, see Platonov, *op. cit.*, chapter 21. It was founded in 1757 in Frankfurt-on-Main and counted among its leading adepts the charlatans Johann Welner, Saint-Germain and Calioastro.

The Reverend Walter Hannah justly commented on this: "For any Christian to declare that Masonry experienced 'a dire calamity' at the Crucifixion, or that Masons suffered a 'loss' at the triumphant death of our Saviour on the Cross which the Excellent and Perfect Princes of the Rose Croix of Heredom can by their own labour 'retrieve' seems not only heretical but actually blasphemous. The only interpretation which makes sense of this passage would appear to be that it is not the death of our Lord which is mourned, *but the defeat of Satan.*"¹⁷⁰ Indeed, for "the eclipse of the Blazing Star" can only mean the defeat of Satan, while the Cubic Stone pouring forth Blood and Water can only mean the triumph of Christ on the Cross - Christ, Who is "the Stone that the builders rejected" which became "the chief Corner-Stone" of the New Testament Church (Matthew 21.42), having been rejected as "the wrong shape" by the leaders of Old Israel. As the Apostle Peter said to the Sanhedrin: "This [Christ] is the Stone which was rejected by you builders [Jews, Masons], which has become the chief Corner-Stone" (Acts 4.11). Any Temple which does not have Christ as the chief Corner-Stone is an abomination to God and will be destroyed by Him just as the Old Testament Temple was destroyed; for "whoever falls on this Stone will be broken; but on whomever it falls, it will grind him to power" (Matthew 21.44). It is in the same Rosicrucian Degree that initiates are told to walk over the Cross of Christ...¹⁷¹

And so Masonry is revealed as a web of deceit whose outer layers are liberalism, scientism, and rationalism; whose inner layers are the overthrow of the existing world order in both Church and State; and whose innermost sanctum is the most explicit Antichristianity.

¹⁷⁰ Hannah, *Darkness Visible*, London: Augustine Press, 1952, p. 203.

¹⁷¹ H.T. F. Rhodes, *The Satanic Mass*, London: Jarrolds, 1968, p. 219-220.

21. THE GRAND ORIENT

1717, the year of the foundation of the Great Lodge of England, was also important as being the date of an Anglo-French treaty by which the Catholic Stuart pretender to the English throne was expelled from France and the Protestant Hanoverian dynasty was recognized by the French government. This facilitated the spread of Freemasonry to France and the Continent.

As a result, writes Viscount Leon de Poncins, it “evolved in a distinctly revolutionary and anti-religious sense. The Grand Orient of France led this movement, followed, with some reserve, by the Grand Lodge of France, and became the guide of the Grand Orients of Europe and South America. Freemasonry in the United States, while maintaining its union and friendly relations with the Grand Lodge of England, occupies an intermediate position between English Freemasonry and the Grand Orients of Europe. Some of its branches are nearer the English conception, and others the European...

“English Freemasonry in 1723 was in no way Christian; it was rationalist, vaguely deistic and secretly gnostic. The latter source of inspiration is still active, but it had encountered the conservative, traditional spirit of England. Most English Freemasons were men who were scarcely concerned with philosophical or metaphysical preoccupations. The revolutionary and anti-Christian inspiration which constituted the essence of contemporary Freemasonry everywhere, encountered a veiled and instinctive resistance in English Masons. The pact which Freemasonry tacitly concluded with the Protestant monarchy, to fight against Catholicism [and the Catholic Stuart pretenders to the English monarchy], which it considered its principal enemy, contributed to restrain the revolutionary tendencies of English Freemasonry, whereas they developed freely in Europe and South America, and rather more timidly in the United States. In short, the revolutionary virus in Freemasonry is more or less inactive in England, where Freemasonry is more an excuse for social reunion than an organisation claiming to remake the world.”¹⁷²

This difference between English and Continental Masonry has been denied by some writers. And of course, from a religious point of view, at least until Grand Orient Masonry officially adopted atheism in 1877 and was “excommunicated” by the Grand Lodge of England, there was little significant difference between the two. Nevertheless, from a *political* point of view the distinction is both valid and important; for English Masonry, linked as it was with the nobility and the monarchy from the beginning, dissociated itself from the revolutionary activities of its brother lodges on the Continent, and as late as 1929 reaffirmed the ban on discussion of politics and religion within the lodge.

It was Continental Masonry, springing from the Grand Orient of France, that was the real revolutionary force in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Europe and beyond, as we see especially in the 30th degree of the Scottish rite, the Kadosch

¹⁷² Vicomte Léon de Poncins, *Freemasonry and the Vatican*, London: Britons Publishing Company, 1968, p. 116.

degree. Here the myth that forms the core of the earlier degrees, the murder of Hiram or Adoniram, the supposed architect of Solomon's Temple, is replaced by the myth of Jacques de Molay, the last great master of the order of the Templars, who was burned alive on the orders of King Philippe the Fair of France and Pope Clement V in 1314, and who was supposed to have founded four Masonic lodges on his deathbed. The initiates of the Kadosch degree avenge the death of the Templars' leader by acting out the murder of the French king and the Pope.

"The Kadosch adept," writes V.F. Ivanov, "tramples on a crown as a symbol of tyranny in general, and then tramples on the papal tiara as a symbol of violence over the free human conscience.

"The king and the pope are symbols, and by these symbols we are given to understand the struggle to the death against 'civil and ecclesiastical despotism'."¹⁷³

This vengeful rite was not just theatre, but a prelude and preparation for real revolutionary action. Thus in 1784 in Wilhemsbad a pan-European congress of Masons in which the mysterious proto-communist sect of the "Illuminati" took a leading role, decided on the murder of Louis XVI of France and Gustavus Adolphus III of Sweden. Both sentences were carried out...

However, the Continental Masons managed to conceal their murderous intentions under a cover of good works and conviviality. This was enough to fool even those who should have been best informed. Thus Louis XVI's queen, Marie Antoinette, wrote to her sister Maria Christina in 1781: "It seems to me that you attach too much significance to Masonry in France; it has by no means played the same role in France as in other countries, thanks to the fact that here everybody belongs to it and so we know everything that goes on there. What danger do you see in it? I understand that it would be possible to fear the spread of Masonry if it were a secret political society, but, you know, this society exists only for good works and for entertainments; there they do a lot of eating, drinking, discussing and singing, and the king says that people who drink and sing cannot be conspirators. Thus it is impossible to call Masonry a society of convinced atheists, for, as I have heard, they constantly speak about God there. And besides, they give a lot of alms, educate the children of the poor or dead members of the brotherhood, give their daughters in marriage - I truly see nothing in bad in all this. The other day the Princess de Lambal was elected great mistress of one lodge; she told me how nice they are to her there, but she said that more was drunk than sung; the other day they offered to give dowries to two girls. True, it seems to me that it would be possible to do good without all these ceremonies, but, you know, everyone has his own way of enjoying himself; as long as they do good, what has the rest to do with us?"¹⁷⁴ However, one year into the revolution she had discovered that Masonry had a great deal to do with them. On August 17, 1790 she wrote to her brother, the Austrian Emperor Leopold II: "Forgive me, dear brother, believe in the tender sentiments of your unhappy sister. The main thing is, keep away from every

¹⁷³ Ivanov, *Russkaia Intelligentsia i Masonstvo: ot Petra I do nashikh dnei* (The Russian Intelligentsia and Masonry: from Peter I to our Days), Harbin, 1934, Moscow, 1997, p. 64.

¹⁷⁴ Ivanov, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

Masonic society. In this way all the horrors that are taking place here are striving to attain one and the same end in all countries."¹⁷⁵

¹⁷⁵ Ivanov, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

22. FREEMASONRY AND THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The first major historical event in which the hand of Judaeo-Masonry is clearly discernible is the American revolution. The first lodges had been established in Boston and Philadelphia by 1730¹⁷⁶, and several of the leaders of the American revolution were Freemasons, including Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, John Hancock, James Madison, James Monroe, Paul Revere, John Paul Jones and La Fayette.¹⁷⁷ However, many of the leaders of the British forces were also Freemasons, and “of the 7 Provincial Grand Masters [of American Masonry], 5 supported George III, and condemned revolutionary agitation against the established authority.”¹⁷⁸

This confirms the point made above, namely that English, as opposed to Continental Masonry, was not revolutionary (or not so revolutionary) in character; while American Masonry, being a mixture of the two (Lafayette represented French Masonry, and Franklin was also influenced by the French), had leading representatives on both sides of the conflict. But it was not simply a question of English versus Continental Masonry: the movement in general had the unexpected property of spawning, as well as most of the leaders of the revolution, several of the leaders of the counter-revolution. Hence the paradox that Tom Paine, one of the leading apologists of the revolution, was not a Freemason, while his reactionary opponent, Edmund Burke, was; that the anti-revolutionary Comte d’Artois and King Gustavus Adolphus III of Sweden were Freemasons, while the ultra-revolutionary Danton and Robespierre were not; that Napoleon, the exporter of the ideals of the revolution, was not a Freemason (although he protected it), while the reactionary generals who defeated him – Wellington, Blücher and Kutuzov - were.

One reason for this paradoxical phenomenon was a distinction discussed in a famous essay by Sir Isaiah Berlin between two concepts of freedom prevailing in eighteenth-century thought: freedom as a *negative* concept, freedom *from* restrictions of various kinds, and freedom as a *positive* concept, freedom *to* do certain things.¹⁷⁹ English liberalism and the English Enlightenment, following Locke, understood freedom in the negative sense; whereas the French Enlightenment, as well as Counter-Enlightenment writers such as Rousseau, tended to understand it in the positive sense – which was also the more revolutionary idea. Those who joined the ranks of the Masons were lovers of freedom in a general sense; but when some of them saw how the Rousseauist, positive concept of freedom led to Jacobinism and all the horrors of the French revolution, they turned sharply against it. Some still remained members of the lodge, but others broke all links with it.¹⁸⁰

Another reason had to do with the decentralized, diffuse organization of Masonry, and its very broad criteria of membership. This meant that a very wide range of people could enter its ranks, and precluded the degree of control and

¹⁷⁶ Ridley, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

¹⁷⁷ Ridley, *op. cit.*, pp. 108-109.

¹⁷⁸ Ridley, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

¹⁷⁹ Berlin, *Two Concepts of Liberty*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

¹⁸⁰ Thus Wellington never entered a lodge after his membership lapsed in 1795, and in 1851 wrote that he “had no recollection of having been admitted a Freemason...” (Ridley, *op. cit.*, p. 161)

discipline that was essential for the attainment and, still more important, the retention of supreme political power. Masonry was therefore the ideal kind of organization for the first stage in the revolutionary process, the dissemination of revolutionary ideas as quickly as possible through as large a proportion of the population as possible. But if “the mystery of iniquity” was to achieve real political power, this first stage has to be succeeded by a second in which a more highly disciplined and ruthless, Communist-style party took over the leadership. Such a take-over is discernible in both the French and the Russian revolutions. In France the Masonic constitutionalists, such as Mirabeau and Lafayette, were pushed aside by the anti-democratic, anti-constitutionalist Jacobins or “Illuminati”, while in Russia the Masonic constitutionalists, such as Kerensky and Lvov, were pushed aside by Lenin and Stalin...

The American revolution was unique in that the first stage has not been succeeded by the second – yet...

The first power in the West clearly to see the threat of Masonry to both Church and State was the Vatican – which, of course, had little influence in America. Catholicism made no radical distinction between English and French Masonry. In 1738 Masonry of all kinds was condemned by Pope Clement XII, in 1751 – by Benedict XIV, in 1821 – by Pius VII, in 1825 – by Leo XII, in 1829 – by Pius VIII, in 1832 and 1839 – by Gregory XVI, in 1846, 1864, 1865, 1873 and 1876 – by Pius IX, and in 1884 – by Leo XIII. The latter’s bull, Humanum Genus declared of the Freemasons: “Their ultimate aim is to uproot completely the whole religious and political order of the world... This will mean that the foundation and the laws of the new structure of society will be drawn from pure Naturalism.”¹⁸¹

The Popes were right. And yet the papacy was powerless to stem the tide of naturalism and unbelief that was sweeping Europe on the eve of the French Revolution. Nor could the revolution planned by the Grand Orient of Paris be prevented by the intrigues of the papacy, for the simple reason that she had started the whole long process of apostasy herself: from Papism to Humanism to Protestantism, from Deism to the Enlightenment and Freemasonry, and on into the still more bloody and blasphemous future – it had all begun in Rome, when the first heretical Popes broke away from the Orthodox Church and the Byzantine Autocracy. The Papacy was therefore compromised; and if deliverance from the rapid growth of Masonry was to come it could only come from the Orthodox Church and that Autocracy that now stood in the place of Byzantium – the Third Rome of Russia...

¹⁸¹ De Poncins, op. cit., p. 31. The bull went on: “In the sphere of politics, the Naturalists lay down that all men have the same rights and that all are equal and alike in every respect; that everyone is by nature free and independent; that no one has the right to exercise authority over another; that it is an act of violence to demand of men obedience to any authority not emanating from themselves. All power is, therefore, in the free people. Those who exercise authority do so either by the mandate or the permission of the people, so that, when the popular will changes, rulers of States may lawfully be deposed even against their will. The source of all rights and civic duties is held to reside either in the multitude or in the ruling power in the State, provided that it has been constituted according to the new principles. They hold also that the State should not acknowledge God and that, out of the various forms of religion, there is no reason why one should be preferred to another. According to them, all should be on the same level...”

23. MASONRY UNDER THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY TSARS

Russia opened her “window to the West”, and therefore to the influences of Western Masonry, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, during the reign of Peter the Great. It was Peter and his successors, especially Catherine II, who accomplished a revolution from above that seriously weakened the foundations of Holy Rus’, thereby making possible the revolution from below that culminated in the Russian revolution of 1917.

“There is no doubt,” writes V.F. Ivanov, “that the seeds of Masonry were sown in Russian by the ‘Jacobites’, supporters of the English King James II, who had been cast out of their country by the revolution and found a hospitable reception at the court of Tsar Alexis Mikhailovich.

“Independently of the Masonic propaganda of the Jacobite Masons, the Russians had learned of the existence of the mysterious union of free stonemasons during their journeys abroad. Thus, for example, Boris Petrovich Sheremetev had got to know Masonry during his travels. Sheremetev had been given a most triumphant meeting on Malta. He took part in the great feast of the Maltese order in memory of John the Forerunner, and they had given him a triumphant banquet there. The grand-master had bestowed on him the valuable Maltese cross made of gold and diamonds. On returning to Moscow on February 10, 1699, Sheremetev was presented to the Tsar at a banquet on February 12 at Lefort’s, dressed in German clothes and wearing the Maltese cross. He received ‘great mercy’ from the Tsar, who congratulated him on becoming a Maltese cavalier and gave him permission to wear this cross at all times. Then a decree was issued that Sheremetev should be accorded the title of ‘accredited Maltese cavalier’.

“‘The early shoots of Russian Masonry,’ writes Vernadsky, ‘were particularly possible in the fleet, since the fleet had been created entirely on western models and under western influence.

“‘In one manuscript of the Public library the story is told that Peter was received into the Scottish degree of St. Andrew, and ‘made an undertaking that he would establish this order in Russia, a promise which he carried out (in the form of the order of St. Andrew the First-Called, which was established in 1698)...

“‘Among the manuscripts of the Mason Lansky, there is a piece of grey paper on which this fact is recorded: ‘The Emperor Peter I and Lefort were received into the Templars in Holland.’

“‘In the Public library manuscript ‘A View on the Philosophers and the French Revolution’ (1816), it is indicated that Masonry ‘existed during the time of Tsar Alexis Mikhailovich. Bruce was its great master, while Tsar Peter was its first inspector.’”¹⁸²

¹⁸² Ivanov, *Russkaia Intelligentsia i Masonstvo: ot Petra I do nashikh dnei* (The Russian Intelligentsia and Masonry: from Peter I to our Days), Harbin, 1934, Moscow, 1997, pp. 95-96. Keith founded his Russian lodge in 1741-1742, and left Russia in 1747.

One contemporary Masonic source writes: "One Russian tradition has it that Peter became a Mason on trip to England and brought it back to Russia. There is no hard evidence of this..."¹⁸³

Whether or not the tsar himself became a Mason, it is undoubted that many Russian aristocrats joined the lodges from this time. Why? Because, according to Sir Geoffrey Hosking, the lodges "became a channel by which young men aspiring to high office or good social standing could find acquaintances and protectors among their superiors; in the Russian milieu this meant an easier and pleasanter way of rising up the Table of Ranks..."¹⁸⁴

There were deeper reasons, however. "Freemasonry," as Andrzej Walicki points out, "had a dual function: on the one hand, it could draw people away from the official Church and, by rationalizing religious experience, could contribute to the gradual secularisation of their world view; on the other hand, it could attract people back to religion and draw them away from the secular and rationalistic philosophy of the Enlightenment. The first function was fulfilled most effectively by the rationalistic and deistic wing of the movement, which set the authority of reason against that of the Church and stood for tolerance and the freedom of the individual. The deistic variety of Freemasonry flourished above all in England, where it had links with the liberal movement, and in France, where it was often in alliance with the encyclopedists. The second function was most often fulfilled by the mystical trend, although this too could represent a modernization of religious faith, since the model of belief it put forward was fundamentally anti-ecclesiastical and postulated a far-reaching internalisation of faith founded on the soul's immediate contact with God."¹⁸⁵

Russians, though not uninfluenced by the rationalist side of Masonry, were especially drawn by its mystical side. For while their faith in Orthodoxy was weak, they were by no means prepared to live without religion altogether. "Finding myself at the crossroads between Voltairianism and religion", wrote Novikov, "I had no basis on which to work, no cornerstone on which to build spiritual tranquillity, and therefore I fell into the society [Masonry]."¹⁸⁶

Masonry continued to grow until the reign of Elizabeth, when "...German influence began to be replaced by French," an investigator of this question tells us. 'At this time the West European intelligentsia was beginning to be interested in so-called French philosophy; even governments were beginning to be ruled by its ideas... In Russia, as in Western Europe, a fashion for this philosophy appeared. In the reign of Elizabeth Petrovna a whole generation of its venerators was already being reared. They included such highly placed people as Count M. Vorontsov and Shuvalov, Princess Dashkova and the wife of the heir to the throne, Catherine Alexeyevna. But neither Elizabeth nor Peter III sympathised with it.

¹⁸³ Richard I. Rhoda, "Russian Freemasonry: A New Dawn", paper delivered at Orient Lodge no. 15 on June 29, 1996, <http://members.aol.com/houltonme/rus.htm>.

¹⁸⁴ Hosking, *Russia: People & Empire*, London: HarperCollins, 1997, pp. 164-165

¹⁸⁵ Walicki, *A History of Russian Thought*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1988, p. 19.

¹⁸⁶ Novikov, in Janet M. Hartley, *A Social History of the Russian Empire, 1650-1825*, Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 232

“Individual Masons from Peter’s time were organising themselves. Masonry was developing strongly...”¹⁸⁷

Nevertheless, “in society people began to be suspicious of Masonry. Masons in society acquired the reputation of being heretics and apostates... Most of Elizabethan society considered Masonry to be an atheistic and criminal matter...

“The Orthodox clergy had also been hostile to Masonry for a long time already. Preachers at the court began to reprove ‘animal-like and godless atheists’ and people ‘of Epicurean and Freemasonic morals and mentality’ in their sermons. The sermons of Gideon Antonsky, Cyril Florinsky, Arsenius Matseyevich, Cyril Lyashevetsky, Gideon Krinovsky and others reflected the struggle that was taking place between the defenders of Orthodoxy and their enemies, the Masons.”¹⁸⁸

It was in Elizabeth’s reign that the Secret Chancellery made an inquiry into the nature and membership of the Masonic lodges. The inquiry found that Masonry was defined by its members as “nothing else than the key of friendship and eternal brotherhood”. It was found not to be dangerous and was allowed to continue, “although under police protection”.¹⁸⁹

Masonry was particularly strong in the university and among the cadets. “The cadet corps was the laboratory of the future revolution. From the cadet corps there came the representatives of Russian progressive literature, which was penetrated with Masonic ideals....

“Towards the end of the reign of Elizabeth Petrovna Masonry openly revealed its real nature. At this time a bitter struggle was developing in the West between Austria and Prussia for the Austrian succession. In 1756 there began the Seven-Year war, in which Russia took an active part.

“The Mason Frederick II was again striving to subject Russia to his influence.

“This aim was to be attained completely by means of the defeat of the Russian army and her capitulation before the ‘genius’ commander.

“And one has to say that everything promised victory for Frederick II over the Russian army.

“He had a very well trained, armed and provisioned army with talented officers.

“Frederick was undoubtedly helped by the Masons – Germans who had taken high administrative and military posts in Russia.

“The noted James Cate, the great provincial master for the whole of Russia, was a field-marshal of the Russian army, but in fact carried out the role of Frederick’s

¹⁸⁷ Ivanov, *op. cit.*, pp. 160, 161, 162-163.

¹⁸⁸ Ivanov, *op. cit.*, pp. 165, 166.

¹⁸⁹ Rhoda, “Russian Freemasonry: A New Dawn”, *op. cit.*

spy; in 1747 he fled [Russia] to serve him and was killed in battle for his adored and lofty brother.

“In general the Russian army was teeming with Prussian spies and Russian Mason-traitors.

“The Russian army was deliberately not prepared...

“And at the head of the Russian army the Masons placed Apraxin, who gave no orders, displayed an unforgivable slowness and finally entered upon the path of open betrayal.

“The victory at Gross-Egersford was won exclusively thanks to the courage and bravery of the Russian soldiers, and was not used as it should have been by the Russian commander-in-chief. Apraxin had every opportunity to cross conquered Prussia, extend a hand to the Swedes in Pomerania and appear before the walls of Berlin. But instead of moving forward he stopped at Tilsit and refused to use the position that was favourable for the Russian army... Apraxin was only fulfilling his duty of a Mason, which obliged him to deliver his lofty brother, Frederick II, from his woes...

“But this was not the only help extended to Prussia by the Russian Masons. In 1758, instead of Apraxin, who was placed on trial, Fermor was appointed as commander-in-chief. He was an active Mason and a supporter of Frederick II. Fermor acted just like Apraxin. He displayed stunning inactivity and slowness. At the battle of Tsonrdof the commander-in-chief Fermor hid from the field of battle. Deserted and betrayed by their commander-in-chief the Russian army did not panic...

“With the greatest equanimity the soldiers did not think of fleeing or surrendering...

“Frederick II had everything on his side: complete gun crews, discipline, superior weapons, the treachery of the Russian commander-in-chief. But he did not have enough faith and honour, which constituted the strength and glory of the Christ-loving Russian Army.

“The help of the dark powers was again required: and the Russian Masons for the third time gave help to Frederick II.

“At first it was suggested that Fermor be replaced by Buturlin, whom Esterhazy quite justly called ‘an idiot’, but when this did not happen, they appointed Peter Saltykov to the post of commander-in-chief. The soldiers called him ‘moor-hen’ and openly accused him of treachery. At Könersdorf the Russian commanders displayed complete incompetence. The left wing of the Russian army under the command of Golitsyn was crushed. At two o’clock Frederick was the master of Mulberg, one of the three heights where Saltykov had dug in. By three o’clock the victory was Frederick’s. And once again the situation was saved by the Russian soldiers. The king led his army onto the attack three times, and three times he retreated, ravaged

by the Russian batteries. 'Scoundrels', 'swine', 'rascals' was what Frederick called his soldiers, unable to conquer the Russian soldiers who died kissing their weapons.

"One can overcome all of them (the Russian soldiers) to the last man, but not conquer them,' Frederick II had to admit after his defeat.

"The victory remained with the Russian soldiers, strong in the Orthodox faith and devotion to the autocracy...."¹⁹⁰

Frederick was saved because Elizabeth died unexpectedly in 1761 and was succeeded by Peter III, a grandson of Peter the Great who nevertheless preferred the Germany he had been brought up in to Russia. As Nicholas Riasanovsky writes: "Having lost his mother in infancy and his father when a boy, Peter was brought up first with the view of succeeding to the Swedish throne, for his father was a son of Charles XII's sister. After Elizabeth's decision, he was educated to succeed to the throne of the Romanovs. Although he lived in Russia from the age of fourteen, Peter III never adjusted to the new country. Extremely limited mentally, as well as crude and violent in his behaviour, he continued to fear and despise Russia and the Russians while he held up Prussia and in particular Frederick II as his ideal. His reign of several months, best remembered in the long run for the law abolishing the compulsory state service of the gentry, impressed many of his contemporaries as a violent attack on everything Russian and a deliberate sacrifice of Russian interests to those of Prussia. While not given to political persecution and in fact willing to sign a law abolishing the security police, the new emperor threatened to disband the guards, and even demanded that icons be withdrawn from the churches and that Russian priests dress like Lutheran pastors, both of which orders the Holy Synod did not dare execute. In foreign policy Peter III's admiration for Frederick the Great led to the withdrawal of Russia from the Seven Years' War, an act which probably saved Prussia from a crushing defeat and deprived Russia of great potential gains. Indeed, the Russian emperor refused to accept even what Frederick the Great was willing to give him for withdrawing and proceeded to make an alliance with the Prussian king."¹⁹¹

Peter III was succeeded (or murdered) by his wife, the German princess Catherine the Great. Catherine not only tried to emancipate the Jews: she also allowed the Masons to reach the peak of their influence in Russia. In her reign there were about 2500 Masons in about 100 lodges in St. Petersburg, Moscow and some provincial towns. "By the middle of the 1780s," writes Dobroklonsky, "it had even penetrated as far as Tobolsk and Irkutsk; Masonic lodges existed in all the more or less important towns. Many of those who were not satisfied by the fashionable scepticism of French philosophy or, after being drawn by it, became disillusioned by it, sought satisfaction for their heart and mind in Masonry".¹⁹²

Fr. Georges Florovsky writes: "The freemasons of Catherine's reign maintained an ambivalent relationship with the Church. In any event, the formal piety of freemasonry was not openly disruptive. Many freemasons fulfilled all church

¹⁹⁰ Ivanov, *op. cit.*, pp. 169, 170, 171-172.

¹⁹¹ Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, *A History of Russia*, Oxford University Press, 2000, p. 248.

¹⁹² Dobroklonsky, *op. cit.*, p. 664.

'obligations' and rituals. Others emphatically insisted on the complete immutability and sacredness of the rites and orders 'particularly of the Greek religion'. However, the Orthodox service, with its wealth and plasticity of images and symbols, greatly attracted them. Freemasons highly valued Orthodoxy's tradition of symbols whose roots reach back deeply into classical antiquity. But every symbol was for them only a transparent sign or guidepost. One must ascend to that which is being signified, that is, from the visible to the invisible, from 'historical' Christianity to spiritual or 'true' Christianity, from the outer church to the 'inner' church. The freemasons considered their Order to be the 'inner' church, containing its own rites and 'sacraments'. This is once again the Alexandrian [Gnostic] dream of an esoteric circle of chosen ones who are dedicated to preserving sacred traditions: a truth revealed only to a few chosen for extraordinary illumination."¹⁹³

Hartley writes: "Freemasonry only became popular amongst the nobility in the reign of Catherine II. This was partly because freemasonry was one of many manifestations of the cultural influence of western and central Europe on the nobility at the time, and partly because, after their freedom from compulsory service in 1762, they had the leisure and opportunity to become involved in private social activities of this nature, both in the capitals and in the provinces.

"Russian lodges were based on English, German or Swedish systems. Ivan Elagin, an influential figure at court in the early years of Catherine II, founded the Russian Grand Provincial Lodge in 1771, modelled on the English system, which involved progression through three degrees within the lodge. Some 14 lodges were opened in St. Petersburg, Moscow and the provinces based on this model. Many Russians, however, were attracted to lodges which had more complex degrees and mystical elements. Baron P.B. Reichel established the Apollo lodge in 1771, which depended on the Grand Lodge of Zinnendorf in Berlin, and soon controlled 8 lodges in German-speaking Riga and Reval. In 1776 the Reichel and Elagin lodges merged and accepted the leadership of the Berlin lodge, and Elagin became the grand master of the new united Grand Provincial lodge. Almost immediately, members of this new lodge became influenced by the Swedish Order of the Temple, a lodge which comprised ten degrees, and whose elaborate robes and knightly degrees particularly appealed to a Russian nobility which lacked knightly orders and traditions of medieval chivalry. In 1778 the first Swedish-style lodge, the Phoenix, was set up in St. Petersburg, followed in 1780 by the Swedish Grand National lodge under the direction of Prince G.P. Gagarin. In the early 1780s there were 14 Swedish lodges in St. Petersburg and Moscow and a few more in the provinces. Most of the Elagin lodges, however, did not join the Swedish system, partly because a direct association with Sweden at a time of diplomatic tension between Russia and Sweden seemed inappropriate.

"Adherents of freemasonry continued to seek new models to help them in their search for further illumination or for more satisfying rituals and structures. I.G. Schwartz, a member of the Harmonia lodge in Moscow, founded by Nikolai Novikov in 1781, brought Russian freemasonry into close association with the strict observance lodge of the grand master Duke Ferdinand of Brunswick. The lodge

¹⁹³ Florovsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 155-156.

became the VIIIth province of the Brunswick lodge, under the acting head of Prince N. Trubestkoi. It is not known how many of the Elagin lodges joined the VIIIth province. Within the VIIIth province there emerged a small esoteric group of Masons who were heavily influenced by the Rosicrucian movement, knowledge of whose charters and seven degrees had been brought back to Russia from Berlin by Schwartz. Masonic and Rosicrucian literature spread through Russia, largely as a result of the activity of the private printing press set up by Novikov (until the 1790s when Masonic publications were censured and banned). Lodges were also set up in the provinces, particularly when provincial governors were Masons. Governor-General A.P. Mel'gunov, for example, opened a lodge in Iaroslavl'. Vigel' founded a lodge in remote Penza in the late eighteenth century. Even where there was no lodge, provincial nobles could become acquainted with masonry through subscriptions to publications such as Novikov's Morning Light.

"Who became Freemasons? The Russian historian Vernadsky estimated that in 1777 4 of the 11-member Council of State, 11 of the 31 gentlemen of the bedchamber, 2 of the 5 senators of the first department of the Senate, 2 of the 5 members of the College of Foreign Affairs and the vice-president of the Admiralty College were Masons (there were none known at this date in the War College). A large number of the noble deputies in the Legislative Commission were Masons. Members of the high aristocracy and prominent figures at court were attracted to freemasonry, including the Repnins, Trubetskoi, Vorontsovs and Panins. Special lodges attracted army officers (like the Mars lodge, founded at Iasi in Bessarabia in 1774) and naval officers (like the Neptune lodge, founded in 1781 in Kronstadt). There were Masons amongst the governors of provinces established after 1775 (including A.P. Mel'gunov in Yaroslavl' and J.E. Sievers in Tver'), and amongst senior officials in central and provincial institutions. Almost all Russian poets, playwrights, authors and academics were Masons. Other lodges had a predominantly foreign membership, which included academics, members of professions, bankers and merchants....

"Catherine II had little sympathy for the mystical elements of freemasonry and their educational work and feared that lodges could become venues for conspiracies against the throne. In the 1790s, at a time of international tension following the French Revolution, Catherine became more suspicious of freemasonry, following rumours that Grand Duke Paul... was being induced to join a Moscow lodge. In 1792 (shortly after the assassination of Gustavus III of Sweden), Novikov's house was searched and Masonic books were found which had been banned as harmful in 1786. Novikov was arrested and sentenced, without any formal trial, to fifteen years imprisonment, though he was freed when Paul came to the throne in 1796. In 1794, Catherine ordered the closure of all lodges."¹⁹⁴

Catherine was not wrong in thinking that the Masons were aiming at the Russian throne. Already in 1781, in Frankfurt, the Illuminati "had decided to create in Russia two capitularies 'of the theoretical degree' under the general direction of Schwartz. One of the capitularies was ruled by Tatischev, and the other by Prince Trubetskoi. At a convention of the Mason-Illuminati in 1782 Russia was declared to be 'the

¹⁹⁴ Hartley, *op. cit.*, pp. 233-235. "I made a mistake," said Catherine, "let us close our high-brow books and set to the ABC" (quoted in Dobroklonsky, *op. cit.*, p. 662).

Eighth Province of the Strict Observance'. It was here that the Masons swore to murder Louis XVI and his wife and the Swedish King Gustavus III, which sentences were later carried out. In those 80s of the 18th century Masonry had decreed that it should strive to destroy the monarchy and the Church, beginning with France and continuing with Russia. But openly, 'for the public', and those accepted into the lower degrees, the Masons said that they were striving to end enmity between people and nations because of religious and national quarrels, that they believed in God, that they carried out charitable work and wanted to educate humanity in the principles of morality and goodness, that they were the faithful citizens of their countries and kings..."¹⁹⁵

However, Russia did not follow the path of France at this time because eighteenth-century Russian Masonry, unlike its contemporary French counterpart, was not very radical in its politics. And Masonry remained in the formative stage until the French revolution in 1789. But then it exploded upon the world in a way that nobody, least of all the Russian tsars, could ignore; and it would be up to Russia to crush the Masonic revolution as it forced its way into the capital of the Third Rome in 1812...

¹⁹⁵ Lebedev, *op. cit.*, p. 243.

24. CATHERINE AND THE JEWS

As a consequence of the three partitions of Poland in 1772, 1793 and 1795, the Russian empire acquired a vast new influx of Jews - as many as a million according to one estimate, 1.36 million according to another. Administering this vast new population and territory with its mixed population of Russians, Poles and Jews would have been a major problem for any State. As the worried Catherine II wrote: "what seemed a child's game is becoming a most serious matter. The Russian state has bumped into the most numerous Jewish masses in Europe".

The problem was made much worse by the fact the Jewish population constituted a "State within the State", being governed by its rabbis and kahals according to the Talmud and its viciously anti-Russian and anti-Christian world-view. The authorities had a responsibility both to that majority of Jews who suffered from the despotism of their rabbis, and to the Belorussian peasants who were exploited by the Jews economically. Nevertheless, Catherine, - influenced, no doubt, by her Masonic courtiers and by the Toleranzpatent (1782) of her fellow "enlightened despot", Joseph II of Austria - tried giving full rights to the Jews...

Solzhenitsyn writes: "When the Jews passed under the authority of the Russian State, the whole of this internal system in which the kahal hierarchy was interested was preserved. And, as Yu. I. Hessen presupposes with that irritation that by the middle of the 19th century had grown among enlightened Jews against the ossified Talmudist tradition, 'the representatives of Jewry's ruling class did all they could to convince the [Russian] government of the necessity of keeping the age-old institution in being, since it corresponded to the interests both of the Russian authorities and of the Jewish ruling class'; 'the kahal together with the rabbinate possessed the fullness of power, and not infrequently abused this power, stealing public resources, trampling on the rights of poor people, incorrectly imposing taxes and taking revenge on personal enemies'. At the end of the 18th century one of the governors of the region joined to Russia wrote in a report: 'the rabbi, the spiritual court and the kahal, "yoked together by close bonds, and having in their power and disposing even of the very conscience of the Jews, lords it over them on their own, without any reference to the civil authorities"'. "

"And when, in the 18th century, there developed in Jewry the powerful religious movement of the Hassidim, on the one hand, and on the other, there began the enlightenment movement of Moses Mendelssohn towards secular education, the kahals energetically suppressed both the one and the other. In 1781 the Vilnius rabbinate declared kherem [anathema] on the Hassidim, and in 1784 a congress of rabbis in Mogilev declared the Hassidim to be 'outside the law' and their property 'escheated'. After this the common people in some towns destroyed the houses of the Hassidim, that is, they caused an intra-Jewish pogrom. The Hassidim were persecuted in the most cruel and dishonourable way, they were not even spared false political denunciations against them to the Russian authorities. However, in 1799, on the denunciation of the Hassidim, the authorities arrested the members of the Vilnius kahal for expropriating taxes they had collected. Hassidism continued to spread, in some provinces with particular success. The rabbinate delivered the books of the Hassidim to public burning, while the Hassidim spoke out as

defenders of the people against the abuses of the kahals. 'At that time the religious struggle put into the shade, as it would seem, the other questions of Jewish life.'

"The part of Belorussia united to Russia in 1772 was constituted by the Polotsk (later the Vitebsk) and Mogilev provinces. It was declared to them in the name of Catherine that the inhabitants of this region "'whatever race or calling they might be" would from now on [retain] the right publicly to practise their faith and possess private property'. Moreover, they would be given 'all those rights, freedoms and privileges that her subjects enjoyed of old'. Thus the Jews were made equal in rights with the Christians - they had been deprived of this in Poland. Moreover, a special addition was made concerning the Jews, that their communities 'would be left and preserved with all those freedoms that they now... enjoy' - that is, nothing would be taken from what they enjoyed in Poland. True, the power of the kahals was thereby preserved, and the Jews through their kahal organization still remained cut off from the rest of the population, and did not yet enter directly into that mercantile-industrial estate that corresponded to their main occupations.

"At first Catherine was wary both of the hostile reaction of the Polish nobility, which had lost power, and of the unpleasant impression [her decree] produced on her Orthodox subjects..." As Lebedev writes, she "was convinced that it was impossible to forbid the entrance of the Jews into Russia, it was necessary to let them in. But she considered it dangerous to do this at the very beginning of her reign, since she understood that she had to deal with the Russian people, 'a religious people', who saw in her 'the defender of the Orthodox Faith', and that the clergy were extremely upset by Peter III's order on the expropriation of the Church's land-holdings. Moreover, she had been shown the resolution of Elizabeth Petrovna on the entrance of the Jews: 'I wish to derive no profit from the enemies of Christ'. The matter was put off, but only for a time..."

"But," continues Solzhenitsyn, "being sympathetic towards the Jews and expecting from them economic benefit for the country, Catherine was preparing for them still greater rights. Already in 1778 there was extended to the Belorussian region the recent measure that applied to the whole of Russia: those who possessed capital up to 500 roubles from now on constituted the estate of the town-dwellers [meschane], and those who had more - the estate of the merchants [kuptsy], the three guilds, in accordance with their wealth, and were freed from poll tax, and would pay 1% from the capital that they had 'declared in accordance with conscience'.

"This decree had a special, great significance: it destroyed the national isolation of the Jews that had prevailed to that time (Catherine wanted to destroy it). It also undermined the traditional Polish view of the Jews as a non-State element. It also undermined the kahal structure, and the coercive power of the kahal. 'From this moment there begins the process of the introduction of the Jews into the Russian State organism... The Jews widely used the right of registering among the merchants' - so that, for example, in Mogilev province 10% of the Jewish population were declared to be merchants (and of the Christians - only 5.5%). The Jewish merchants were now freed from paying taxes to the kahal and were no longer obliged, in particular, to seek permission from the kahal for every trip, as

before: they now had to deal only with the common magistrate, on common terms. (In 1780 the Jews of Mogilev and Shklov met Catherine with odes.)

“With the departure of the Jewish merchants the State rubric ‘Jew’ also ceased to exist. All the rest of the Jews now had to be categorised in some estate, and it was evident that they could be categorised only as town-dwellers. But at first there were few who wanted to transfer, because the annual poll tax from town-dwellers at that time was 60 kopecks, while from the Jews it was 50 kopecks. However, no other path remained to them. And from 1783 the Jewish town-dwellers, like the Jewish merchants, had to pay their taxes, not to the kahal, but to the magistrate, on common terms, and receive a passport for a journey from him, too.

“This movement was strengthened by a general municipal decree of 1785, which envisaged only estates, and by no means nations. According to this decree, all the town-dwellers [and therefore all the Jews) received the right to participate in local administration according to estates and to take up public posts. ‘According to the conditions of that time, this meant that the Jews became citizens with equal rights... Entering the merchant and town-dweller classes in the capacity of members with equal rights was an event of major social significance’, and was meant to turn the Jews into ‘a social force of which it was impossible not to take account, thereby raising their moral self-esteem’. This also alleviated the practical task of defending their vital interests. ‘At that time the mercantile-industrial class, as also the municipal societies, enjoyed broad self-rule... Thus into the hands of the Jews, on an equal basis with the Christians, was handed considerable administrative and judicial power, thanks to which the Jewish population acquired strength and significance in social-state life.’ There were now burgomeisters and ratmans and judges from the Jews. At first in the major towns a limitation was applied: that there should be no more Jews than Christians in elected posts. However, in 1786 ‘Catherine sent the Belorussian governor-general an order signed in his own hand’: that equal rights for the Jews ‘in municipal-estate self-rule... should “unfailingly and without any delay be brought into effect”, while non-fulfillers of the decree “would be punished by law”’.

“Let us note that in this way the Jews receive civil equality of rights not only in distinction from Poland, but earlier than in France or the German lands. (Under Frederick II there was a very powerful oppression of the Jews.) And, which is still more significant: the Jews in Russia from the beginning had that personal freedom which the Russian peasants were not to have for a further 80 years. And paradoxically: the Jews received even greater freedom than the Russian merchants and town-dwellers: the latter lived unfailingly in the towns, while the Jewish population, not following their example, ‘could live in the district settlements, occupied, particularly, in the wine trade’. ‘Although the Jews lived in large numbers not only in the towns, but also in the villages, they were registered in the municipal societies... included into the estates of the merchants and town-dwellers’. ‘By reason of the nature of their activity, surrounded by unfree peasantry, they played an important economic role – the [village] trade was concentrated in their hands, they leased various sections of the landowners’ sources of income, and sold vodka in the taverns’ – and thereby ‘assisted in the spread of drunkenness’. The Belorussian administration pointed out that ‘the presence of

Jews in the villages has a harmful effect on the economic and moral condition of the peasant population, since the Jews... develop drunkenness among the local population'. 'In the reports of the local administration, mention was made, incidentally, that the Jews led the peasants into drunkenness, idleness and poverty by giving them vodka on credit...' But 'the wine industry was a tempting source of income' - both for the Polish landowners and for the Jewish middlemen.

"It is natural that the civil gift received by the Jews could not fail to bring with it a reverse threat: it was evident that the Jews had to submit to the common rule, stop the wine trade in the villages and leave them. In 1783 it was published that "'a direct rule obliges each citizen to determine his trade and craft, a decent wage, and not wine distilling, as being an industry not appropriate for him", and if a landowner permits the distilling of vodka in the village "to a merchant, a town-dweller or Jew", then he will be considered a breaker of the law'. And then: 'they began to thrust the Jews out of the villages and into the towns, so as to distract them from their age-old pursuits... the leasing of wine distilleries and taverns'.

"It goes without saying that for the Jews the threat of being thrown out of the villages looked, not like a State tidying-up measure, but like a special measure against their national-confessional group. In being clearly deprived of such a profitable industry in the villages, and being moved to the town, the Jewish town-dwellers fell into a thick net of intra-municipal and intra-Jewish competition. The Jews became very upset, and in 1784 a deputation from the kahals to St. Petersburg to lobby for the rescinding of this measure. (At the same time the kahals calculated: with the help of the government they would get back the fullness of the power over the Jewish population that they had lost.) But the reply in the name of the empress was: 'Since the people of the Jewish confession have already entered into a condition equal with others, it behoves them in all cases to observe the rule established by Her Majesty that everyone in accordance with his calling and condition should enjoy the benefits and rights without distinction of confession or nation.'

"However, she had to take account of the concentrated strength of the highly involved Polish landowners. Although in 1783 the administration of the Belorussian region had forbidden them from farming out or leasing the wine distilleries 'to people who do not have the right to it, "especially the Jews",... the landowners continued to farm out the wine distilleries to the Jews. This was their right', the well-established heritage of age-old Polish customs.

"And the Senate did not dare to compel the landowners. And in 1786 it rescinded the transfer of the Jews to the towns. For this the following compromise was worked out: let the Jews be considered as having been moved to the towns, but retain their right to temporary absence in the countryside. That is, let them remain in the village, wherever they lived. The Senate's decree of 1786 allowed the Jews to live in the villages, and 'the landowners were allowed to farm out the production and sale of spirits to the Jews, while the Christian merchants and town-dwellers did not receive these rights.'

"Moreover, the lobbying of the kahal delegation to St. Petersburg did not

remain completely without success. It did not obtain what it asked for, the establishment of separate Jewish courts for all law-suits between Jews, but (1786) the kahals were given back a significant part of the administrative rights and oversight over the Jewish town-dwellers, that is, the majority of the Jewish population: the apportionment not only of public duties, but also the collection of the poll-tax, and once again the regulation of the right of absence from the community. That meant that the government saw its own practical interest in not weakening the power of the kahal.

“In general throughout Russia the whole of the mercantile-industrial estate (merchants and town-dwellers) did not enjoy freedom of movement and was tied to the place of its registration (so that by their departure they not lower the capacity of pay of their municipal societies). But for Belorussia in 1782 the Senate made an exception: the merchants could go from town to town ‘in accordance with the convenience of their commerce’. This rule again gave the advantage to the Jewish merchants.

“However, they began to use this right more broadly than it had been defined: ‘the Jewish merchants began to be registered in Moscow and Smolensk’. ‘The Jews began to settle in Moscow soon after the reunion of the Belorussian region in 1772... At the end of the 18th century there was a significant number of Jews in Moscow... Some Jews, having registered among the local merchants, started to trade on a large scale... But other Jews sold foreign goods in their flats or coaching inns, and also by delivering to houses, which at that time was completely forbidden.’

“And in 1790 ‘the Moscow society of merchants made a judgement’ that ‘in Moscow there had appeared from abroad and from Belorussia ‘a very large number of Jews’, some of whom had registered straight into the Moscow merchants and were using forbidden methods of trading, by which they were causing that trade ‘very significant harm and disturbance’, while the cheapness of their goods indicated that they were contraband. Moreover, ‘the Jews, as is well-known, clip coins; it is possible that they will do this also in Moscow’. And in response to ‘their cunning schemes’ the Moscow merchants demanded the removal of the Jewish merchants from Moscow. But the Jewish merchants in their turn presented ‘a complaint... that they were no longer being received among the Moscow and Smolensk merchants’.

“The ‘Council of the Empress’ reviewed the complaints. In accordance with the unified Russian law it found that the Jews did not have the right ‘to be registered into the Russian mercantile towns and ports’, but only in Belorussia. They said that “‘no benefit is foreseen” from allowing the Jews into Moscow’. And in December, 1791 an imperial decree was issued ‘on not allowing the Jews to be registered in the inner provinces’, while they could go to Moscow ‘only for definite periods on business’. The Jews could enjoy the rights of the merchants and town-dwellers in Belorussia. But Catherine added a softener: the Jews were given the right to live and be registered as town-dwellers also in newly-acquired New Russia – in the governor-generalship of Yekaterinoslav and in the province of Tauris (soon this would be the Yekaterinoslav, Tauris and Kherson provinces).

That is, she opened to the Jews new and extensive provinces into which Christian merchants and town-dwellers, in accordance with the general rule, were not allowed to settle from the inner provinces...

“The pre-revolutionary *Jewish encyclopaedia* writes: by the decree of 1791 ‘a beginning was made to the Pale of Settlement, although unintentionally. Under the conditions of the general structure of society and the State at that time, and of Jewish life in particular, the government could not have had in mind to create for the Jews a special oppressive situation, or of introducing exclusive laws for them, in the sense of limiting their rights of residence. According to the circumstances of that time, this decree did not contain in itself anything that could put the Jews in this respect in a less favourable position by comparison with the Christians... The decree of 1791 did not introduce any limitation in the rights of the Jews in respect of residence, it did not create a special ‘pale’, and even ‘before the Jews were opened new provinces into which according to the general rule it was not allowed to move’; ‘the centre of gravity of the decree of 1791 did not lie in the fact that they were Jews, but in the fact that they were trading people; the question was viewed not from a national or religious point of view, but only from the point of view of usefulness’.

“And so this decree of 1791, which was even advantageous for Jewish by comparison with Christian merchants, with the years was turned into the basis of the future ‘Pale of Settlement’, which lay like a dark shadow on the existence of the Jews in Russia almost to the revolution itself...”

IV. THE EMANCIPATION OF ISRAEL (1789-1917)

25. THE JEWS AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

On January 21, 1793 King Louis XVI of France was guillotined. After the execution a huge old man with a long beard who had been prominent in the murdering of priests during the September riots mounted the scaffold, plunged both hands into the king's blood and sprinkled the people with it, shouting: "People of France! I baptize you in the name of Jacob and Freedom!"¹⁹⁶

Who was Jacob? There are various theories. Some think it was the ghost of Jacob Molet, the leader of the Templars who was executed by the Catholic Church. Others think it refers to Masons of the Scottish rite who were supporters of the Stuart Jacobites. Others think it was a reference to the Patriarch Jacob's "struggle with God" in Genesis 32. Some think "Jacob" simply refers to Jewry. So were the French now baptized into the spirit of the Jewish revolution?...

In order to answer this question, we need to go back a little in time, to the beginning of that revolution which gave the Jews the opportunity to burst through into the forefront of world politics for the first time since the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. There were 39,000 of them in France in 1789. Most (half according to one estimate, nine-tenths according to another¹⁹⁷) were Yiddish-speaking Ashkenazim living in Alsace and Lorraine, which France had acquired under the terms of the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648.

"It is important," writes Nesta Webster, "to distinguish between these two races of Jews [the Ashkenazi and the Sephardim] in discussing the question of Jewish emancipation at the time of the Revolution. For whilst the Sephardim had shown themselves good citizens and were therefore subject to no persecutions, the Ashkenazim by their extortionate usury and oppressions had made themselves detested by the people, so that rigorous laws were enforced to restrain their rapacity. The discussions that raged in the National Assembly on the subject of the Jewish question related therefore mainly to the Jews of Alsace."¹⁹⁸

The eighteenth century had already witnessed some important changes in the relationship between the State and Jewry. In England, the Jews had achieved emancipation de facto, if not de jure. This was helped by the small number of Jews in Britain, and the non-ideological approach of the British government.

It was a different matter on the continent, where a more ideological approach prevailed. In 1782 the Masonic Austrian Emperor Joseph II published his Toleranzpatent, whose purpose was that "all Our subjects without distinction of nationality and religion, once they have been admitted and tolerated in our States, shall participate in common in public welfare,... shall enjoy legal freedom, and encounter no obstacles to any honest way of gaining their livelihood and of increasing general industriousness... Existing laws pertaining to the Jewish nation... are not always compatible with these Our most gracious intentions." Most

¹⁹⁶ Eliphaz Levi, in Sergius Fomin, *Rossia pered Vtorym Prishestvoiem* (Russia before the Second Coming), Moscow, 1993, p. 38.

¹⁹⁷ William Doyle, *The Oxford History of the French Revolution*, Oxford University Press, 1990, p. 411.

¹⁹⁸ Webster, *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, Christian Book Club of America, 1924, p. 247.

restrictions on the Jews were removed, but these new freedoms applied only to the “privileged Jew” – that is, the Jew whom the State found “useful” in some way – and not to the “foreign Jew”. Moreover, even privileged Jews were not granted the right of full citizenship and craft mastership.¹⁹⁹ For Joseph wanted to grant *tolerance* to the Jews, but not full *equality*.

As for France, “already, in 1784, the Jews of Bordeaux had been accorded further concessions by Louis XVI; in 1776 all Portuguese Jews had been given religious liberty and the permission to inhabit all parts of the kingdom. The decree of January 28, 1790, conferring on the Jews of Bordeaux the rights of French citizens, put the finishing touch to this scheme of liberation. [The Sephardic Jews of South-West France and papal Avignon, who were already more assimilated than their Ashkenazi co-religionists in Alsace, were given full citizenship in July, 1790.] But the proposal to extend this privilege to the Jews of Alsace evoked a storm of controversy in the Assembly and also violent insurrections amongst the Alsace peasants.”²⁰⁰

In their first debate on the subject, on September 28, 1789, a further important distinction was made between the nation and the individuals constituting the nation. Thus Stanislas Comte de Clermont-Tonnerre argued that “there cannot be a nation within a nation”, so “the Jews should be denied everything as a nation but granted everything as individuals.”²⁰¹ A separate *nation* of the Jews could not be allowed to exist within France. For “virtually all – moderates no less than radicals, Dantonists no less than Robespierrists, Christians as well as deists, pantheists, and atheists – held that equality of status in the state they were in their various ways intent on establishing was bound up of necessity with the elimination of all groups, classes, or corporations intermediate (and therefore mediating) between the state itself and the citizen.”²⁰²

Vital writes: “The immediate issue before the Assembly was the admission of certain semi-pariah classes – among them actors and public executioners – to what came to be termed ‘active citizenship’. It was soon apparent, however, that the issues presented by the Jews were very different. It was apparent, too, that it would make no better sense to examine the Jews’ case in tandem with that of the Protestants. The latter, like the Jews, were non-Catholics, but their *national* identity was not in doubt, nor, therefore, their right to the new liberties being decreed for all. Whatever else they were, they were Frenchmen. No one in the National Assembly thought otherwise. But were the Jews Frenchmen? If they were not, could they become citizens? The contention of the lead speaker in the debate, Count Stanislaw de Clermont-Tonnerre, was that the argument for granting them full rights of citizenship needed to be founded on the most general principles. Religion was a private affair. The law of the state need not and ought not to impinge upon it. So long as religious obligations were compatible with the law of the state and contravened it in no particular it was wrong to deprive a person, whose conscience required him to assume such religious obligations, of those rights which it was the

¹⁹⁹ David Vital, *A People Apart*, Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 35-36.

²⁰⁰ Webster, *op. cit.*, p. 247.

²⁰¹ Paul Johnson, *A History of the Jews*, London: Phoenix, 1987, 1995, p. 306.

²⁰² Vital, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

duty of all citizens qua citizens to assume. One either imposed a national religion by main force, so erasing the relevant clause of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen to which all now subscribed. Or else one allowed everyone the freedom to profess the religious opinion of his choice. Mere *tolerance* was unacceptable. 'The system of tolerance, coupled.. to degrading distinctions, is so vicious in itself, that he who is compelled to tolerate remains as dissatisfied with the law as is he whom it has granted no more than such a form of tolerance.' There was no middle way. The enemies of the Jews attacked them, and attacked him, Clermont-Tonnerre, on the grounds that they were deficient morally. It was also held of the Jews that they were unsociable, that their laws prescribed usury, that they were forbidden to mix with the French by marriage or at table or join them in defence of the country or in any other common enterprise. But these reproaches were either unjust or specious. Usury was blameworthy beyond a doubt, but it was the laws of France that had compelled the Jews to practise it. And so with most of the other charges. Once the Jews had title to land and a country of their own the practice of usury would cease. So would the unsociability that was held against them. So would much of their religious eccentricity [ces travers religieux]. As for the further argument, that they had judges and laws of their own, why so they did, and on this matter he, Clermont-Tonnerre, would say to his critics (coming to the passage in his address to the Assembly that would be quoted over and over again in the course of the two centuries that followed), that that indeed was impermissible.

“As a nation the Jews must be denied everything, as individuals they must be granted everything; their judges can no longer be recognized; their recourse must be to our own exclusively; legal protection for the doubtful laws by which Jewish corporate existence is maintained must end; they cannot be allowed to create a political body or a separate order within the state; it is necessary that they be citizens individually.’

“There remained the question, what if, as some argued, it was the case that the Jews themselves had no interest in citizenship? Why in that case, he went on, ‘if they do not want it, let them say so, in which case expel them [s’ils veulent ne l’être pas, qu’ils le disent, et alors, qu’on les bannisse]’. The idea of a society of non-citizens within the state and a nation within a nation was repugnant to him. But in fact, the speaker concluded, that was not at all what the Jews wanted. The evidence was to the contrary. They wished to be incorporated into the nation of France.

“Clermont-Tonnerre was promptly contradicted on this last, vital point by the abbé Maury. The term ‘Jew’, said the abbé, did not denote a religious sect, but a nation, one which had laws which it had always followed and by which it wished to continue to abide. ‘To proclaim the Jews citizens would be as if to say that, without letters of naturalization and without ceasing to be English or Danish, Englishmen and Danes could become Frenchmen.’ But Maury’s chief argument was of a moral and social order. The Jews were inherently undesirable, socially as well as economically. They had been chased out of France, and then recalled, no less than seven times – chased out by avarice, as Voltaire had rightly put it, readmitted by avarice once more, but in foolishness as well.

“The Jews have passed seventeen centuries without mingling with the other nations. They have never engaged in anything but trade in money; they have been the plague of the agricultural provinces; not one of them has ever dignified [su ennoblir] his hands by driving a plough. Their laws leave them no time for agriculture; the Sabbath apart, they celebrate fifty-six more festivals than the Christians in each year. In Poland they possess an entire province. Well, then! While the sweat of Christian slaves waters the furrows in which the Jews’ opulence germinates they themselves, as their fields are cultivated, engage in weighing their ducats and calculating how much they can shave off the coinage without exposing themselves to legal penalties.’

“They have never been labourers, Maury continued, not even under David and Solomon. And even then they were notorious for their laziness. Their sole concern was commerce. Would you make soldiers of them, the abbé asked. If you did, you would derive small benefit from them: they have a horror of celibacy and they marry young. He knew of no general who would wish to command an army of Jews either on the Sabbath – a day on which they never gave battle – or indeed at any other time. Or did the Assembly imagine that they could make craftsmen of them when their many festivals and sabbath days presented an insurmountable obstacle to such an enterprise. The Jews held 12 million mortgages in Alsace alone, he informed his colleagues. Within a month of their being granted citizenship they would own half the province outright. In ten years’ time they would have ‘conquered’ all of it, reducing it to nothing more than a Jewish colony – upon which the hatred the people of Alsace already bore for the Jews would explode.

“It was not that he, Maury, wished the Jews to be persecuted. ‘They are men, they are our brothers; anathema on whoever speaks of intolerance!’ Nor need their religious opinions disturb anyone [!]. He joined all others in agreeing that they were to be protected. But that did not mean that they could be citizens. It was as individuals that they were entitled to protection, not as Frenchmen.

“Robespierre took the opposite line, supporting Clermont-Tonnerre. All who fulfilled the generally applicable conditions of eligibility to citizenship were entitled to the rights that derived from it, he argued, including the right to hold public office. And so far as the facts were concerned, much of what Maury had said about the Jews was ‘infinitely exaggerated’ and contrary to known history. Moreover, to charge the Jews themselves with responsibility for their own persecution at the hands of others, was absurd.

“Vices are imputed to them... But to whom should these vices be imputed if not to ourselves for our injustice?... Let us restore them to happiness, to country [patrie], and to virtue by restoring them to the dignity of men and citizens; let us reflect that it can never be politic, whatever anyone might say, to condemn a multitude of men who live among us to degradation and oppression.”²⁰³

Thus spoke the man who was soon to lead the most degrading and oppressive régime in European history to that date. Indeed, it is striking how those who spoke

²⁰³ Vital, op. cit., pp. 43-45.

most fervently for the Jews – apart from leaders of the Jewish community such as the banker Cerfbeer and Isaac Beer – were Freemasons or Illuminati.

Thus in the two years before the crucial debate on September 27, 1791, writes General Nechvolodov, “fourteen attempts were made to give the Jews civic equality and thirty-five major speeches were given by several orators, among them Mirabeau, Robespierre, Abbé Grégoire, Abbé Sièyes, Camille, Desmoulins, Vernier, Barnave, Lameth, Duport and others.

“‘Now there is a singular comparison to be made,’ says Abbé Lemann, ‘- all the names which we have just cited and which figure in the *Moniteur* as having voted for the Jews are also found on the list of Masons... Is this coincidence not proof of the order given, in the lodges of Paris, to work in favour of Jewish emancipation?’

“And yet, in spite of the revolutionary spirit, the National Assembly was very little inclined to give equality of civil rights to the Jews. Against this reform there rose up all the deputies from Alsace, since it was in Alsace that the majority of the French Jews of that time lived....

“But this opposition in the National Assembly did not stop the Jews. To attain their end, they employed absolutely every means.

“According to Abbé Lemann, these means were the following:

“First means: entreaty. A charm exercised over several presidents of the Assembly. Second: the influence of gold. Third means: logic. After the National Assembly had declared the ‘rights of man’, the Jews insisted that these rights should logically be applied to them, and they set out their ideas on this subject with an ‘implacable arrogance’.

“Fourth means: recourse to the suburbs and the Paris Commune, so as to force the National Assembly under ‘threat of violence’ to give the Jews equality.

“‘One of their most thorough historians (Graetz),’ says Abbé Lemann, ‘did not feel that he had to hide this manoeuvre. Exhausted, he says, by the thousand useless efforts they had made to obtain civil rights, they thought up a last means. Seeing that it was impossible to obtain by reason and common sense what they called their rights, they resolved to force the National Assembly to approve of their emancipation.

“‘To this end, naturally, were expended vast sums, which served to establish the ‘Christian Front’ which they wanted.

“‘In the session of the National Assembly of January 18, 1791, the Duke de Broglie expressed himself completely openly on this subject: ‘Among them,’ he said, ‘there is one in particular who has acquired an immense fortune at the expense of the State, and who is spending in the town of Paris considerable sums to win supporters of his cause.’ He meant Cerfbeer.

“At the head of the Christian Front created on this occasion were the lawyer Godard and three ecclesiastics: the Abbés Mulot, Bertoliot and Fauchet.

“Abbé Fauchet was a well-known illuminatus, and Abbé Mulot – the president of the all-powerful Paris Commune, with the help of which the Jacobins exerted, at the time desired, the necessary pressure on the National and Legislative Assemblies, and later on the Convention.

“What Gregory, curé of Embermeuil, was for the Jews in the heart of the National Assembly, Abbé Mulot was in the heart of the Commune.

“However, although they were fanatical Jacobins, the members of the Commune were far from agreeing to the propositions of their president that they act in defence of Jewish rights in the National Assembly. It was necessary to return constantly to the attack, naturally with the powerful help of Cerfbeer’s gold and that of the Abbés Fauchet and Bertoliot. This latter declared during a session of the Commune on this question: ‘It was necessary that such a happy and unexpected event as the revolution should come and rejuvenate France... Let us hasten to consign to oblivion the crimes of our fathers.’

“Then, during another session, the lawyer Godard bust into the chamber with fifty armed ‘patriots’ dressed in costumes of the national guard with three-coloured cockades. They were fifty Jews who, naturally provided with money, had made the rounds of the sections of the Paris Commune and of the wards of the town of Paris, talking about recruiting partisans of equality for the Jews. This had its effect. Out of the sixty sections of Paris fifty-nine declared themselves for equality (only the quartier des Halles abstained). Then the Commune addressed the National Assembly with an appeal signed by the Abbés Mulot, Bertoliot, Fauchet and other members, demanding that equality be immediately given to the Jews.

“However, even after that, the National Assembly hesitated in declaring itself in the manner provided. Then, on September 27, the day of the penultimate session of the Assembly before its dissolution, the Jacobin deputy Adrien Duport posed the question of equality for the Jews in a categorical fashion. The Assembly knew Adrien Duport’s personality perfectly. It knew that in a secret meeting of the chiefs of Freemasonry which preceded the revolution, he had insisted on the necessity of resort to a system of terror. The Assembly yielded. There followed a decree signed by Louis XVI granting French Jews full and complete equality of rights...”²⁰⁴

However, as many had feared, emancipation created problems. In the late 1790s a new wave of Ashkenazis entered France from Germany, attracted by the superior status their emancipated French brothers now enjoyed. This was to lead to further disturbances in Alsace, which it was left to Napoleon to deal with...

“Nevertheless,” as Paul Johnson writes, “the deed was done. French Jews were now free and the clock could never be turned back. Moreover, emancipation in some form took place wherever the French were able to carry the revolutionary spirit with

²⁰⁴ General A. Nechvolodov, *L'Empéreur Nicolas II et les Juifs (Emperor Nicholas II and the Jews)*, Paris, 1924, pp. 216-220.

their arms. The ghettos and Jewish closed quarters were broken into in papal Avignon (1791), Nice (1792) and the Rhineland (1792-3). The spread of the revolution to the Netherlands, and the founding of the Batavian republic, led to Jews being granted full and formal rights by law there (1796). In 1796-8 Napoleon Bonaparte liberated many of the Italian ghettos, French troops, young Jews and local enthusiasts tearing down the crumbling old walls.

“For the first time a new archetype, which had always existed in embryonic form, began to emerge from the shadows: the revolutionary Jew. Clericalists in Italy swore enmity to ‘Gauls, Jacobins and Jews’. In 1793-4 Jewish Jacobins set up a revolutionary regime in Saint Esprit, the Jewish suburb of Bayonne. Once again, as during the Reformation, traditionalists saw a sinister link between the Torah and subversion.”²⁰⁵

Or more precisely: the Talmud and subversion. For it was not the Torah that taught the Jews to rebel perpetually against all Gentile power: it was the Talmud, with its institutionalized hatred of all non-Jews.

²⁰⁵ Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 306-307.

26. THE JACOBINS AND THE ILLUMINATI

We have seen that the emancipation of the Jews in 1789-91 was carried out chiefly by the Freemasons. This is hardly surprising, given the Jewish nature of the central Masonic myth and rites. As we have seen, Judaism and Masonry are inter-related and inter-dependent.

The first stage of the Revolution, from 1789 to 1791, was dominated by the Masons, whose numbers had grown at an astonishing rate in the pre-revolutionary years. Adam Zamoyski writes that “there were 104 lodges in France in 1772, 198 by 1776, and a staggering 629 by 1789. Their membership included virtually every grandee, writer, artist, lawyer, soldier or other professional in the country, as well as notable foreigners such as Franklin and Jefferson – some 30,000 people.”²⁰⁶ “Between 800 and 900 Masonic lodges,” writes Doyle, “were founded in France between 1732 and 1793, two-thirds of them after 1760. Between 1773 and 1779 well over 20,000 members were recruited. Few towns of any consequence were without one or more lodges by the 1780s and, despite several papal condemnations of a deistic cult that had originated in Protestant England, the élite of society flocked to join. Voltaire was drafted in on his last visit to Paris, and it was before the assembled brethren of the Nine Sisters Lodge that he exchanged symbolic embraces with Franklin.”²⁰⁷

In 1791 a split began to emerge between the more moderate liberal Masons, the great majority, who had been responsible for liberal reforms like the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and a more violent and revolutionary minority. Thus the split Convention elected in 1792 was divided between “Montagnards” (Jacobins) on the left, led by Marat, Danton, Robespierre and the Parisian delegates, and the “Girondins” on the right, led by Brissot, Vergniaud and the “faction of the Gironde”. The Montagnards were identified with the interests of the Paris mob and the most radical ideas of the Revolution; the Girondins – with the interests of the provinces and the original liberal ideals of 1789. The Montagnards stood for disposing of the king as soon as possible; the Girondins wanted a referendum of the whole people to decide.

The Montagnard Saint-Just said that a trial was unnecessary; the people had already judged the king on August 10; it remained only to punish him. For “there is no innocent reign... every King is a rebel and a usurper.”²⁰⁸ Robespierre had voted against the death penalty in the Assembly, but now he said that “Louis must die that the country may live” – an unconscious echo of the words of Caiaphas about Christ: “It is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not” (John 11.50). And he agreed with Saint-Just: “Louis cannot

²⁰⁶ Zamoyski, *Holy Madness: Romantics, Patriots and Revolutionaries, 1776-1871*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1999, p. 51.

²⁰⁷ Doyle, *op. cit.*, pp. 64-65. As we have seen, Franklin was a major player in the American revolution, in which French and Americans co-operated in overthrowing British monarchical rule. The American revolution had demonstrated that the ideas of the philosophes were not just philosophical theory, but could be translated into reality. And the meeting of Franklin and Voltaire showed that science and philosophy could meet in the womb of Masonry to bring forth the common dream - liberty and “the pursuit of happiness”.

²⁰⁸ Hunt, *op. cit.*, 1998, p. 37.

be judged, he has already been judged. He has been condemned, or else the Republic is not blameless. To suggest putting Louis XVI on trial, in whatever way, is a step back towards royal and constitutional despotism; it is a counter-revolutionary idea; because it puts the Revolution itself in the dock. After all, if Louis can still be put on trial, Louis can be acquitted; he might be innocent. Or rather, he is presumed to be until he is found guilty. But if Louis can be presumed innocent, what becomes of the Revolution?"²⁰⁹

There was a certain logic in these words: since the Revolution undermined all the foundations of the *ancien régime*, the possibility that the head of that régime might be innocent implied that the Revolution might be guilty. So "revolutionary justice" required straight execution rather than a trial; it could not afford to question the foundations of the Revolution itself. It was the same logic that led to the execution without trial of Tsar Nicholas II in 1918.

But the majority of the deputies were not yet as "advanced" in their thinking as Robespierre. So "during the third week of January 1793," writes Jasper Ridley, "the Convention voted four times on the issue. A resolution finding Louis guilty of treason, and rejecting the idea of an appeal to the people by a plebiscite [so much for Rousseauist democracy!], was carried by 426 votes to 278; the decision to impose the death penalty was carried by 387 to 314. Philippe Egalité [the Duke of Orléans and cousin of the king who became Grand Master of the Masons, then a Jacobin, renouncing his title for the name 'Philippe Egalité'] voted to convict Louis and for the death penalty. A deputy then proposed that the question of what to do with Louis should be postponed indefinitely. This was defeated by 361 to 360, a single vote. Philippe Egalité voted against the proposal, so his vote decided the issue. On 20 January a resolution that the death sentence should be immediately carried out was passed by 380 to 310, and Louis was guillotined the next day."²¹⁰

Now the Jacobins cast the Girondins aside. A coup against the Girondist deputies was carried out between May 31 and June 2, 1793. "In July 1793," writes Jasper Ridley, "a young Girondin woman, Charlotte Corday, gained admission to Marat's house by pretending that she wished to give him a list of names of Girondins to be guillotined. She found him sitting as usual in his bath to cure his skin disease, and she stabbed him to death."²¹¹ She was guillotined, and the Girondin party was suppressed.

"In Lyons, the Girondins had gained control of the Freemasons' lodges. In the summer of 1793 the Girondins there defied the authority of the Jacobin government in Paris, and guillotined one of the local Jacobin leaders. The Lyons Freemasons played a leading part in the rising against the Paris Jacobins; but the Jacobins suppressed the revolt, and several of the leading Girondin Freemasons of Lyons

²⁰⁹ Doyle, *op. cit.*, p. 195. The lawyer Bertrand Barère said, borrowing a phrase from Thomas Jefferson: "The tree of liberty does not flourish unless moistened with the blood of kings. I vote for death".

²¹⁰ Ridley, *The Freemasons*, London: Constable, 1999, pp. 136-137.

²¹¹ David's painting of the dead Marat in his bath gave the revolution an "icon" of its first martyr. See Simon Schama's excellent analysis of the painting and the painter for BBC television. (V.M.)

were guillotined.”²¹² The revolutionary government now took terrible revenge on its defeated enemies. On October 12 the Committee “moved a decree that Lyons should be destroyed. Its very name was to disappear, except on a monument among the ruins which would proclaim ‘Lyons made war on Liberty. Lyons is no more.’”²¹³ Lyons was not completely destroyed, but whole ranges of houses were burnt and thousands were guillotined and shot. “The effect... was designed to be a salutary one. ‘What cement for the Revolution!’ gloated Achard in a letter to Paris.”²¹⁴

And so the Revolution was frenziedly devouring its own children.²¹⁵ Or rather, the Masons were devouring their own brothers; for the struggle between the Girondists and the Montagnards was in fact, according to Lev Tikhomirov, a struggle between different layers of Masonry.²¹⁶ “In the period of the terror the majority of Masonic lodges were closed. As Louis Blanc explains, a significant number of Masons, though extremely liberal-minded, could still not, in accordance with their personal interests, character and public position, sympathize with the incitement of the maddened masses against the rich, to whom they themselves belonged. In the hottest battle of the revolution it was those who split off into the highest degrees who acted. The Masonic lodges were replaced by political clubs, although in the political clubs, too, there began a sifting of the revolutionaries into the more moderate and the extremists, so that quite a few Masons perished on the scaffolds from the hands of their ‘brothers’. After the overthrow of Robespierre on 9 Thermidor the Masonic lodges were again opened.”²¹⁷

O.F. Soloviev writes: “The brotherhoods were considered outposts of counter-revolution, many disbanded themselves, some members emigrated, others stopped all work. Only after the coming to power of Napoleon, who protected the order, was its activity renewed and even broadened.”²¹⁸

*

If we look into the origins of Jacobinism, then we very soon come up against the name of an organization called *Illuminism*, founded on May 1, 1776²¹⁹ by a Bavarian professor called Weishaupt, who assumed the name of “Spartacus” (from the slave who rebelled against Rome in the first century BC).

²¹² Ridley, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

²¹³ Doyle, *op. cit.*, p. 254.

²¹⁴ Jocelyn Hunt, *The French Revolution*, London & New York: Routledge, 1998, p. 63.

²¹⁵ As Pierre Vergniaud said before the Convention in March, 1793: “It must be feared that the Revolution, like Saturn, will devour its children one after the other”.

²¹⁶ Tikhomirov, *Religiozno-Filosofskie Osnovy Istorii* (The Religious-Philosophical Foundations of History), Moscow, 1997, p. 458.

²¹⁷ Tikhomirov, *op. cit.*, p. 460.

²¹⁸ Soloviev, *Masonstvo v Mirovoj Politike XX Veke* (Masonry in World Politics in the 20th Century), Moscow: Rosspen, 1998, p. 22 (in Russian).

²¹⁹ May 1, which has been adopted as International Labour Day by the Socialists, was a feast “of satanic forces – witches, sorcerers, evil spirits, demons” (O.A. Platonov, *Ternovij Venets Rossii* (Russia’s Crown of Thorns), Moscow: Rodnik, 1998, p. 194). It was called “Walpurgisnacht” in Germany after the eighth-century English missionary to Germany, St. Walburga, whose feast is May 1.

Illuminism arose out of the dissatisfaction of a group of Masons with the general state of Masonry. Thus another founder member, Count Mirabeau, noted in the same year of 1776: "The Lodge *Theodore de Bon Conseil* at Munich, where there were a few men with brains and hearts, was tired of being tossed about by the vain promises and quarrels of Masonry. The heads resolved to graft on to their branch another secret association to which they gave the name of the Order of the Illuminés. They modelled it on the Society of Jesus, whilst proposing to themselves something diametrically opposed."²²⁰

"Our strength," wrote Weishaupt, "lies in secrecy. Therefore we must without hesitation use as a cover some innocent societies. The lodges of blue masonry are a fitting veil to hide our real aims, since the world is accustomed to expecting nothing important or constructive from them. Their ceremonies are considered pretty trifles for the amusement of big children. The name of a learned society is also a magnificent mask behind which we can hide our lower degrees."²²¹

"Weishaupt constructed his organization on several levels, revealing his most radical plans only to his chosen co-workers. Weishaupt chose the members of his organization mainly amidst young people, carefully studying each candidature.

"Having sifted out the unreliable and dubious, the leaders of the order performed on the rest a rite of consecration, which took place after a three-day fast in a dark basement. Every candidate was consecrated separately, having first had his arms and legs bound. [Then] from various corners of the dark basement the most unexpected questions were showered upon the initiate.

"Having replied to the questions, he swore absolute obedience to the leaders of the order. Every new member signed that he would preserve the secrets of the organization under fear of the death penalty.

"However, the newcomer was not yet considered to be a full member of the organization, but received the status of novice and for one to three months had to be under the observation of an experienced illuminé. He was told to keep a special diary and regularly present it to the leaders. The novice filled in numerous questionnaires, and also prepared monthly accounts of all matters linking him with the order. Having passed through all the trials, the novice underwent a second initiation, now as a fully-fledged member.

"After his initiation the new member was given a distinguishing sign, gesture and password, which changed depending on the rank he occupied.

²²⁰ Webster, *op. cit.*, p. 205. According to his second-in-command, Baron von Knigge, Weishaupt had a "Jesuitical character" and his organisation was "such a machine behind which perhaps Jesuits may be concealed" (quoted in Webster, *op. cit.*, p. 227). He was in fact "a Jew by race who had been baptized a Roman Catholic and had become professor of canon law at the Roman Catholic university of Ingoldstadt in Bavaria" (Jasper Ridley, *The Freemasons*, London: Constable, 1999, p. 114).

²²¹ Platonov, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

“The newcomer received a special pseudonym (order’s name), usually borrowed from ancient history..., and got to know an ancient Persian method of timekeeping, the geography of the order, and also a secret code.

“Weishaupt imposed into the order a system of global spying and mutual tailing.

“Most of the members were at the lowest level of the hierarchy.

“No less than a thousand people entered the organization, but for conspiratorial purposes each member knew only a few people. As Weishaupt himself noted, ‘directly under me there are ten, who are completely inspired by me myself, while under each of them are two, etc. Thus I can stir up and put into motion a thousand people. This is how one must command and act in politics.’”²²²

“Do you realize sufficiently,” he wrote in the discourse of the reception of the *Illuminatus Dirigens*, “what it means to rule – to rule in a secret society? Not only over the lesser or more important of the populace, but over the best men, over men of all ranks, nations, and religions, to rule without external force, to unite them indissolubly, to breathe one spirit and soul into them, men distributed over all parts of the world?”²²³

The *supposed* aim of the new Order was to improve the present system of government and to abolish “the slavery of the peasants, the servitude of men to the soil, the rights of main morte and all the customs and privileges which abase humanity, the corvées under the condition of an equitable equivalent, all the corporations, all the maîtrises, all the burdens imposed on industry and commerce by customs, excise duties, and taxes... to procure a universal toleration for all religious opinions... to take away all the arms of superstitions, to favour the liberty of the press, etc.”²²⁴

This was almost exactly the same programme as that carried out by the Constituent Assembly at the beginning of the French revolution in 1789-91 under the leadership of, among others, the same Count Mirabeau – a remarkable coincidence!... However, this liberal democratic programme was soon forgotten when Weishaupt took over control of the Order. For “Spartacus” had elaborated a much more radical programme, a programme that was to resemble the socialism of the later, more radical stages of the revolution. “Weishaupt had made into an absolute theory the misanthropic gibes [*boutades*] of Rousseau at the invention of property and society, and without taking into account the statement so distinctly formulated by Rousseau on the impossibility of suppressing property and society once they had been established, he proposed as the end of Illuminism the abolition of property, social authority, of nationality, and the return of the human race to the happy state in which it formed only a single family without artificial needs, without useless sciences, every father being priest and magistrate. Priest of we know not what religion, for in spite of their frequent invocations of the God of Nature, many

²²² Platonov, *op. cit.*, pp. 195-196.

²²³ Webster, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

²²⁴ Webster, *op. cit.*, p. 205.

indications lead us to conclude that Weishaupt had, like Diderot and d’Holbach, no other God than Nature herself...’’²²⁵

Weishaupt proceeded to create an inner secret circle within Masonry. He used the religious forms of Masonry, and invented a few “mysteries” himself. But his aim was to found a *political* organization controlled by himself with a political theory, according to Webster, that was “no other than that of modern Anarchy, that man should govern himself and rulers should be gradually done away with. But he is careful to deprecate all ideas of violent revolution – the process is to be accomplished by the most peaceful methods. Let us see how gently he leads up to the final conclusion:

“‘The first stage in the life of the whole human race is savagery, rough nature, in which the family is the only society, and hunger and thirst are easily satisfied... in which man enjoys the two most excellent goods, Equality and Liberty, to their fullest extent. ... In these circumstances... health was his usual condition... Happy men, who were not yet enough enlightened to lose their peace of mind and to be conscious of the unhappy mainsprings and causes of our misery, love of power... envy... illnesses and all the results of imagination.’

“The manner in which man fell from this primitive state of felicity is then described:

“‘As families increased, means of subsistence began to lack, the nomadic life ceased, property was instituted, men established themselves firmly, and through agriculture families drew near each other, thereby language developed and through living together men began to measure themselves against each other, etc... But here was the cause of the downfall of freedom; equality vanished. Man felt new unknown needs...’

“Thus men became dependent like minors under the guardianship of kings; the human must attain to majority and become self-governing:

“‘Why should it be impossible that the human race should attain to its highest perfection, the capacity to guide itself? Why should anyone be eternally led who understands how to lead himself?’

“Further, men must learn not only to be independent of kings but of each other:

“‘Who has need of another depends on him and has resigned his rights. So to need little is the first step to freedom; therefore savages and the most highly enlightened are perhaps the only free men. The art of more and more limiting one’s needs is at the same time the art of attaining freedom...’

“Weishaupt then goes on to show how the further evil of Patriotism arose:

²²⁵ Henri Martin, *Histoire de France (History of France)*, XVI, 533; in Webster, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

“With the origin of nations and peoples the world ceased to be a great family, a single kingdom: the great tie of nature was torn... Nationalism took the place of human love.... Now it became a virtue to magnify one’s fatherland at the expense of whoever was not enclosed within its limits, now as a means to this narrow end it was allowed to despise and outwit foreigners or indeed even to insult them. This virtue was called Patriotism...’

“And so by narrowing down affection to one’s fellow-citizens, the members of one’s own family, and even to oneself:

“There arose out of Patriotism, Localism, the family spirit, and finally Egoism... Diminish Patriotism, then men will learn to know each other again as such, their dependence on each other will be lost, the bond of union will widen out...’

“... Whilst the ancient religions taught the hope of a Redeemer who should restore man to his former state, Weishaupt looks to man alone for his restoration. ‘Men,’ he observes, ‘no longer loved men but only such and such men. The word was quite lost...’ Thus in Weishaupt’s masonic system the ‘lost word’ is ‘Man,’ and its recovery is interpreted by the idea that Man should find himself again. Further on Weishaupt goes on to show how ‘the redemption of the human race is to be brought about’:

“These means are secret schools of wisdom, these were from all time the archives of Nature and of human rights, through them will Man be saved from his Fall, princes and nations will disappear without violence from the earth, the human race will become one family and the world the abode of reasonable men. Morality alone will bring about this change imperceptibly. Every father of a family will be, as formerly Abraham and the patriarchs, the priest and unfettered lord of his family, and Reason will be the only code of Man. This is one of our greatest secrets...’

“... His first idea was to make Fire Worship the religion of Illuminism; the profession of Christianity therefore appears to have been an after-thought. Evidently Weishaupt discovered, as others have done, that Christianity lends itself more readily to subversive ideas than any other religion. And in the passages which follow we find adopting the old ruse of representing Christ as a Communist and as a secret-society adept. Thus he goes on to explain that ‘if Jesus preaches contempt of riches, He wishes to teach us the reasonable use of them and prepare for the community of goods introduced by Him,’ and in which, Weishaupt adds later, He lived with His disciples. But this secret doctrine is only to be apprehended by initiates...

“Weishaupt thus contrives to give a purely political interpretation to Christ’s teaching:

“The secret preserved through the Disciplinam Arcani, and the aim appearing through all His words and deeds, is to give back to men their original liberty and equality... Now one can understand how far Jesus was the Redeemer and Saviour of the world.’

“The mission of Christ was therefore by means of Reason to make men capable of freedom: ‘When at last reason becomes the religion of man, so will the problem be solved.’

“Weishaupt goes on to show that Freemasonry can be interpreted in the same manner. The secret doctrine concealed in the teaching of Christ was handed down by initiates who ‘hid themselves and their doctrine under the cover of Freemasonry,’ and in a long explanation of Masonic hieroglyphics he indicates the analogies between the Hiram legend and the story of Christ. ‘I say then Hiram is Christ.’... In this manner Weishaupt demonstrates that ‘Freemasonry is hidden Christianity... But this is of course only the secret of what Weishaupt calls ‘real Freemasonry’ in contradistinction to the official kind, which he regards as totally unenlightened.”²²⁶

But the whole religious side of Weishaupt’s system is in fact simply a ruse to attract religious men. Weishaupt himself despised religion: “You cannot imagine,” he wrote, “what consideration and sensation our Priest’s degree is arousing. The most wonderful thing is that great Protestant and reformed theologians who belong to Θ [Illuminism] still believe that the religious teaching imparted in it contains the true and genuine spirit of the Christian religion. Oh! men, of what cannot you be persuaded? I never thought that I should become the founder of a new religion.”²²⁷

Only gradually, and only to a very few of his closest associates, did Weishaupt reveal the real purpose of his order – the revolutionary overthrow of the whole of society, civil and religious. Weishaupt has been credited with founding the idea of world revolution.²²⁸ Elements of all religions and philosophical systems, including Christianity and Masonry, were used by Weishaupt to enrol a body of influential men (about 2500 at one time²²⁹) who would obey him in all things while knowing neither him personally nor the real aims of the secret society they had been initiated into. The use of codes and pseudonyms, and the pyramidal structure of his organization, whereby nobody on a lower level knew what was happening on the one above his, while those on the higher levels knew everything about what was happening below them, was copied by all succeeding revolutionary organizations.

In 1782 Weishaupt convened a Universal Congress of Illuminati in Wilhelmsbad, and was well on the way to taking over Freemasonry when, in July, 1785, an Illuminatus was struck by lightning and papers found on him led to the Bavarian government banning the organisation. However, both Illuminism and Weishaupt continued in existence – only France rather than Germany became the centre of their operations. Thus the Parisian lodge of the Amis Réunis, renamed the Ennemis Réunis, gathered together all the really radical Masons from various other lodges, many of which were still royalist, and turned them, often unconsciously, into agents of Weishaupt. These adepts included no less than thirty princes. For it was

²²⁶ Webster, *op. cit.*, pp. 213-217.

²²⁷ Webster, *op. cit.*, pp. 218-219.

²²⁸ Yu.K. Begunov, A.D. Stepanov, K.Yu. Dushenov, *Taina Bezzakonia* (The Mystery of Iniquity), St. Petersburg, 2002, p. 401.

²²⁹ Ridley, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

characteristic of the revolution that among those who were most swept up by the madness of its intoxication were those who stood to lose most from it.

Some far-sighted men, such as the Apostolic Nuncio in Vienna and the Marquis de Luchet, warned against Illuminism, and de Luchet predicted almost exactly the course of events that the revolution would take on the basis of his knowledge of the order. But no one paid any attention. But then, in October, 1789 a pamphlet was seized in the house of the wife of Mirabeau's publisher among Mirabeau's papers and published two years later.

"Beginning with a diatribe against the French monarchy," writes Webster, "the document goes on to say that 'in order to triumph over this hydra-headed monster these are my ideas':

"We must overthrow all order, suppress all laws, annul all power, and leave the people in anarchy. The law we establish will not perhaps be in force at once, but at any rate, having given back the power to the people, they will resist for the sake of the liberty which they will believe they are preserving. We must caress their vanity, flatter their hopes, promise them happiness after our work has been in operation; we must elude their caprices and their systems at will, for the people as legislators are very dangerous, they only establish laws which coincide with their passions, their want of knowledge would besides only give birth to abuses. But as the people are a lever which legislators can move at their will, we must necessarily use them as a support, and render hateful to them everything we wish to destroy and sow illusions in their path; we must also buy all the mercenary pens which propagate our methods and which will instruct the people concerning their enemies which we attack. The clergy, being the most powerful through public opinion, can only be destroyed by ridiculing religion, rendering its ministers odious, and only representing them as hypocritical monsters... Libels must at every moment show fresh traces of hatred against the clergy. To exaggerate their riches, to make the sins of an individual appear to be common to all, to attribute to them all vices; calumny, murder, irreligion, sacrilege, all is permitted in times of revolution.'

"We must degrade the noblesse and attribute it to an odious origin, establish a germ of equality which can never exist but which will flatter the people; [we must] immolate the most obstinate, burn and destroy their property in order to intimidate the rest, so that if we cannot entirely destroy this prejudice we can weaken it and the people will avenge their vanity and their jealousy by all the excesses which will bring them to submission.'

"After describing how the soldiers are to be seduced from their allegiance, and the magistrates represented to the people as despots, 'since the people, brutal and ignorant, only see the evil and never the good of things,' the writer explains they must be given only limited power in the municipalities.

"Let us beware above all of giving them too much force; their despotism is too dangerous, we must flatter the people by gratuitous justice, promise them a great diminution in taxes and a more equal division, more extension in fortunes, and less humiliation. These phantasies [vertiges] will fanaticise the people, who will flatten

out all resistance. What matter the victims and their numbers? Spoliations, destructions, burnings, and all the necessary effects of a revolution? Nothing must be sacred and we can say with Machiavelli: "What matter the means as long as one arrives at the end?"²³⁰

The early phase of the revolution – that of the constitutional monarchy and the Declaration of the Rights of Man – was led by the more idealistic kind of Freemasons. But its later stages were controlled by the Jacobin-Illuminati with their radically destructive plans. Thus "according to Lombard de Langres [writing in 1820]: 'France in 1789 counted more than 2,000 lodges affiliated to the Grand Orient; the number of adepts was more than 100,000. The first events of 1789 were only Masonry in action. All the revolutionaries of the Constituent Assembly were initiated into the third degree. We place in this class the Duc d'Orléans, Valence, Syllery, Laclos, Sièyes, Pétion, Menou, Biron, Montesquiou, Fauchet, Condorcet, Lafayette, Mirabeau, Garat, Rabaud, Dubois-Crancé, Thiébaud, Larochevoucauld, and others.'

"Amongst these others [continues Webster] were not only the Brissotins, who formed the nucleus of the Girondin party, but the men of the Terror – Marat, Robespierre, Danton, and Desmoulins.

"It was these fiercer elements, true disciples of the Illuminati, who were to sweep away the visionary Masons dreaming of equality and brotherhood. Following the precedent set by Weishaupt, classical pseudonyms were adopted by these leaders of the Jacobins, thus Chaumette was known as Anaxagoras, Clotz as Anacharsis, Danton as Horace, Lacroix as Publicola, and Ronsin as Scaevola; again, after the manner of the Illuminati, the names of towns were changed and a revolutionary calendar was adopted. The red cap and loose hair affected by the Jacobins appear also to have been foreshadowed in the lodges of the Illuminati.

"Yet faithfully as the Terrorists carried out the plan of the Illuminati, it would seem that they themselves were not initiated into the innermost secrets of the conspiracy. Behind the Convention, behind the clubs, behind the Revolutionary Tribunal, there existed, says Lombard de Langres, that 'most secret convention [convention secrétissime] which directed everything after May 31, an occult and terrible power of which the other Convention became the slave and which was composed of the prime initiates of Illuminism. This power was above Robespierre and the committees of the government,... it was this occult power which appropriated to itself the treasures of the nation and distributed them to the brothers and friends who had helped on the great work.'²³¹

What was this occult power that controlled even the Illuminati? Many writers think that it was the Talmudists, the rabbinic leaders of the Jewish people. However, the final triumph of the Talmudists was delayed temporarily by an excess of the revolutionary zeal they had themselves stimulated. "In the local communes," writes L.A. Tikhomirov, "individual groups of especially wild Jacobins, who had not been initiated into higher politics, sometimes broke into synagogues, destroying the

²³⁰ Webster, *op. cit.*, pp. 241-242.

²³¹ Webster, *op. cit.*, pp. 244-245.

Torah and books, but it was only by 1794 that the revolutionary-atheist logic finally forced even the bosses to pose the question of the annihilation not only of Catholicism, but also of Jewry. At this point, however, the Jews were delivered by 9 Thermidor, 1794. Robespierre fell and was executed. The moderate elements triumphed. The question of the ban of Jewry disappeared of itself, while the Constitution of Year III of the Republic granted *equal rights* to the Jews.”²³²

²³² Tikhomirov, *op. cit.*, p. 365.

27. NAPOLEON AND THE JEWS

If the French revolution gave the Jews their first political victory, Napoleon gave them their second. On May 22, 1799, the Paris *Moniteur* published the following report from Constantinople on April 17: "Buonaparte has published a proclamation in which he invites all the Jews of Asia and Africa to come and place themselves under his flag *in order to re-establish ancient Jerusalem*. He has already armed a great number and their battalions are threatening Aleppo." This was not the first time that the Jews had persuaded a Gentile ruler to restore them to Jerusalem. The Roman Emperor Julian the Apostate had allowed the Jews to return to Jerusalem and start rebuilding the Temple. However, fire came out from the foundations and black crosses appeared on the workers' garments, forcing them to abandon the enterprise.²³³

And the Jews were to be thwarted again. For British sea-power prevented Napoleon from reaching Jerusalem and making himself, as was reported to be his intention, king of the Jews. The Jews would have to wait over a century before another Gentile power – this time, the British – again offered them a return to Zion.

Napoleon now learned what many rulers before and after had learned: that kindness towards the Jews does not make them more tractable. Nechvolodov writes: "Since the first years of the Empire, Napoleon I had become very worried about the Jewish monopoly in France and the isolation in which they lived in the midst of the other citizens, although they had received citizenship. The reports of the departments showed the activity of the Jews in a very bad light: 'Everywhere there are false declarations to the civil authorities; fathers declare the sons who are born to them to be daughters... Again, there are Jews who have given an example of disobedience to the laws of conscription; out of sixty-nine Jews who, in the course of six years, should have formed part of the Moselle contingent, none has entered the army.'

"By contrast, behind the army, they give themselves up to frenzied speculation.

"'Unfortunately,' says Thiers describing the entry of the French into Rome in his *History of the Revolution*, 'the excesses, not against persons but against property, marred the entry of the French into the ancient capital of the world... Berthier had just left for Paris, Massena had just succeeded him. This hero was accused of having given the first example. He was soon imitated. They began to pillage the palaces, convents and rich collections. Some Jews in the rear of the army bought for a paltry price the magnificent objects which the looters were offering them.'

"It was in 1805, during Napoleon's passage through Strasbourg, after the victory of Austerlitz, that the complaints against the Jews assumed great proportions. The principal accusations brought against them concerned the terrible use they made of usury. As soon as he returned to Paris, Napoleon judged it necessary to concentrate

²³³ Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History*, III, 20; Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History*, V, 22; Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History*, III, 15; Karen Armstrong, *A History of Jerusalem*, London: HarperCollins, 1997, pp. 194-196.

all his attention on the Jews. In the State Council, during its session of April 30, he said, among other things, the following on this subject:

“The French government cannot look on with indifference as a vile, degraded nation capable of every iniquity takes exclusive possession of two beautiful departments of Alsace; one must consider the Jews as a nation and not as a sect. It is a nation within a nation; I would deprive them, at least for a certain time, of the right to take out mortgages, for it is too humiliating for the French nation to find itself at the mercy of the vilest nation. Some entire villages have been expropriated by the Jews; they have replaced feudalism... It would be dangerous to let the keys of France, Strasbourg and Alsace, fall into the hands of a population of spies who are not at all attached to the country.”²³⁴

Napoleon eventually decided on an extraordinary measure: to convene a 111-strong Assembly of Jewish Notables in order to receive clear and unambiguous answers to the following questions: did the Jewish law permit mixed marriages; did the Jews regard Frenchmen as foreigners or as brothers; did they regard France as their native country, the laws of which they were bound to obey; did the Judaic law draw any distinction between Jewish and Christian debtors? At the same time, writes Johnson, Napoleon “supplemented this secular body by convening a parallel meeting of rabbis and learned laymen, to advise the Assembly on technical points of Torah and halakhah. The response of the more traditional elements of Judaism was poor. They did not recognize Napoleon’s right to invent such a tribunal, let alone summon it...”²³⁵

However, if some traditionalists did not welcome it, other Jews received the news with unbounded joy. “According to Abbé Lemann,” writes Nechvolodov, “they grovelled in front of him and were ready to recognize him as the Messiah. The sessions of the Sanhedrin [composed of 46 rabbis and 25 laymen from all parts of Western Europe] took place in February and March, 1807, and the *Decision of the Great Sanhedrin* began with the words: ‘Blessed forever is the Lord, the God of Israel, Who has placed on the throne of France and of the kingdom of Italy a prince according to His heart. God has seen the humiliation of the descendants of ancient Jacob, and He has chosen Napoleon the Great to be the instrument of His mercy... Reunited today under his powerful protection in the good town of Paris, to the number of seventy-one doctors of the law and notables of Israel, we constitute a Great Sanhedrin, so as to find in us a means and power to create religious ordinances in conformity with the principles of our holy laws, and which may serve as a rule and example to all Israelites. These ordinances will teach the nations that our dogmas are consistent with the civil laws under which we live, and do not separate us at all from the society of men...’”²³⁶

“The Jewish delegates,” writes Platonov, “declared that state laws had the same obligatory force for Jews, that every honourable study of Jewish teaching was allowed, but usury was forbidden, etc. [However,] to the question concerning mixed marriages of Jews and Christians they gave an evasive, if not negative reply.

²³⁴ Nechvolodov, *op. cit.*, pp. 221-222.

²³⁵ Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 310.

²³⁶ Nechvolodov, *op. cit.*, pp. 225-226.

‘Although mixed marriages between Jews and Christians cannot be clothed in a religious form, they nevertheless do not draw upon them any anathema.’²³⁷

On the face of it, the convening of the Sanhedrin was a great triumph for Napoleon, who could now treat Jewry as just another religious denomination, and not a separate nation, “appropriating for the state what had traditionally been a subversive institution”.²³⁸ However, the Jews did not restrain their money-lending and speculative activities, as Napoleon had pleaded with them to do. On the contrary, only one year after the convening of the Great Sanhedrin, when it became evident that their financial excesses were continuing, Napoleon was forced to adopt repressive measures against them.

Moreover, he created rabbinic consistories in France having disciplinary powers over Jews and granted rabbis the status of state officials – a measure that was to strengthen the powers of the rabbis over their people. In time Jewish consistories were created all over Europe. They “began the stormy propaganda of Judaism amidst Jews who had partially fallen away from the religion of their ancestors, organised rabbinic schools and spiritual seminaries for the education of youth in the spirit of Talmudic Judaism.”²³⁹

Moreover, as Tikhomirov points out, “no laws could avert the international links of the Jews. Sometimes they even appeared openly, as in Kol Ispoel Khaberim (Alliance Israélite Universelle), although many legislatures forbade societies and unions of their own citizens to have links with foreigners. The Jews gained a position of exceptional privilege. For the first time in the history of the diaspora they acquired greater rights than the local citizens of the countries of the dispersion. One can understand that, whatever the further aims for the resurrection of Israel might be, the countries of the new culture and statehood became from that time a lever of support for Jewry.”²⁴⁰

Indeed, the main result of the Great Sanhedrin, writes Nechvolodov, “was to unite Judaism still more. ‘Let us not forget from where we draw our origin,’ said Rabbi Salomon Lippmann Cerfbeer on July 26, 1808, in his speech for the opening of the preparatory assembly of the Sanhedrin:- ‘Let it no longer be a question of

²³⁷ Platonov, *op. cit.*, p. 266.

²³⁸ Eliane Glaser, “Napoleon’s Jews: A Law unto Themselves”, *BBC History Magazine*, vol. 8, no. 8, August, 2007, p. 36. This did not mean, however, that the complaints of the citizens of Alsace were ignored. According to the “infamous decree” of March 17, 1808, writes Vital, “existing debts to Jews [in Alsace] were to be heavily and arbitrarily reduced. But the stipulations of the decree went a great deal further. Restrictions were to be levelled on the freedom of Jews to engage in a trade of their choice and to move from one part of the country to another without special permission. They were to submit to special commercial registration. They were not to employ the Hebrew language in their commercial transactions. Unlike all other citizens, they were to be forbidden to offer substitutes in case of conscription for military service. And the entry of foreign Jews into France was to be conditional either on military performance or on satisfaction of specified property qualifications.” (*op. cit.*, p. 59). The decree lasted for ten years, but was not then renewed by the Restoration government.

²³⁹ Platonov, *op. cit.*, pp. 267-268.

²⁴⁰ Tikhomirov, *op. cit.*, p. 366.

“German” or “Portuguese” Jews; although disseminated over the surface of the globe, we everywhere form only one unique people.”²⁴¹

As we have seen, the emancipation of the Jews in France led to their emancipation in other countries. Even after the fall of Napoleon, on June 8, 1815, the Congress of Vienna decreed that “it was incumbent on the members of the German Confederation to consider an ‘amelioration’ of the civil status of all those who ‘confessed the Jewish faith in Germany.’”²⁴² Gradually, though not without opposition, Jewish emancipation and Jewish power spread throughout Europe...

²⁴¹ Nechvolodov, *op. cit.*, p. 226.

²⁴² Vital, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

28. THE JEWS UNDER ALEXANDER I

Throughout the medieval and early modern periods, the Jews had been forbidden to settle in Russia. From the beginning of the Muscovite kingdom, however, Jews had begun to infiltrate into Russia from Poland-Lithuania, where, as we have seen, the Polish landowners had given them considerable privileges, employing them to collect very heavy taxes, fees, tolls and produce from the Russian serfs. In some cases the Poles even handed over churches and monasteries to the Jews, who would extort fees for the celebration of sacraments.²⁴³

“In the 16th century,” writes Solzhenitsyn, quoting Yury Hessen, “the spiritual leadership of the Jewish world came to be concentrated in German-Polish Jewry... So as to prevent the possibility of the Jewish people being dissolved amidst the surrounding population, the spiritual leaders had from ages past introduced stipulations whose purpose was to isolate the people from close contact with their neighbours. Using the authority of the Talmud,... the Rabbis wrapped round the public and private life of the Jew with a complex web of prescriptions of a religio-social nature, which... prevented them getting close to people of other faiths.’ Real and spiritual needs ‘were brought in sacrifice to outdated forms of popular life’, ‘blind fulfilment of ritual was transformed for the people into the goal, as it were, of the existence of Jewry... Rabbinism, ossified in lifeless forms, continued to keep both the mind and the will of the people in fetters.’”²⁴⁴

In 1648, the Ukrainian Cossacks and peasants rose up against their Polish and Jewish oppressors and appealed to the Tsar for help. The Tsarist armies triumphed, and by the treaty of Andrusovo in 1667 Eastern Ukraine was ceded – together with its Jewish population – to Russia.²⁴⁵ For the next hundred years, writes Janet Hartley, these Jews of the Russian empire “lived mostly in the Ukraine although a small Jewish community became established in Moscow. The government legislated to contain and control the Jewish population within the empire’s borders. Both Catherine I (1725-27) and Elizabeth (1741-62) attempted to ban Jews from Russia; one estimate is that 35,000 Jews were banished in 1741.”²⁴⁶

From the second half of the eighteenth century, however, the universalism and cosmopolitanism of the Enlightenment, together with the principles of human and national rights of the French revolution, led to the emancipation of the Jews, first in France, and then in most of the countries of Europe. This process was slow and accompanied by many reverses and difficulties, but inexorable. The only great power which firmly resisted it was *Russia*....

²⁴³ Hieromonk Patapios, “A Traditionalist Critique of ‘The Orthodox Church’”, *Orthodox Tradition*, volume XVI, № 1, 1999, pp. 44-45.

²⁴⁴ A.I. Solzhenitsyn, *Dvesti Let Vmeste (Two Hundred Years Together)*, Moscow, 2001, vol. 1, p. 34.

²⁴⁵ 1667 was the very year in which Patriarch Nikon was unjustly deposed; so the first major influx of Jews into Russia coincided with the first serious undermining of Russian Church-State relations. (L.A. Tikhomirov, “Yevrei i Rossia” (“The Jews and Russia”), *Kritika Demokratii (A Critique of Democracy)*, Moscow, 1997, p. 487).

²⁴⁶ Hartley, *A Social History of the Russian Empire, 1650-1825*, London and New York: Longman, 1999, p. 15.

Contrary to popular myth, the myth of its being “the prison of the peoples”, the record of the Russian empire in its treatment of various subject populations was in general good. We only have to look at the large number of Baltic German names among the senior officials of the empire, the very large measure of autonomy given to the Finns (and to the Poles before they rebelled), and the way in which Tatar khans and Georgian princes were fully assimilated (or rather: assimilated to the degree that *they* wanted). In fact, Russia was probably more liberal, and certainly less racist, in its treatment of its subject peoples than its contemporary rival, the supposedly “liberal” empire of Great Britain.

But the Jews presented certain intractable problems not found in the other peoples of the empire. The first problem was the sheer *number* of Jews who suddenly found themselves within its boundaries. Thus Hartley writes: “The empire acquired a further c. 250,000 Jews after the establishment of the Congress Kingdom of Poland in 1815. There was a substantial Jewish population in Bessarabia (11.3 per cent in 1863). In 1854, the Jewish population of the whole empire was estimated as 1,062,132.”²⁴⁷ These numbers grew rapidly in the second half of the nineteenth century. And by the beginning of the twentieth century, according to Lebedev, *about half* the number of the Jews *in the whole world* were to be found in the Russian empire.

More fundamental, however, than the administrative problem presented by these large numbers was the fact that, as David Vital writes, “there were differences... between Russia and the other European states... in respect of the place of religion generally and what were taken to be the teachings of religion on what were unquestionably the state’s affairs. It was not merely that in principle Russia continued to be held by its Autocrat and its minions to be a Christian state with a particular duty to uphold its own Orthodox Church. It was that, far from the matter of the state’s specifically Christian duty slowly wasting away, as in the west, it continued actively to exercise the minds of Russia’s rulers as one of the central criteria by which questions of public policy were to be judged and decided. The continuous search for an effective definition of the role, quality, and ultimate purposes of the Autocracy itself was an enterprise which, considering the energy and seriousness with which it was pursued, sufficed in itself to distinguish Russia from its contemporaries. The programmes to which the state was committed and all its structures were under obligation to promote varied somewhat over time. But in no instance was there serious deviation from the rule that Russian Orthodoxy was and needed to remain a central and indispensable component of the ruling ethos. Nineteenth-century imperial Russia was therefore an ideological state in a manner and to a degree that had become so rare as to be virtually unknown in Europe and would not be familiar again for at least a century...”²⁴⁸

Moreover, if Russia was the last ideological state in Europe, the large numbers of Ashkenazi Jews that came within the Russian empire between 1772 and 1815 constituted an ideological “state within the state” whose anti-Christian books, rabbinic leaders and *kahal* institutions caused them to be bitterly hostile to everything that Russia stood for. To put it bluntly: if the Russians worshipped

²⁴⁷ Hartley, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

²⁴⁸ David Vital, *A People Apart: The Jews in Europe, 1789-1939*, Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 86-87.

Christ, the Jews hated Him. And no amount of state intervention, whether in a liberal or illiberal, emancipatory or anti-emancipatory direction, could resolve this basic contradiction or defuse the hostile sentiments it aroused on both sides. The situation was exacerbated by the fact that, unlike the Orthodox Christians, who are taught to recognise and obey secular authorities even if they are not Orthodox, and not only out of fear but for conscience's sake (Romans 13.1-4), the Jews ultimately recognised no authorities beside their own, rabbinical ones. And if they did obey the Gentile powers, it was only because they had been taught that resistance was counter-productive, not because these powers had any *moral* authority over them.

This led the Jew, writes Vital, "to be deeply sceptical of civil authority of *all* kinds... The lasting effect of such scepticism was to leave him peculiarly independent in mind and social outlook. "Having no earthly masters to whom he thought he owed unquestioning political obedience (the special case of the Hasidic rebbe or zaddik and his devotees aside), '[the European Jew's] was... a spirit that, for his times, was remarkably free. Permitted no land, he had no territorial lord. Admitted to no guild, he was free of the authority of established master-craftsmen. Not being a Christian, he had neither bishop nor priest to direct him. And while he could be charged or punished for insubordination to state or sovereign, he could not properly be charged with disloyalty. Betrayal only entered into the life of the Jews in regard to their own community or, more broadly, to Jewry as a whole. It was to their own nation alone that they accepted that they owed undeviating loyalty."²⁴⁹

We have seen how important and harmful the internal Jewish authority of the kahal was considered to be by the enlightened Polish Jew Hourwitz. The Tsar's servants were soon to make this discovery for themselves. Tsar Paul I appointed the poet and state official Gavriil Romanovich Derzhavin to investigate why Belorussia had been afflicted by such a severe famine. After visiting Belorussia twice in 1799 and 1800, Derzhavin came to the conclusion that the main cause of the famine was the desperate poverty into which the Jewish tavern-keepers and money-lenders, in connivance with the Polish landowners, had reduced the Belorussian peasants.²⁵⁰

But more importantly, writes Platonov, Derzhavin "noted the ominous role of the kahals – the organs of Jewish self-rule on the basis of the bigoted laws of the Talmud, which 'a well-constructed political body must not tolerate', as being a state within the state. Derzhavin discovered that the Jews, who considered themselves oppressed, established in the Pale of Settlement a secret Israelite kingdom divided into kahal districts with kahal administrations endowed with despotic power over the Jews which inhumanly exploited the Christians and their property on the basis of the Talmud. ...²⁵¹

²⁴⁹ Vital, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19.

²⁵⁰ Solzhenitsyn writes, quoting Derzhavin, that "some 'landowners, giving the sale of wine on franchise to the Jews in their villages, are making agreements with them that their peasants should buy nothing that they needed from anyone else, and should take loans from nobody except these tax-farmers [three times more expensive], and should sell none of their products to anyone except these same Jewish tax-farmers... cheaper than the true price'" (*op. cit.*, p. 47).

²⁵¹ In 1800, I.G. Friesel, governor of Vilna, reported: "Having established their own administrative institution, called Synagogues, Kahals, or associations, the Jews completely separated themselves from the people and government of the land. As a result, they were exempt from the operation of

“Derzhavin also uncovered the concept of ‘herem’ – a curse which the kahal issued against all those who did not submit to the laws of the Talmud. This, according to the just evaluation of the Russian poet, was ‘an impenetrable sacrilegious cover for the most terrible crimes’.

“In his note Derzhavin ‘was the first to delineate a harmonious, integral programme for the resolution of the Jewish question in the spirit of Russian statehood, having in mind the unification of all Russian subjects on common ground’.

“Paul I, after reading the note, agreed with many of its positions and decorated the author. However, the tragic death of the Tsar as the result of an international Masonic conspiracy destroyed the possibility of resolving the Jewish question in a spirit favourable for the Russian people. The new Emperor, Alexander I, being under the influence of a Masonic environment, adopted a liberal position. In 1802 he created a special Committee for the improvement of the Jews, whose soul was the Mason Speransky, who was closely linked with the Jewish world through the well-known tax-farmer Perets, whom he considered his friend and with whom he lived.

“Another member of the committee was G.R. Derzhavin. As general-governor, he prepared a note ‘On the removal of the deficit of bread in Belorussia, the collaring of the avaricious plans of the Jews, on their transformation, and other things’. Derzhavin’s new note, in the opinion of specialists, was ‘in the highest degree a remarkable document, not only as the work of an honourable, penetrating statesman, but also as a faithful exposition of all the essential sides of Jewish life, which hinder the merging of this race with the rest of the population.’

“In the report of the official commission on the Jewish question which worked in the 1870s in the Ministry of the Interior, it was noted that at the beginning of the reign of Alexander I the government ‘stood already on the ground of the detailed study of Jewry and the preparation that had begun had already at that time exposed such sides of the public institutions of this nationality which would hardly be tolerable in any state structure. But however often reforms were undertaken in the higher administrative spheres, every time some magical brake held up the completion of the matter.’ This magical brake stopped Derzhavin’s proposed reform of Jewry, which suggested the annihilation of the kahals in all the provinces populated by Jews, the removal of all kahal collections and the limitation of the influx of Jews to a certain percentage in relation to the Christian population, while the remaining masses were to be given lands in Astrakhan and New Russia provinces, assigning the poorest to re-settlement. Finally, he proposed allowing the Jews who did not want to submit to these restrictions freedom to go abroad. However, these measures were not confirmed by the government.

the statutes which governed the peoples of the several estates, and even if special laws were enacted, these remained unenforced and valueless, because the ecclesiastical and temporal leaders of the Jews invariably resisted them and were clever enough to find means to evade them.” (Isaac Levitats, *The Jewish Community in Russia, 1772-1844*, New York, 1970, p. 29; quoted in Hartley, *op. cit.*, pp. 98-99). (V.M.)

“Derzhavin’s note and the formation of the committee elicited great fear in the Jewish world. From the published kahal documents of the Minsk Jewish society it becomes clear that the kahals and the ‘leaders of the cities’ gathered in an extraordinary meeting three days later and decided to send a deputation to St. Petersburg with the aim of petitioning Alexander I to make no innovations in Jewish everyday life. But since this matter ‘required great resources’, a very significant sum was laid upon the whole Jewish population as a tax, refusal from which brought with it ‘excommunication from the people’ (herem). From a private note given to Derzhavin by one Belorussian landowner, it became known that the Jews imposed their herem also on the general procurator, uniting with it a curse through all the kahals ‘as on a persecutor’. Besides, they collected ‘as gifts’ for this matter, the huge sum for that time of a million rubles and sent it to Petersburg, asking that ‘efforts be made to remove him, Derzhavin, from his post, and if that was not possible, at any rate to make an attempt on his life’.”²⁵²

Not surprisingly, Tsar Alexander’s Statute for the Jews of December 9, 1804 turned out to be fairly liberal – much more liberal than the laws of Frederick Augustus in Napoleon’s Duchy of Warsaw. Its strictest provisions related to a ban on Jews’ participation in the distilling and retailing of spirits. Also, “there was to be no relaxation of the ancient rule that Jews (negligible exceptions apart²⁵³) were to be prevented from penetrating into ‘inner Russia’. Provision was made for an eventual, but determined, attack on the rabbinate’s ancient – but in the government’s view presumptuous and unacceptable – practice of adjudicating cases that went beyond the strict limits of the religious (as opposed to the civil and criminal domain), but also on rabbinical independence and authority generally....”²⁵⁴

“But the Jews themselves could take some comfort in it being expressly stated that there was to be no question of forcible conversion to Christianity; that they were not to be oppressed or harassed in the observance of their faith and in their general social activities; that the private property of the Jews remained inviolable; and that Jews were not to be exploited or enserfed. They were, on the contrary, to enjoy the same, presumably full protection of the law that was accorded other subjects of the realm. They were not to be subject to the legal jurisdiction of the landowners on whose estates they might happen to be resident. And they were encouraged in every way the Committee could imagine – by fiscal and other economic incentives, for example, by the grant of land and loans to develop it, by permission to move to the New Russian Territories in the south – to undergo decisive and (so it was presumed) irreversible change in the two central respects which both Friezel and Derzhavin had indeed, and perfectly reasonably, regarded as vital: education and employment. In this they were to be encouraged very strongly; but they were not to be forced...”²⁵⁵

However, the liberal Statute of 1804 was never fully implemented, and was succeeded by stricter measures towards the end of Alexander’s reign and in the

²⁵² Platonov, *op. cit.*, pp. 242, 243-245.

²⁵³ In fact they were not negligible at all. The Pale of Settlement was exceedingly porous!

²⁵⁴ The kahal was abolished in 1821 in Poland and in 1844 in the rest of the Russian empire.

²⁵⁵ Vital, *op. cit.*, pp. 95-96.

reign of his successor, Nicholas I. There were many reasons for this. Among them, of course, was Napoleon's invasion of Russia in 1812, which, if it had been successful, would have united the Western Sephardic Jews with the Eastern Ashkenazi Jews in a single State, free, emancipated, and under their own legally convened Sanhedrin. But not only did Napoleon not succeed: the invasion of Russia was the graveyard of his empire. In 1813, and again in 1815, the Russian armies entered Paris. From now on, the chief target of the Jews' hatred in both East and West would be the Russian Empire...

But the main reason for the tightening of Russian policy was "the Jews' abhorrence of Christianity, the intensely negative light in which non-Jewish society had always been regarded, and the deeply ingrained suspicion and fear in which all forms of non-Jewish authority were commonly held."²⁵⁶ As a result, in the whole of the 19th century only 69,400 Jews converted to Orthodoxy.²⁵⁷ If the French delegates who emancipated French Jewry could ignore this fact, the Russian Tsars could not.²⁵⁸

The Tsars' gradual tightening of policy had little or no effect on the basic problem of religious and social antagonism. As Platonov writes: "The statute of the Jews worked out in 1804, which took practically no account of Derzhavin's suggestion, continued to develop the isolation of the Jewish communities on Russian soil, that is, it strengthened the kahals together with their fiscal, judicial, police and educational independence. However, the thought of re-settling the Jews out of the western region continued to occupy the government after the issuing of the statute in 1804. A consequence of this was the building in the New Russian area (from 1808) of Jewish colonies in which the government vainly hoped to 're-educate' the Jews, and, having taught them to carry out productive agricultural labour, to change in this way the whole structure of their life. Nevertheless, even in these model colonies the kahal-rabbinic administration retained its former significance and new settlements isolated themselves from the Christian communities; they did not intend to merge with them either in a national or in a cultural sense. The government not only did not resist the isolation of the Jews, but even founded for them the so-called Israelite Christians (that is, Talmudists who had converted to Orthodoxy). A special committee existed from 1817 to 1833..."²⁵⁹

²⁵⁶ Vital, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

²⁵⁷ Vladimir Gubanov (ed.), *Nikolai II-ij i novie mucheniki (Nicholas II and the New Martyrs)*, St. Petersburg, 2000, p. 698. Gubanov took this figure from the Jewish Encyclopaedia.

²⁵⁸ Nor did the Jews receive emancipation from the great powers at the Congress of Vienna, although their situation had made it onto the agenda (Zamoyski, *Rites of Peace*, p. 568).

²⁵⁹ Platonov, *op. cit.*, p. 245.

29. THE ROTHSCHILD CENTURY

Economic liberalism is based on egoism in theory and practice. Thus in Adam Smith's *Inquiry into the Nature and Cause of the Wealth of Nations* (1776) we read: "It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest. We address ourselves, not to their humanity but to their self-love... [The individual] is in this as in any other cases, led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention... I have never known much good done by those who affected to trade for the public good. It is an affectation, indeed, not very common among merchants, and very few words need to be employed in dissuading them from it."²⁶⁰

It is a paradoxical theory, to say the least: that the public interest is best served by everyone pursuing his self-interest as freely as possible! But it found confirmation in the work of a Jewish London banker called David Ricardo in the 1820s. "It was Ricardian economic theory," writes Norman Cantor, "that became and remains the theoretical foundation of that market capitalism in which so many nineteenth-century Jews [most famously, the Rothschilds] made their fortune and general fame, or at least found the means for a satisfying private family life. Ricardo was the Moses of Jewish capitalism, who brought down the tables of truth to show to the chosen people and the admiring Gentiles as well.

"The main point of Ricardian economics is identical with that of Reform Judaism's Haskalah-Kantian theology. Just as God in the latter is a creator whose majesty is humanly unapproachable, so the market is a universal, rationalizing structure that cannot be modified by human will or sentiment, such as by paying wages beyond the minimum with which the market can operate, or by state interference with the business cycle or capital accumulation. Leave God and the market alone and attend to your personal, family, and communal lives and business interests..."²⁶¹

The most famous Jewish beneficiaries of Ricardian economics were the Rothschilds, whose break-through moment came at the Battle of Waterloo...

There is indeed nothing mystical about the Jews' acquisition of enormous wealth. In the present as in the past - for example, in the Hungarian Jew George Soros' vastly successful gamble on Britain leaving the European Exchange Rate Mechanism in 1990, or in the Jewish bank Goldman Sachs' ability to profit even from the drastic culling of the American banks in 2007 - we see the same prosaic formula for success, consisting of the following in order of importance: (i) The exceptionally close solidarity of the members of the tribe to each other on the basis of their common Jewish faith or - which comes to the same thing - Jewish nationality; (ii) Their vast capital base, which enables them to ride out storms and disasters that would sink a less well capitalized organization; and (iii) Their vast intelligence network combined with great speed and security of communication, which enables them always to be "ahead of the game" in what may be called "institutionalized

²⁶⁰ Smith, in Robert Harvey, *Global Disorder*, London: Robinson, 2003, p. 392.

²⁶¹ Cantor, *The Sacred Chain*, London: Fontana, 1996, p. 266.

insider dealing.” All three elements were important in the rise of the Rothschilds...

Niall Ferguson writes: “Master of unbounded wealth, he boasts that he is the arbiter of peace and war, and that the credit of nations depends upon his nod; his correspondents are innumerable; his couriers outrun those of sovereign princes, and absolute sovereigns; ministers of state are in his pay. Paramount in the cabinets of continental Europe, he aspires to the domination of our own.’

“Those words were spoken in 1828 by the Radical MP Thomas Dunscombe. The man he was referring to was Nathan Myer Rothschild, founder of the London branch of what was, for most of the nineteenth century, the biggest bank in the world. It was the bond market that made the Rothschild family rich – rich enough to build forty-one stately homes all over Europe...

“... His brothers called Nathan ‘the general in chief’. ‘All you ever write,’ complained Salomon wearily in 1815, ‘is pay this, pay that, send this, send that.’ It was this phenomenal drive, allied to innate financial genius, that propelled Nathan from the obscurity of the Frankfurt Judengasse to mastery of the London bond market. Once again, however, the opportunity for financial innovations was provided by war.

“On the morning of 18 June 1815, 67,000 British, Dutch and German troops under the Duke of Wellington’s command looked out across the fields of Waterloo, not far from Brussels, towards an almost equal number of French troops commanded by the French Emperor, Napoleon Bonaparte. The Battle of Waterloo was the culmination of more than two decades of intermittent conflict between Britain and France. But it was more than a battle between two armies. It was also a contest between rival financial systems: one, the French, which under Napoleon had come to be based on plunder (the taxation of the conquered); the other, the British, based on debt.

“Never had so many bonds been issued to finance a military conflict. Between 1793 and 1815 the British national debt increased by a factor of three, to £745 million, more than double the annual output of the UK economy. But this increase in the supply of bonds had weighed heavily on the London market. Since February 1792, the price of a typical £100 3 per cent consol had fallen from £96 to below £60 on the eve of Waterloo, at one time (in 1797) sinking below £50...

“According to a long-standing legend, the Rothschild family owed the first millions of their fortune to Nathan’s successful speculation about the effect of the outcome of the battle on the price of British bonds. In some versions of the story, Nathan witnessed the battle himself, risked a Channel storm to reach London ahead of the official news of Wellington’s victory and, by buying bonds ahead of a huge surge in prices, pocketed between £20 and £135 million. It was a legend the Nazis later did their best to embroider. In 1940 Joseph Goebbels approved the release of *Die Rothschilds*, which depicts an oleaginous Nathan bribing a French general to ensure the Duke of Wellington’s victory, and then deliberately misreporting the outcome in London in order to precipitate panic selling of British bonds, which he then snaps up at bargain-basement prices. Yet the reality was altogether different.

Far from making money from Wellington's victory, the Rothschilds were very nearly ruined by it. Their fortune was made not because of Waterloo, but despite it.

"After a series of miscued interventions, British troops had been fighting against Napoleon on the Continent since August 1808, when the future Duke of Wellington, then Lieutenant-General Sir Arthur Wellesley, led an expeditionary force to Portugal, invaded by the French the previous year. For the better part of the next six years, there would be a recurrent need to get men and *materiel* to the Iberian Peninsula. Selling bonds to the public had certainly raised plenty of cash for the British government, but banknotes were of little use on distant battlefields. To provision the troops and pay Britain's allies against France, Wellington needed a currency that was universally acceptable. The challenge was to transform the money raised on the bond market into gold coins, and to get them to where they were needed. Sending gold guineas from London to Lisbon was expensive and hazardous in time of war. But when the Portuguese merchants declined to accept the bills of exchange that Wellington proffered, there seemed little alternative but to ship cash.

"The son of a moderately successful Frankfurt antique dealer and bill broker, Nathan Rothschild had arrived in England only in 1799 and had spent most of the next ten years in the newly industrializing North of England, purchasing textiles and shipping them back to Germany. He did not go into the banking business in London until 1811. Why, then, did the British government turn to him in its hour of financial need? The answer is that Nathan had acquired valuable experience as a smuggler of gold to the Continent, in breach of the blockade that Napoleon had imposed on trade between England and Europe. (Admittedly, it was a breach the French authorities tended to wink at, in the simplistic mercantilist belief that outflows of gold from England must tend to weaken the British war effort.) In January 1814, the Chancellor of the Exchequer authorized the Commissary-in-Chief, John Charles Merries, to 'employ that gentleman [Nathan] in most secret and confidential manner to collect in Germany, coins, not exceeding in value £600,000, which he may be able to procure within two months from the present time.' These were then to be delivered to British vessels at the Dutch port of Helvoetsluys and sent on to Wellington, who had by now crossed the Pyrenees into France. It was an immense operation, which depended on the brothers' ability to manage large-scale bullion transfers. They executed their commission so well that Wellington was soon writing to express his gratitude for the 'ample... supplies of money'. As Harries put it: 'Rothschild of this place has executed the various services entrusted to him in this line admirably well, and though a Jew [*sic*], we place a good deal of confidence in him.' By May 1814 Nathan had advanced nearly £1.2 to the government, double the amount envisaged in his original instructions.

"Mobilizing such vast amounts of gold even at the tail end of a war was risky, no doubt. Yet from the Rothschilds' point of view, the hefty commissions they were able to charge more than justified the risks. What made them so well suited to the task was that the brothers had a ready-made banking network within the family – Nathan in London, Amschel in Frankfurt, James (the youngest) in Paris, Carl in Amsterdam and Salomon roving wherever Nathan saw fit. Spread throughout Europe, the five Rothschilds were uniquely positioned to exploit price and exchange

rate differences between markets, the process known as arbitrage. If the price of gold was higher in, say, Paris than in London, James in Paris would sell gold for bills of exchange, then send these to London, where Nathan would use them to buy a larger quantity of gold. The fact that their own transactions on Herries's behalf were big enough to affect such price differentials only added to the profitability of the business. In addition, the Rothschilds also handled some of the large subsidies paid to Britain's continental allies. By June 1814, Herries calculated that they had effected payments of this sort to a value of 12.6 million francs. 'Mr. Rothschild', remarked the Prime Minister, Lord Liverpool, had become 'a very useful friend'. As he told the Foreign Secretary, Lord Castlereagh, 'I do not know what we should have done without him...' By now his brothers had taken to calling Nathan the master of the Stock Exchange.

"After his abdication in April 1814, Napoleon had been exiled to the small Italian island of Elba, which he proceeded to rule as an empire in miniature. It was too small to hold him. On 1 March 1815, to the consternation of the monarchs and ministers gathered to restore the old European order at the Congress of Vienna, he returned to France, determined to revive his Empire. Veterans of the *grande armée* rallied to his standard. Nathan Rothschild responded to this 'unpleasant news' by immediately resuming gold purchases, buying up all the bullion and coins he and his brothers could lay their hands on, and making it available to Herries for shipment to Wellington. In all, the Rothschilds provided gold coins worth more than £2 million – enough to fill 884 boxes and fifty-five casks. At the same time, Nathan offered to take care of a fresh round of subsidies to Britain's continental allies, bringing the total of his transactions with Herries in 1815 to just under £9.8 million. With commissions on all this business ranging from 2 to 6 per cent, Napoleon's return promised to make the Rothschilds rich men. Yet there was a risk that Nathan had underestimated. In furiously buying up such a huge quantity of gold, he had assumed that, as with all Napoleon's wars, this would be a long one. It was a near fatal miscalculation.

"Wellington famously called the Battle of Waterloo 'the nearest run thing you ever saw in your life'. After a day of brutal charges, countercharges and heroic defense, the belated arrival of the Prussian army finally proved decisive. For Wellington, it was a glorious victory. Not so for the Rothschilds. No doubt it was gratifying for Nathan Rothschild to receive the news of Napoleon's defeat first, thanks to the speed of his couriers, nearly forty-eight hours before Major Henry Percy delivered Wellington's official dispatch to the Cabinet. No matter how early it reached him, however, the news was anything but good from Nathan's point of view. He had expected nothing as decisive so soon. Now he and his brothers were sitting on top of a pile of cash that nobody needed – to pay for a war that was over. With the coming of peace, the great armies that had fought Napoleon could be disbanded, the coalition of allies dissolved. That meant no more soldiers' wages and no more subsidies to Britain's wartime allies. The price of gold, which had soared during the war, would be bound to fall. Nathan was faced not with the immense profits of legend but with heavy and growing losses.

"But there was one possible way out: the Rothschilds could use their gold to make a massive and hugely risky bet on the bond market. On 20 July 1815 the

evening edition of the London *Courier* reported that Nathan had made 'great purchases of stock', meaning British government bonds. Nathan's gamble was that the British victory at Waterloo, and the prospect of a reduction in government borrowing, would send the price of British bonds soaring upwards. Nathan bought more and, as the price of consols duly began to rise, he kept on buying. Despite his brothers' desperate entreaties to realize profits, Nathan held his nerve for another year. Eventually, in late 1817, with bond prices up more than 40 per cent, he sold. Allowing for the effects on the purchasing power of sterling of inflation and economic growth, his profits were worth around £600 million today. It was one of the most audacious trades in financial history, one which snatched financial victory from the jaws of Napoleon's military defeat. The resemblance between victor and vanquished was not lost on contemporaries. In the words of one of the partners at Barings, the Rothschilds' great rivals, 'I must candidly confess that I have not the nerve for his operations. They are generally well planned, with great cleverness and adroitness in execution – but he is in money and funds what Bonaparte was in war.' To the Austrian Chancellor Prince Metternich's secretary, the Rothschilds were simply *die Finanzbonaparten*. Others went still further, though not without a hint of irony. 'Money is the god of our time,' declared the German [Jewish] poet Heinrich Heine in March 1841, 'and Rothschild is his prophet.'

"To an extent that even today remains astonishing, the Rothschilds went on to dominate international finance in the half century after Waterloo. So extraordinary did this achievement seem to contemporaries that they often sought to explain it in mystical terms...

"The more prosaic reality was that the Rothschilds were able to build on their successes during the final phase of the Napoleonic Wars to establish themselves as the dominant players in an increasingly international London bond market. They did this by establishing a capital base and an information network that were soon far superior to those of their nearest rivals, the Barings. Between 1815 and 1859, it has been estimated that the London house issued fourteen different sovereign bonds with a face value of nearly £43 million, more than half the total issued by all banks in London. Although British government bonds were the principal security they marketed to investors, they also sold French, Prussian, Russian, Austrian, Neapolitan and Brazilian bonds. In addition, they all but monopolized bond issuance by the Belgian government after 1830. Typically, the Rothschilds would buy a tranche of new bonds outright from a government, charging a commission for distributing these to their network of brokers and investors throughout Europe, and remitting funds to the government only when all the instalments had been received from buyers. There would usually be a generous spread between the price the Rothschilds paid the sovereign borrower and the price they asked of investors (with room for an additional price 'run up' after the initial public offering). Of course, as we have seen, there had been large-scale international lending before, notably in Genoa, Antwepr and Amsterdam. But a distinguishing feature of the London bond market after 1815 was the Rothschilds' insistence that most new borrowers issue bonds denominated in sterling, rather than their own currency, and make interest payments in London or one of the other markets where the Rothschilds had branches. A new standard was set by their 1818 initial public offering of Prussian 5 per cent bonds, which – after protracted and often fraught

negotiations – were issued not only in London, but also in Frankfurt, Berlin, Hamburg and Amsterdam. In his book *On the Traffic in State Bonds* (1825), the German legal expert Johann Heinrich Bender singled out this as one of the Rothschilds' most important financial innovations: 'Any owner of government bonds... can collect the interest at his convenience in several different places without any effort.' Bond issuance was by no means the only business the Rothschilds did, to be sure: they were also bond traders, currency arbitrageurs, bullion dealers and private bankers, as well as investors in insurance, mines and railways. Yet the bond market remained their core competence. Unlike their lesser competitors, the Rothschilds took pride in dealing only in what would now be called investment grade securities. No bond they issued in the 1820s was to default by 1829, despite a Latin American debt crisis in the middle of the decade (the first of many).

"With success came ever greater wealth. When Nathan died in 1836, his personal fortune was equivalent to 0.62 per cent of British national income. Between 1818 and 1852, the combined capital of the five Rothschild 'houses' (Frankfurt, London, Naples, Paris and Vienna) rose from £1.8 million to £9.8 million. As early as 1825 their combined capital was nine times greater than that of Baring Brothers and the Banque de France. By 1899, at £41 million, it exceeded the capital of the five biggest German joint-stock banks put together. Increasingly, the firm became a multinational asset manager for the wealth of the managers' extended family. As their numbers grew from generation to generation, familial unity was maintained by a combination of periodically revised contracts between the five houses and a high level of intermarriage between cousins or between uncles and nieces. Of twenty-one marriages involving descendants of Nathan's father Mayer Amschel Rothschild that were solemnized between 1824 and 1877, no fewer than fifteen were between his direct descendants. In addition, the family's collective fidelity to the Jewish faith, at a time when some other Jewish families were slipping into apostasy or mixed marriage, strengthened their sense of common identity and purpose as 'the Caucasian [Jewish] royal family'."²⁶²

²⁶² Ferguson, *The Ascent of Money*, New York: Penguin Press, 2008, pp. 78-88.

30. VARIETIES OF JEWISHNESS: DISRAELI, HEINE AND MARX

The nineteenth-century was the age of nationalism par excellence. However, among the many kinds of nationalism that grew up in this period, Jewish nationalism was a particularly complex variety that did not fit easily into the category of the nationalisms either of the great, "historic" nations (Nationen) or of the lesser, newer nationalities (Nationalitätchen) that grew up in reaction to the former.²⁶³ It was anomalous because, on the one hand, it was very old, much older than European nationalism, and on the other, because most Western Jews until the later nineteenth century were vigorously trying to deny its existence, and were trying instead to assimilate themselves to Gentile culture. It was anomalous also because it is so linked with the religion of the Jews that for many the idea of a Jewish secular nationalism distinct from, and not based upon, the Jewish faith was both inconceivable and anathema.

Sir Isaiah Berlin writes: "Perpetual discussions went on, during the nineteenth century - the most historically conscious of all ages - about whether the Jews were a race, or solely a religion; a people, a community, or merely an economic category. Books, pamphlets, debates increased in volume if not in quality. But there was one persistent fact about this problem, which was in some respects more clearly perceived by the Gentiles than by the Jews themselves: namely, that if they were only a religion, this would not have needed quite so much argument and insistence; while if they were nothing but a race, this would not have been denied quite so vehemently as it has been by persons who nevertheless professed to denote a unique group of human beings by the term 'Jew'.

"It gradually became clear, both to Jews and to those who took an interest in their affairs, that in fact they constituted an anomaly, which could not be defined in terms of the ordinary definition of nations, as applied at any rate to European nations; and that any attempt to classify them in such terms would lead to unnatural, artificial and Procrustean consequences. Despite passionate denials of this proposition from many sides, it became increasingly clear to almost everyone who approached the problem from outside that the Jews were a unique combination of religion, race and people; that they could not be classified in normal terms, but demanded an extraordinary description, and their problem an extraordinary solution."²⁶⁴

At least three major currents of thought can be discerned in Jewish thought about themselves at this time: old-style nationalism of the kind fostered by the Talmud and the rabbis; *anti-nationalism* or *assimilationism*, that is, union with the prevailing liberal-secular culture of the West, and *violent rejection* of that same culture on the basis of the creed of *the internationalist proletarian revolution*. Other factors making for the great complexity of Jewish nationalism were: the lack of a territorial base or homeland and the very different conditions of Jews in different parts of Europe.

Since 1789 and the declaration of the rights of men, Jewish assimilation into European life, which was achieved either through Christian baptism (the favoured

²⁶³ David Vital, *A People Apart: The Jews in Europe, 1789-1939*, Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 253.

²⁶⁴ Berlin, "The Origins of Israel", *The Power of Ideas*, London: Chatto & Windus, 2000, pp. 143-144.

route), or through the sanitised, almost Protestant religion known as Reform Judaism, had progressed rapidly, if unevenly, through Europe. It was furthest advanced in Britain, where we see it triumphant in the careers of such men as the banker Lionel Rothschild, the philanthropist Sir Moses Montefiore and the politician Benjamin Disraeli. And yet the striking fact especially about these men is their continued attraction to Israel: Montefiore financed Jewish colonies in Palestine, and Disraeli wrote novels, particularly *Tancred*, about the return to Zion.

In his early novels, such as *Coningsby* and *Sybil*, Disraeli showed himself to be a passionate monarchist, a defender of the old aristocratic order based on the land and an enemy of the contemporary worship of Mammon that produced such a lamentable contrast between the “two nations” of England, the rich and the poor. “Toryism,” he predicted, “will yet rise... to bring back strength to the Crown, liberty to the subject, and to announce that power has only one duty: to secure the social welfare of the PEOPLE.”²⁶⁵

Such a creed, combined with his Anglicanism, might lead us to believe that Disraeli was trying, like so many assimilated Jews, to distance himself as far as possible from his Jewish roots and make himself out to be a High Tory Englishman. But this was only half true; as Constance de Rothschild wrote, “he believed more in the compelling power of a common ancestry than in that of a common faith. He said to me, as he has said over and over again in his novels, ‘All is race, not religion – remember that.’”²⁶⁶

Nor did he hide his views. In 1847 he made them public, first in the third novel of his trilogy, *Tancred*, published in March, and then in his famous speech pleading Jewish emancipation in the Commons in December.

“*Tancred*,” writes Sarah Bradford, “which Disraeli began in 1845, the year in which Peel’s Jewish Disabilities Bill had opened every municipal office to the Jews (membership of Parliament still remaining closed to them), was Disraeli’s favourite among his novels. It had originally been conceived as part of the Young England plan, an examination of the state of the English Church as an instrument of moral regeneration, but evolved into an exposition of the debt of gratitude which European civilization, and the English Church in particular, owed to the Jews as the founders of their religious faith. It was the expression of all his most deeply-felt convictions, combining his feeling for Palestine and the East and his theory of the superiority of the Jewish race with the revolt of the romantic against progress and scientific materialism...”

“... Disraeli’s hero, Tancred de Montacute, is young, rich and noble, heir to the Duke of Bellamont. Serious and deeply religious, Tancred, disappointed by the failure of the ‘mitred nullities’ of the Anglican Church to satisfy his spiritual needs, conceives the idea of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in search of redemption. He is encouraged in this project by Sidonia, a thinly disguised London Rothschild, whose City office, Sequin Court, and select dinner parties are minutely described. Sidonia talks to Rothschild of ‘the spiritual hold which Asia has always had upon the North’,

²⁶⁵ Disraeli, *Sybil*; in Sarah Bradford, *Disraeli*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1982, p. 136.

²⁶⁶ Rothschild, in Bradford, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

recommending him to contact, Lara, prior of the Convent of Terra Santa in Jerusalem, who is a descendant of an aristocratic Spanish Sephardic family and a Nuevo Cristiano, or converted Jew. He compares Lara's knowledge of the Old (Jewish) faith with the New (Christian) learning of the English Church in a manner extremely derogatory to the Anglican bishops, while introducing the main theme of the book: 'You see, he is master of the old as well as the new learning; this is very important; they often explain each other. Your bishops here know nothing about these things. How can they? A few centuries back they were tattooed savages.'

"This was hardly a tactful way of putting his argument to his English readers; but when Disraeli gets Tancred to the East, his statements become even odder and, to his Victorian Gentile audience, more offensive. Tancred visits Jerusalem and establishes himself in Syria... He meets and falls in love with a beautiful Jewess named Eva, whom Disraeli uses as a mouthpiece for his main message. 'Half Christendom worships a Jewess,' Eva tells Tancred, 'and the other half a Jew. Now let me ask you. Which do you think should be the superior race, the worshipped or the worshippers?' Disraeli goes even further, for not only do Christians owe a debt of gratitude to the Jews as the forerunners of their religion, but if the Jews had not crucified Christ there would be no Christianity. He aims his argument at a specifically British audience: 'Vast as is the obligation of the whole human family to the Hebrew race, there is no portion of the modern population indebted to them as the British people.'

"As the book progresses Disraeli's arguments become even more mystical and confusing. He introduces an odd supernatural figure, the Angel of Arabia, who accords Tancred a visionary interview on Mount Sinai. The Angel, in Disraelian fashion, blames the sickness of human society on the atheistic influence of the French Revolution...

"...The Angel, Tancred and the author are anti-Progress. In a famous passage that was to rouse *The Times* to fury, Disraeli declares: 'And yet some flat-nosed Frank, full of bustle and puffed up with self-conceit (a race spawned perhaps in the morasses of some Northern forest hardly yet cleared) talks of Progress! Progress to what, and from where? Amid empires shrivelled into deserts, amid the wrecks of great cities, a single column or obelisk of which nations import for the prime adornment of their mud-built capitals, amid arts forgotten, commerce annihilated, fragmentary literatures, and by populations destroyed, the European talks of progress, because by an ingenious application of some scientific acquirements, he has established a society which has mistaken comfort for civilisation.' Tancred's cure for the 'fever of progress' is to 'work out a great religious truth on the Persian and Mesopotamian plains', and by revivifying Asia to regenerate Europe.

"Disraeli, carried away by the onrush of his feelings and wild ideas, simply backs away when faced with the necessity of producing some solution to Tancred's vague plans for revivifying Europe... [He] had conceived the love between Eva and Tancred as a symbol of his most important message, the synthesis between Judaism and Christianity; but in the end he finds even this impossible to carry through...

“... *The Times*... reproved Disraeli for writing a novel with a message: ‘It is a bastard kind of writing – that of fiction “with a purpose”, ... the “unsubstantial” aim of “converting the whole world back to Judaism”.’ The reviewer ridiculed this notion by pointing out the anxiety of contemporary Jewry to approximate itself ever more nearly to Gentile society, with particular reference to the Rothschilds: ‘Whilst Mr. Disraeli eloquently discourses of a speedy return to Jerusalem, Sidonia buys a noble estate in Bucks, and Sidonia’s first cousin is high-sheriff of the county. So anxious, indeed, are the Hebrews generally to return to the Holy Land as a distinct race, that they petition Parliament for all the privileges of British citizens... During the last ten years the Western Jew has travelled faster and farther from Jerusalem than he journeyed during ten centuries before.’...

“Disraeli was not deterred by the public reaction to *Tancred*; he was to repeat his arguments in the debate on Jewish Disabilities on 16 December. The background to the bill was the election, in August of that year, of Disraeli’s friend, Baron Lionel de Rothschild, as Liberal candidate for the City of London. As a Jew, Baron Lionel had felt unable to take the oath requiring a member of Parliament to swear ‘on the true faith of a Christian’ and was therefore debarred from taking his seat...

“[Disraeli’s] argument... aimed at removing Christian scruples by pointing out that Judaism and Christianity were practically synonymous, that Judaism was the foundation of Christianity.

“‘The Jews,’ Disraeli began, ‘are persons who acknowledge the same God as the Christian people of this realm. They acknowledge the same divine revelation as yourselves.’ No doubt many of the listening squires did not greatly like the idea of their Anglican faith being equated with that of ‘the Ikys and Abys’, but worse was to come. They should be grateful, Disraeli told them, because ‘They [the Jews] are, humanly speaking, the authors of your religion. They unquestionably those to whom you are indebted for no inconsiderable portion of your known religion, and for the whole of your divine knowledge.’ At this point the first outraged cries of ‘Oh!’ broke out, but Disraeli only warmed to his theme. ‘Every Gentleman here,’ he told the astonished House, ‘does profess the Jewish religion, and believes in Moses and the Prophets’, a statement that provoked a chorus of angry cries.

“‘Where is your Christianity, if you do not believe in their Judaism?’ Disraeli asked them. He went on: ‘On every sacred day, you read to the people the exploits of Jewish heroes, the proofs of Jewish devotion, the brilliant annals of past Jewish magnificence. The Christian Church has covered every kingdom with sacred buildings, and over every altar... we find the tables of the Jewish law. Every Sunday – every Lord’s day – if you wish to express feelings of praise and thanksgiving to the Most High, or if you wish to find expressions of solace in grief, you find both in the words of the Jewish poets.’

“No doubt most of Disraeli’s hearers thought he was going too far, and stirred uncomfortably in their seats. When, however, he prepared to launch into yet another paragraph on the same theme, ‘... every man in the early ages of the Church, by whose power, or zeal, or genius, the Christian faith was propagated,

was a Jews,' the dissidents in the House lost patience and shouted him down. 'Interruption' Hansard notes flatly.

"At this, Disraeli too lost patience. He rounded on his tormentors, telling them in so many words that much of their concern for the safeguarding of Christianity was humbug, and that the real reason for their opposition to admitting the Jews was pure anti-Semitic prejudice: 'If one could suppose that the arguments we have heard... are the only arguments that influence the decision of this question, it would be impossible to conceive what is the reason of the Jews not being admitted to full participation in the rights and duties of a Christian legislature. In exact proportion to your faith ought to be your wish to do this great act of national justice... But you are influenced by the darkest superstitions of the darkest ages that ever existed in this country. It is this feeling that has been kept out of this debate; indeed that has been kept secret in yourselves... and that is unknowingly influencing you.'

"He ended defiantly: 'I, whatever may be the consequences – must speak what I feel. I cannot sit in this House with any misconception of my opinion on the subject. Whatever may be the consequences on the seat I hold... I cannot, for one, give a vote which is not in deference to what I believe to be the true principles of religion. Yes, it is as a Christian that I will not take upon me the awful responsibility of excluding from the Legislature those who are of the religion in the bosom of which my Lord and Saviour was born.'"²⁶⁷

It is difficult to know at whom to be more amazed – the audacity of Disraeli in telling the highest assembly of the most powerful Christian nation on earth that all the greatest Christians were in fact Jews, and that Christianity was merely a variety of Judaism, or the ignorance and naivety of the English (and, later, of the Anglo-Saxons as a whole), who in essence bought the argument, eventually passed the Bill (Lionel de Rothschild became Liberal MP for the City in 1858) and from then on acted as the main protectors of the Jews and Judaism on the stage of world history! This confirms Keble's charge in his Assize Sermon of 1833 that "under the guise of charity and toleration we are come almost to this pass: that no difference, in matters of faith, is to disqualify for our approbation and confidence, whether in public or domestic life."

Disraeli's speech was a sign of the times, a sign not only that the Jews had now truly broken through the barriers of discrimination to reach the highest positions in the western world (Disraeli himself became the British Prime Minister), but also, and more importantly, that having reached the top of the "greasy pole", *they would unfailingly use their position to advance the interests of their race, whether baptised or unbaptised*. In other words, if we were to judge from the behaviour of the Rothschilds and Montefiores and Disraelis, at any rate, *the Jews would never be fully assimilated*. For, as Disraeli said: "All is race, not religion – remember that..."

*

²⁶⁷ Bradford, *op. cit.*, pp. 179-184.

And yet there were many assimilated Jews who went to the other extreme: far from emphasising their Jewishness, and using their position in society to help their fellow Jews, they did everything in their power to deny the very principle of nationality. The French revolution had been the watershed. Before it, Jewish revolutionary activity had been religious in character – and therefore nationalist as well, insofar as Talmudism was inseparable from Jewish self-consciousness. During the revolution, Jewish activity had been neither religious nor specifically anti-religious in character, but nationalism under the guise of internationalism, Jewish emancipation under the guise of obtaining equal rights for all men and all nations. According to Norah Webster, “religious feeling appears to have played an entirely subordinate part” among the Jews in the French Revolution. “The Jews... were free before the Revolution to carry on the rites of their faith. And when the great anti-religious campaign began, many of them entered whole-heartedly into the attack on all religious faiths, their own included...”²⁶⁸

After the revolution the Jews poured into the secret societies – a fact well-known and admitted by Disraeli.²⁶⁹ But nationalism no longer seems to have been their motive. For the Jews were now, as we have seen, thoroughly emancipated in some western countries, such as Britain and France, and on the way there in many more. Their financial power, symbolised by the Rothschilds, was enormous. And except to some extent in Germany, there were no real barriers to their political advancement, either. But the Jews who poured into the socialist revolutionary movements were not interested in the conventional route to power that men like Disraeli and Crémieux had traversed; they were neither religious Judaists nor interested in bettering the fate of their fellow Jews. Rather, they tended to identify Jewry and Jewishness with the most hated aspects of the capitalist system.

An analyst of this phenomenon was the German Jewish poet Heinrich Heine. Heine, as Paul Johnson writes, “hated being a Jew. He wrote of ‘the three evil maladies, poverty, pain and Jewishness’. In 1822 he was briefly associated with the Society for Jewish Science, but he had nothing to contribute. He did not believe in Judaism as such and saw it as an anti-human force. He wrote the next year: ‘That I will be enthusiastic for the rights of the Jews and their civil equality, that I admit, and in bad times, which are inevitable, the Germanic mob will hear my voice so that it resounds in German beerhalls and palaces. But the born enemy of all positive religion will never champion the religion which first developed the fault-finding

²⁶⁸ Webster, *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, The National Book Club of America, 1924, pp. 249, 250, 251.

²⁶⁹ This fact was well-known to Disraeli from “the exceptional intelligence service linking the London house of Rothschild with the branches in Paris, Frankfurt, Vienna and Naples” (Bradford, *op. cit.*, p. 187). In a speech in the House of Commons in 1852 he spoke of the secret societies aiming to destroy tradition, religion and property. And he said that at the head of all of them stood people of the Jewish race... However, he chose not to mention it when, on July 14, 1856, he said in the House of Commons: “There is in Italy a power which we seldom mention in this House... I mean the secret societies... It is useless to deny, because it is impossible to conceal, that a great part of Europe – the whole of Italy and France and a great portion of Germany, to say nothing of other countries – is covered with a network of these secret societies, just as the superficies of the earth is now being covered with railroads. And what are their objects? They do not attempt to conceal them. They do not want constitutional government; they do not want ameliorated institutions... they want to change the tenure of land, to drive out the present owners of the soil and to put an end to ecclesiastical establishments... Some of them may go further...”

with human beings which now causes us so much pain.’ But if he rejected Talmudic Judaism, he despised the new Reform version. The Reformers were ‘chiropractors’ who had ‘tried to cure the body of Judaism from its nasty skin growth by bleeding, and by their clumsiness and spidery bandages of rationalism, Israel must bleed to death... we no longer have the strength to wear a beard, to fast, to hate and to endure out of hate; that is the motive of our Reform.’ The whole exercise, he said scornfully, was to turn ‘a little Protestant Christianity into a Jewish company. They make a tallis out of the wool of the Lamb of God, and a vest out of the feathers of the Holy Ghost, and underpants out of Christian love, and they will go bankrupt and their successors will be called: God, Christ & Co.’...

“Heine suffered from a destructive emotion which was soon to be commonplace among emancipated and apostate Jews: a peculiar form of self-hatred. He attacked himself in [his attacks on the baptised Jew] Gans. Later in life he used to say he regretted his baptism. It had, he said, done him no good materially. But he refused to allow himself to be presented publicly as a Jew. In 1835, lying, he said he had never set foot in a synagogue. It was his desire to repudiate his Jewishness, as well as his Jewish self-hatred, which prompted his many anti-Semitic remarks. A particular target was the Rothschild family. He blamed them for raising loans for the reactionary great powers. That, at any rate, was his respectable reason for attacking them. But his most venomous remarks were reserved for Baron James de Rothschild and his wife, who showed him great kindness in Paris. He said he had seen a stockbroker bowing to the Baron’s chamber-pot. He called him ‘Herr von Shylock in Paris’. He said, ‘There is only one God – Mammon. And Rothschild is his prophet.’... Heine was both the prototype and the archetype of a new figure in European literature: the Jewish radical man of letters, using his skill, reputation and popularity to undermine the intellectual self-confidence of established order.”²⁷⁰

But while trying to repudiate his Jewishness, Heine remained loyal to his race. Thus “I would fall into despair,” he wrote to a friend in 1823, “if you approved of my baptism”. Again, in one work he described three symbolic beauties: Diana – ancient classical art, Abondona – romantic art, and Herodias – a Jewess, and declared himself to prefer “the dead Jewess”. Indeed, according to the Jewish historian Graetz, Heine only superficially renounced Jewry, “and was like those warriors who remove the arms and banner from the enemy, so as to use them to beat and annihilate him more thoroughly!”²⁷¹ To prove the point, some four or five years before his death (from syphilis), Heine returned to the Judaist faith...

Again, if Heine was a radical, he saw more clearly than almost any conservative – and this clarity of sight was another characteristic of his Jewishness, given to him by his outsider status – the horrors to which radicalism would lead. As Golo Mann writes, “he foresaw the inevitable annihilation of the rich and their state by the poor, the ‘dangerous classes’ as they were called in France at the time. His prescience did not make him happy, yet he despised the existing social order; his attitude was that of one who was above or outside it. It was as though Heine was bewitched by Communism. In his articles he constantly talked about it at a time when only a very

²⁷⁰ Johnson, *A History of the Jews*, London: Phoenix, 1995, pp. 342, 343, 345.

²⁷¹ Alexander Andreyevich Chernov, *Bol'shoe Pochemu ili Strategicheskij Plan v Dejstvii* (The Great ‘Why’, or The Strategic Plan in Action), Kiev, 1974, pp. 100, 101 (MS).

few people concerned themselves with it. He spoke of it more with dread than hope, as of an elemental movement of the age, immune to politics.

“Communism is the secret name of the terrible antagonist who confronts the present-day bourgeois regime with proletarian domination and all its consequences. There will be a terrible duel... Though Communism is at present little talked about, vegetating in forgotten attics on wretched straw pallets, it is nevertheless the dismal hero destined to play a great, if transitory part in the modern tragedy...’ (20 June 1842).

“Three weeks later he prophesied that a European war would develop into a social world revolution from which would emerge an iron Communist dictatorship, ‘the old absolutist tradition... but in different clothes and with new catchphrases and slogans... Maybe there will then only be *one* shepherd and *one* flock, a free shepherd with an iron crook and an identically shorn, identically bleating human herd. Confused, sombre times loom ahead, and the prophet who might want to write a new apocalypse would need to invent entirely new beasts, and such frightening ones that St. John’s animal symbols would appear like gentle doves and amoretti by comparison... I advise our grandchildren to be born with very thick skins.’

“Then again he saw Communism not as a system under which men would enjoy the material benefits of life but as one under which they would slave at their jobs with dreary monotony; once he even predicted [with Dostoyevsky] the marriage of the Catholic Church with the Communists and foresaw an empire of asceticism, joylessness and strict control of ideas as the child of this union. Heine made himself few friends by such prophecies. The conservatives, the good German citizens, regarded him as a rebel and a frivolous wit. The Left saw in him a faithless ally, a socialist who was afraid of the revolution, who took back today what he had said yesterday and who behaved like an aristocrat. It is true that Heine, the artist, was both an aristocrat and a rebel. He hated the rule of the old military and noble caste, particularly in Prussia, despised the role of the financiers, particularly in France, and yet feared a levelling reign of terror by the people....

“Heine could not identify himself with any of the great causes that excited his compatriots at home or in exile [in Paris]; the servant of beauty and the intellect cannot do this. He could only see things with gay, sarcastic or melancholy eyes, without committing himself. Yet just because he was detached, sometimes to the point of treachery, his work has remained more alive than that of his more resolute contemporaries.

“Those who had no doubts, who were reliable, were equally irritated by Heine’s attitude towards Germany. At times he loved it and could not do otherwise. He had been born there and spoke its language; he was only a young man when he wrote the poems which have become part of Germany’s national heritage. Sick and lonely in exile, he longed for home. Yet at other times he mocked his compatriots in a manner which they could not forgive for their philistinism, their provincialism, their weakness for titles, their bureaucrats, soldiers and thirty-six monarchs. In an extremely witty poem he says that if there were ever to be a German revolution the

Germans would not treat their kings as roughly as the British and French had treated theirs...

"No sooner had Heine written verses of this kind and mocked at the Germans for their lamb-like patience than he warned the French that the German revolution of the future would far exceed theirs in terror.

"A drama will be enacted in Germany compared with which the French Revolution will seem like a harmless idyll. Christianity may have restrained the martial ardour of the Teutons for a time, but it did not destroy it; now that the old restraining talisman, the cross, has rotted away, the old frenzied madness will break out again.'

"The French must not believe that it would be a pro-French revolution, though it might pretend to be republican and extreme. German nationalism, unlike that of the French, was not receptive to outside influences filled with missionary zeal; it was negative and aggressive, particularly towards France. 'I wish you well and therefore I tell you the bitter truth. You have more to fear from liberated Germany than from the entire Holy Alliance with all its Croats and Cossacks put together...' Heine toyed with things cleverly and irresponsibly. At the time it was thought in France, in Italy and in Germany too that nationalism was international, closely related to the republican and the democratic cause; that nations, once they were free and united at home, would join forces in one great league of nations. Heine did not share this view. He regarded nationalism, particularly German nationalism, as a stupid, disruptive force motivated by hatred..."²⁷²

*

Karl Marx, a friend of Heine's, was a still more developed and important example of the same phenomenon: the God-hating, Jew-hating Jew. According to Johnson, "Heine's jibe about religion as a 'spiritual opium' was the source of Marx's phrase 'the opium of the people'. But the notion that Heine was the John the Baptist to Marx's Christ, fashionable in German scholarship of the 1960s, is absurd. A huge temperamental gulf yawned between them. According to Arnold Ruge, Marx would say to Heine: 'Give up those everlasting laments about love and show the lyric poets how it should be done - with the lash.' But it was precisely the lash Heine feared: 'The [socialist] future,' he wrote, 'smells of knouts, of blood, of godlessness and very many beatings'; 'it is only with dread and horror that I think of the time when those dark iconoclasts will come to power'. He repudiated 'my obdurate friend Marx', one of the 'godless self-gods'.

"What the two men had most in common was their extraordinary capacity for hatred, expressed in venomous attacks not just on enemies but (perhaps especially)

²⁷² Mann, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-82. Talmon writes that Heine "was vouchsafed an uncanny prophetic insight into the terrifying potentialities of German Romantic pantheism, with its vision of man as a being swallowed up or impelled by cosmic forces, the all-embracing Will of History, and the destiny of the Race. These were the favourite images of the various architects of catastrophe, who never tired of pouring scorn on the bloodless, cogitating, analysing and vacillating creature cut off from the vital forces of being." (*op. cit.*, p. 162)

on friends and benefactors. This was part of the self-hatred they shared as apostate Jews. Marx had it to an even greater extent than Heine. He tried to shut Judaism out of his life... Despite Marx's ignorance of Judaism as such, there can be no doubt about his Jewishness. Like Heine and everyone else, his notion of progress was profoundly influenced by Hegel, but his sense of history as a positive and dynamic force in human society, governed by iron laws, an atheist's Torah, is profoundly Jewish. His Communist millennium is deeply rooted in Jewish apocalyptic and messianism. His notion of rule was that of the cathedocrat. Control of the revolution would be in the hands of the elite intelligentsia, who had studied the texts, understood the laws of history. They would form what he called the 'management', the directorate. The proletariat, 'the men without substance', were merely the means, whose duty was to obey - like Ezra the Scribe, he saw them as ignorant of the law, the mere 'people of the land'²⁷³.

Johnson ignores the anti-Christian essence of Talmudic Judaism. Nevertheless he is perceptive in his analysis of Marx's Communism "as the end-product of his theoretical anti-Semitism... In 1843 Bruno Bauer, the anti-Semite leader of the Hegelian left, published an essay demanding that the Jews abandon Judaism completely and transform their plea for equal rights into a general campaign for human liberation both from religion and from state tyranny.

"Marx replied to Bauer's work in two essays published in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbucher* in 1844, the same year Disraeli published *Tancred*. They are called 'On the Jewish Question'. Marx accepted completely the savagely anti-Semitic context of Bauer's argument, which he said was written 'with boldness, perception, with and thoroughness in language that is precise as it is vigorous and meaningful'. He quoted with approval Bauer's maliciously exaggerated assertion that 'the Jew determines the fate of the whole [Austrian] empire by his money power... [and] decides the destiny of Europe'. Where he differed was in rejecting Bauer's belief that the anti-social nature of the Jew was religious in origin and could be remedied by tearing the Jew away from his religion. In Marx's view, the evil was social and economic. 'Let us,' he wrote, 'consider the real Jew. Not the *Sabbath Jew*... but the *everyday Jew*.' What, he asked, was 'the profane basis of Judaism? *Practical need, self-interest*. What is the worldly cult of the Jew? *Huckstering*. What is his worldly god? *Money*.' The Jews had gradually conveyed this 'practical' religion to all society: 'Money is the jealous God of Israel, besides which no other god may exist. Money abases all the gods of mankind and changes them into commodities. Money is the self-sufficient *value* of all things. It has, therefore, deprived the whole world, both the human world and nature, of their own proper value. Money is the alienated essence of man's work and existence: this essence dominates him and he worships it. The god of the Jews has been secularised and has become the god of this world.'

"The Jews, Marx continued, were turning Christians into replicas of themselves, so that the once staunchly Christian New Englanders, for example, were now the slaves of Mammon. Using his money-power, the Jew had emancipated himself and had gone on to enslave Christianity. The Jew-corrupted Christian 'is convinced he

²⁷³ Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 347.

has no other destiny here below than to become richer than his neighbours' and 'the world is a stock exchange'. Marx argued that the contradiction between the Jew's theoretical lack of political rights and 'the effective political power of the Jew' is the contradiction between politics and 'the power of money in general'. Political power supposedly overrides money; in fact 'it has become its bondsman'. Hence: 'It is from its own entrails that civil society ceaselessly engenders the Jew.'"²⁷⁴

There was much truth in Marx's analysis; but it was one-sided. Contemporary European and American civilisation was based on a complex intertwining of apostate Jewry and heretical Christianity. If the Jews had taught the Christians the worship of money, and gone on to enslave them thereby, the Christians had nevertheless prepared the way for this by betraying their own Christian ideals and introducing to the Jews the semi-Christian, semi-pagan ideas of liberty, equality and fraternity, human rights, etc. The Jews had seized on these ideas to emancipate themselves and then take them to their logical extreme in the proletarian revolution, taking control both of money power in the heights, and of political power in the depths of society. And so the relationship between the Jews and the Christians was mutually influential and mutually destructive.

The only question that remained was Lenin's: kto kogo?, who would control whom? The answer to this was: the Jews would control the Christians. Why? Because the Christians, though fallen away from the true faith, nevertheless retained vestiges of Christian values and morality that restrained them from ultimate evil; they lacked that extra insight and ruthlessness that was given to the Jews for their greater ambition, greater hatred, greater proximity to Satan... And so heretical Christians might cooperate with apostate Jews in the overthrow of Christian civilization, as Engels cooperated with Marx. But in the end the heretical Christians would do the will of the apostate Jews, as Engels did the will of Marx.

The only power that could effectively stand against both – and was therefore hated by both – was the power of the true faith, the Orthodox faith, upheld by the

²⁷⁴ Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 350-351. Cf. Oleg Platonov's development of this argument: "Under the influence of Jewish economics the personal worth of a man was turned into an exchange value, into merchandise. Instead of the spiritual freedom given to the people of the New Testament, Jewish-Masonic civilisation brought 'the shameless freedom of trade'. As the Jewish philosopher Moses Hesse wrote, 'money is the alienated wealth of a man, attained by him in commercial activity. Money is the quantitative expression of the worth of a man, the brand of our enslavement, the seal of our shame, of our grovelling. Money is the coagulated blood and sweat of those who at market prices trade their inalienable property, their wealth, their vital activity, for the sake of accumulating that which is called capital. And all this is reminiscent of the insatiability of the cannibal.'

"'Money is the god of our time, while Rothschild is its prophet!' replied the Jewish poet Heinrich Heine to Hesse. The whole family of the Rothschilds, which had enmeshed in its octopus grip of debt obligations the political and industrial structures of Europe, seemed to the poet to be 'true revolutionaries'. And he called Baron M. Rothschild 'the Nero of financiers', remembering that the Roman Nero 'annihilated' the privileges of the patricians for the sake of creating 'a new democracy'.

"In creating economics on the antichristian foundations of the Talmud, Jewry not only acquired for itself financial power. Through Jewry money became a world power, by means of its control over the Christian peoples. The gold-digging spirit of Jewish economics, crossing the frontiers of Jewry, began to corrupt the Christians themselves; and in the precise expression of K. Marx, 'with the help of money the Jews liberated themselves to the same extent as the Christians became Jews.'" (*Ternovij Venets Rossii* (Russia's Crown of Thorns), Moscow, 1998, p. 147).

Russian Orthodox Empire. It was logical, therefore, for Marx and Engels to see in Russia the main obstacle to the success of the revolution...

Johnson continues: "Marx's solution, therefore, is not like Bauer's, religious, but economic. The money-Jew had become the 'universal *anti-social* element of the present time'. To 'make the Jew impossible' it was necessary to abolish the 'preconditions' and the 'very possibility' of the kind of money activities for which he was notorious. Once the economic framework was changed, Jewish 'religious consciousness would evaporate like some insipid vapour in the real, life-giving air of society'. Abolish the Jewish attitude to money, and both the Jew and his religion, and the corrupt version of Christianity he had imposed on the world, would simply disappear: 'In the final analysis, the *emancipation* of the Jews is the emancipation of mankind from Judaism.' Or again: 'In emancipating itself from *bucksterism* and *money*, and thus from real and practical Judaism, our age would emancipate itself.'

"Marx's two essays on the Jews thus contain, in embryonic form, the essence of his theory of human regeneration: by economic changes, and especially by abolishing private property and the personal pursuit of money, you could transform not merely the relationship between the Jew and society but all human relationships and the human personality itself. His form of anti-Semitism became a dress-rehearsal for Marxism as such. Later in the century August Bebel, the German Social Democrat, would coin the phrase, much used by Lenin: 'Anti-Semitism is the socialism of fools.' Behind this revealing epigram was the crude argument: we all know that Jewish money-men, who never soil their hands with toil, exploit the poor workers and peasants. But only a fool grasps the Jews alone. The mature man, the socialist, has grasped the point that the Jews are only symptoms of the disease, not the disease itself. The disease is the religion of money, and its modern form is capitalism. Workers and peasants are exploited not just by the Jews but by the entire bourgeois-capitalist class – and it is the class as a whole, not just its Jewish element, which must be destroyed.

"Hence the militant socialism Marx adopted in the later 1840s was an extended and transmuted form of his earlier anti-Semitism. His mature theory was a superstition, and the most dangerous kind of superstition, belief in a conspiracy of evil. But whereas originally it was based on the oldest form of conspiracy-theory, anti-Semitism, in the later 1840s and 1850s this was not so much abandoned as extended to embrace a world conspiracy theory of the entire bourgeois class. Marx retained the original superstition that the making of money through trade and finance is essentially a parasitical and anti-social activity, but he now placed it on a basis not of race and religion, but of class. The enlargement does not, of course, improve the validity of the theory. It merely makes it more dangerous, if put into practice, because it expands its scope and multiplies the number of those to be treated as conspirators and so victims. Marx was no longer concerned with specific Jewish witches to be hunted but with generalized human witches. The theory remained irrational but acquired a more sophisticated appearance, making it highly attractive to educated radicals. To reverse Bebel's saying, if anti-Semitism is the socialism of fools, socialism became the anti-Semitism of intellectuals. An intellectual like Lenin, who clearly perceived the irrationality of the Russian anti-Semitic pogrom, and would have been ashamed to conduct one, nevertheless fully

accepted its spirit once the target was expanded into the whole capitalist class – and went on to conduct pogroms on an infinitely greater scale, killing hundreds of thousands on the basis not of individual guilt but merely of membership of a condemned group.”²⁷⁵

Johnson’s definition of socialism as the anti-Semitism of intellectuals has considerable psychological plausibility; but it needs to be extended and deepened. The original irrational rebellion against civilized society was the rebellion of the Jews, the former people of God, against their Lord, God and Saviour, Jesus Christ. This was the original anti-Semitism, in that it was directed both against the greatest Semite, Jesus Christ, and his Semitic disciples, and against the original, pure religion of the Semites, which Jesus Christ came to fulfil in the Church founded on Himself, “in whom there is neither Jew nor Greek”.

As Christianity spread among the Gentiles, this original anti-Semitism, full of hatred and “on the basis not of individual guilt but merely of a condemned group”, was transmuted into the anti-Gentilism of the Talmud, being directed against the whole of Gentile Christian society. As Christian society degenerated into heresy, the Jewish virus of anti-Christian hatred infected the Christians themselves, becoming standard anti-Semitism. The sign that this anti-Semitism was simply the reversal of the same Jewish disease of anti-Gentilism is the fact that its object ceased to be the Talmudic religion, the real source of the disease, but the Jews *as a race* and *as a whole*.

However, with the gradual assimilation of the Jews into Western Christian society during the nineteenth century, Jewish radicals such as Marx joined with Gentile intellectuals such as Engels to create a new strain of the virus, a strain directed not against Jews alone or Christians alone, but against a whole *class*, the class of the bourgeois rich.

In this perspective we can see that Marx’s view that the solution of “the Jewish question” lay in economics was wrong. Bauer was right that its solution was religious; but he was wrong in thinking that simply destroying the Talmud would cure the disease. For what was to be put in its place? The heretical, lukewarm Christianity of the West, which hardly believed in itself any more and was in any case, as we have seen, deeply infected by both Jewish and pagan elements?

As the example of Disraeli proves, that could never satisfy the spiritual quest of the more intelligent Jews. It could only prepare the way for a new, more virulent strain of the virus, which is in fact what we see in Marxism. The only solution was a return to the original, untainted faith of the Apostles... But that was only to be found in the East, and especially in Russia – where, however, the true faith of the Apostles lived in conjunction with both Jewish anti-Gentilism and Gentile anti-Semitism, and where the most virulent form of the virus, Marxism, would find its most fertile breeding-ground...

²⁷⁵ Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 352-353.

31. VARIETIES OF JEWISHNESS: MOSES HESS

The specifically religious, Talmudic form of Jewish nationalism was under threat in this age of nationalism as never before from several directions: from the secular, humanist ideals of the French revolution, from the rising tide of German anti-semitism, and from Reform Judaism. But to the defence of Talmudism there arose the German Jew Moses Hess, a friend and collaborator of Marx and Engels. He charted a path for the survival of Talmudism that was prophetic on many accounts; for it looked forward both to the Bolshevik revolution, and to the Holocaust, and to the foundation of the Zionist State of Israel.

“Hess’s task,” writes Michael Hoffman, “was to see that the Judaics did not succumb to the new winds of reform and religious indifferentism with which Catholics and Protestants under the spell of *Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité*, had fallen. This had been a perennial problem for Judaism: how to insulate their own nation from the liberal toxins they themselves deliberately sow among the Gentiles.

“Forged in the crucible of the German Rhineland, where he was born to an Orthodox Judaic family, and at a period of time that marked the beginning of the Prussian reaction against the legacy of Napoleon, Hess approached this dilemma through the vehicle of his Zionism, the religious nationalism which embraces the Talmud not necessarily as a code for daily living, but as a totem of racial cohesion and a prophylactic against liberalism. Hess wrote:

“Many who have emancipated themselves from dry orthodoxy have recently manifested in their studies a deepening conception of Judaism, and have thus brought about the banishment of that superficial rationalism which was the cause of a growing indifference to things Jewish and which finally led to a total severance from Judaism.’

“Hess termed as ‘nihilists’ all liberal Judaics who sought to abolish the influence of the Talmud, which he regarded as the ‘fountain of life’. Hess endeavoured to build a Hegelian-Kabbalistic bridge between the Judaic liberals and the rabbinic traditionalists. ‘The new seminaries, modelled after the Breslau school... ought to make it their aim to bridge the gap between the nihilism of the Reformers, who never learn anything, and the staunch conservatism of the Orthodox, who never forget anything.’

“The bridge consisted of Communist leadership for the reform-minded, and what came to be called modern Orthodoxy for the conservatives, with these two seeming opposite tendencies eventually reconciled, far in the future, in the racial patriotism that is Israeli Zionism. As Hess stated, ‘The pious Jew is above all a Jewish patriot. The ‘new’ Jew, who denies the existence of the Jewish nationality, is not only a deserter in the religious sense, but is also a traitor to his people, his race and even to his family.’

“In his early 1837 work, *The Holy History of Mankind*, Hess advocated an occult, Talmudic hierarchy of Adamic man (human beings, i.e. Jews), contrasted with

subhuman creatures, the *Nephilim*. 'This tradition,' observes Hess, 'leads toward a higher and clearer consciousness.'

"In 1841 Hess began to be supported by a wealthy circle of Rhineland capitalists. They appointed him to head a leading Masonic newspaper which they funded, the *Rheinische Zeitung*, in whose offices he made the acquaintance of Karl Marx, whose teacher he became and in whom he discerned messianic qualities. In a letter written before Marx had published anything, Hess predicted of him, '... he will give the final blow to all medieval religion and politics... Can you imagine Rousseau, Voltaire, Holbach, Lessing, Heine and Hegel combined in one person? If you can - you have Dr. Marx.'

"After the Prussians drove Hess into exile in France, he joined with the German-Judaic expatriates there to lay the groundwork for the Communist ideology in such works as *Kommunistisches Bekenntnis in Fragen und Antworten* ('A Communist Credo: Questions and Answers'); *Über das Geldwesen* ('On Money') and *Sozialismus und Kommunismus*. Though attributed to Marx and Friedrich Engels, Hess himself wrote the first draft of *The Communist Manifesto* and sections of *The German Ideology*, which is officially said to have been written by Marx and Engels.

"Hess the Communist sought to extirpate the Gentile's connection to the land by weakening private property rights and in particular, the right to inherit land. In keeping with the conjunction of seeming opposites, in which Communism often is backed by capitalists, Hess believed that the modernizing trends of free trade and commerce would contribute to Communism through the demise of property rights. He also favoured the factory system which he believed would 'guarantee abundance'."²⁷⁶

In 1862, under the influence of the Italian Risorgimento, Hess wrote *Rome and Jerusalem: the Last National Question*, which explores the possibility of the Jews becoming a nation in the way that the Italians were becoming one.²⁷⁷

In his first paragraph he stated his most important conclusion: that the Jews could *never* become fully assimilated into western culture: "After an estrangement of twenty years, I am back with my people. I have come to be one of them again, to participate in the celebration of the holy days, to share the memories and hopes of the nation, to take part in the spiritual and intellectual warfare going on within the House of Israel, on the one hand, and between our people and the surrounding civilized nations, on the other; for though the Jews have lived among the nations for almost two thousand years, they cannot, after all, become a mere part of the organic whole." (First Letter).

Not that Hess was renouncing his assimilated western humanist ideals. On the contrary: "When I labour for the regeneration of my own nation, I do not thereby renounce my humanistic aspiration. The national movement of the present day is

²⁷⁶ Hoffman, "Moses Hess", *Revisionist History*,

²⁷⁷ http://www.zionismontheweb.org/Moses_Hess_Rome_and_Jerusalem.htm. This book was published in 1995 by the University of Nebraska Press.

only another step on the road of progress which began with the French Revolution. The French nation has, since the great Revolution, been calling to the other nations for help. But the nations have turned a deaf ear to the voice from the distance and have lent a not unwilling ear to the tumult of reaction in their own midst. Today, this roar deafens not only the people in certain parts of Germany, those who, by dint of political trickery, are aroused to the pitch of enthusiasm for the kings and war lords. But the other nations hear and follow the call of France. The call has reached also our ancient nation, and I would unite my voice with that of France, that I may at least warn my racial brothers in Germany against listening to the loud noise of the reactionaries." (Third Letter).

Hess considered assimilation into German culture a vain dream: "The endeavours are vain. Even conversion itself [to Christianity] does not relieve the Jews from the enormous pressure of German Anti-Semitism. The German hates the Jewish religion less than the race; he objects less to the Jews' peculiar beliefs than to their peculiar noses." (Fourth Letter)

"The real Teutomaniacs of the Arndt and Jahn type will always be honest, reactionary conservatives. The Teutomaniac, in his love of the Fatherland, loves not the State but race dominance. How, then, can he conceive the granting of equal rights to other races than the dominant one, when equality is still a utopia for the large masses of Germany? The sympathetic Frenchman assimilates with irresistible attraction every foreign race element. Even the Jew is here a Frenchman. Jefferson said long ago, at the time of the American Revolution, that every man has two fatherlands, first his own and then France. The German, on the other hand, is not at all anxious to assimilate any foreign elements, and would be perfectly happy if he could possess all fatherlands and dominions for himself. He lacks the primary condition of every chemical assimilative process, namely, warmth." (Fifth Letter).

As we have seen, Heine had been particularly sensitive to the rise of German nationalism. And indeed, in Germany, after the failure of the 1848 socialist revolution, we find the beginnings of a particularly rabid form of anti-semitism. Thus according to William Marr, "we Germans completed in the year 1848 our abdication in favour of the Jews... Life and the future belong to Judaism, death and the past to Germanism."²⁷⁸

The term "antisemitism" was itself coined in Germany. Thus Daniel Pipes writes: "*Antisemitism*, a term coined in 1879 with the founding in Berlin of the *Antisemitenliga* (Antisemitic League), is a form of anti-Jewish hatred that differs in several ways from what came before: (1) it changes the emphasis from religion to race, (2) it transforms dislike into fear, (3) it turns a bias into an all-encompassing ideology, even way of life, and (4) it replaces the episodic persecution of Jews with a permanent one. Antisemitism moved Jew hatred from the realm of emotions to that of political activism, from defensive to offensive, and from life's sidelines to its

²⁷⁸ Wilhelm Marr, *Der Sieg des Judentums über das Germanentum* (The Victory of Jewry over the German Spirit), 1879, pp. 27, 44; in Cohen and Major, *History in Quotations*, London: Cassell, 2004, p. 630.

core. It also changed the depiction of Jews from heretics into malevolently powerful figures."²⁷⁹

A particularly famous German anti-semite of the period was the composer Richard Wagner, who had fought on the barricades in the 1848 revolution, but later turned into a conservative monarchist anti-semite writing operas in the service of his patron, King Ludwig of Bavaria. His *Ring* cycle preached the all-corrupting power of money – which, of course, was incarnate, in his mind, in the Jews. Wagner, writes Richard Evans, “had made his home in [Bayreuth] until his death in 1883 and his epic music-dramas were played every year in the opera house he had had constructed specially for this purpose. They were designed not least to propagate pseudo-Germanic national myths, in which heroic figures from Nordic legend were to serve as model leaders for the German future. Wagner himself had already been a cultural anti-Semite in the early 1850s, arguing in his notorious book *Judaism in Music* that the ‘Jewish spirit’ was inimical to musical profundity. His remedy was for the complete assimilation of Jews into German culture, and the replacement of Jewish religion, indeed all religion, by secular aesthetic impulses of the sort he poured into his own music-dramas. But towards the end of his life his views took on an increasingly racist tone under the influence of his second wife, Cosima, daughter of the composer Franz Liszt. By the end of the 1870s she was recording in her diaries that Wagner, whose outlook on civilization was distinctly pessimistic by this time, had read Wilhelm Marr’s anti-semitic tract of 1873 and broadly agreed with it. As a consequence of this shift in his position, Wagner no longer desired the assimilation of the Jews into German society, but their expulsion from it. In 1881, discussing Lessing’s classic play *Nathan the Wise* and a disastrous fire in the Vienna Ring Theatre, in which more than four hundred people, many of them Jewish, had died, Cosima noted that her husband said ‘in a vehement quip that all Jews should burn in a performance of “Nathan”’.

“After Wagner’s death, his widow turned Bayreuth into a kind of shrine, at which a band of dedicated followers would cultivate the dead Master’s sacred memory. The views of the circle she gathered round her at Bayreuth were rabidly anti-Semitic. The Wagner circle did its best to interpret the composer’s operas as pitting Nordic heroes against Jewish villains, although his music was of course capable of being interpreted in many other ways as well...”²⁸⁰

"Wagner," writes Paul Johnson, "advocated the Untergang (downfall) of the Jews. 'I regard the Jewish race as the born enemy of pure humanity and everything that is noble in it; it is certain that we Germans will go under before them, and perhaps I am the last German who knows how to stand up as an art-loving man against the Judaism that is already getting control of everything.' He wrote this in *Religion and Art* (1881), published the year the great Russian pogroms were driving a new wave of Ostjuden refugees into central Europe. Wagner was particularly influential in intensifying anti-Semitism, especially among the middle and upper classes, not only because of his personal standing but because he repeatedly advanced the argument - with innumerable examples - that the Jews were progressively 'taking over' the citadel of German culture, especially its music. Even their so-called 'geniuses', he

²⁷⁹ Pipes, *Conspiracy*, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

²⁸⁰ Evans, *The Coming of the Third Reich*, London: Penguin, 2003, pp. 32-33.

insisted - men like Giacomo Meyerbeer, Mendelssohn or Heine himself - were not truly creative, and meanwhile a host of Jewish middlemen were taking over the critical press, publishing, theatres and operas, art galleries and agencies. It was Wagner's writings which provoked the furious outpourings of Eugen Dühring, who throughout the 1880s published a succession of widely read racial attacks on the Jew: the 'Jewish question', he declared, should be 'solved' by 'killing and extirpation'.²⁸¹

But Hess considered that not only the Germans, but all the European nations, with the exception of France (Hess was wrong here, as the Dreyfus case was to show), were antisemitic: "... The European nations have always considered the existence of the Jews in their midst as an anomaly. We shall always remain strangers among the nations. They may tolerate us and even grant us emancipation, but they will never respect us as long as we place the principle ubi bene ibi patria [where it is good, there is our fatherland] above our own great national memories. Though religious fanaticism may cease to operate as a factor in the hatred against the Jews in civilized countries, yet in spite of enlightenment and emancipation, the Jew in exile who denies his nationality will never earn the respect of the nations among whom he dwells. He may become a naturalized citizen, but he will never be able to convince the Gentiles of his total separation from his own nationality. It is not the old-type, pious Jew, who would rather suffer than deny his nationality, that is most despised, but the modern Jew who, like the German outcasts in foreign countries, denies his nationality, while the hand of fate presses heavily upon his own people..." (Fifth Letter).

The Jews are good at assimilating foreign cultures, but they have gone too far: "Just as it is impossible for me to entertain any prejudice against my own race, which has played such an important role in universal history and which is destined for a still greater one in the future, so it is impossible for me to show against the holy language of our fathers the antipathy of those who endeavour to eliminate Hebrew from Jewish life, and even supersede it by German inscriptions in the cemetery. I was always exalted by Hebrew prayers. I seem to hear in them an echo of fervent pleadings and passionate entreaties, issuing from suffering hearts of a thousand generations. Seldom do these heart-stirring prayers fail to impress those who are able to understand their meaning. The most touching point about these Hebrew

²⁸¹ Johnson, *A History of the Jews*, London: Phoenix, 1995, p. 394. According to Solzhenitsyn, German antisemitism began in 1869 with Richard Wagner. Then "in the 70s [it came] from conservative and clerical circles, who demanded that German Jews be restricted in their rights and their further immigration be forbidden. From the end of the 70s this movement 'also took hold of the intellectual circles of society'. It was expressed and brought to its most generalized formulations by the prominent Prussian historian Henrich von Trietschke: 'The present agitation has correctly caught the mood of society, which considers the Jews to be our national misfortune', 'the Jews can never be fused with the West European peoples' and express their hatred for Germanism. After him came Eugen Dühring (who is so well known for his quarrel with Marx and Engels): 'The Jewish question is simple a racial question, and the Jews are not only foreign to us, they are innately and unalterably a corrupt race'. Then came the philosopher Eduard Hartmann. - In the political sphere this movement led in 1882 to the First International Anti-Jewish Congress (in Dresden), which accepted a 'Manifesto to the governments and peoples of the Christian states, who are perishing from Jewry', and demanding the expulsion of the Jews from Germany. - But by the 90s the anti-Jewish parties had weakened and suffered a series of political defeats." (*Dvesti let vmeste* (Two hundred years together), Moscow, 2002, pp. 315-316)

prayers is, that they are really an expression of the collective Jewish spirit; they do not plead for the individual, but for the entire Jewish race. The pious Jew is above all a Jewish patriot. The 'new' Jew, who denies the existence of the Jewish nationality, is not only a deserter in the religious sense, but is also a traitor to his people, his race and even to his family. If it were true that Jewish emancipation in exile is incompatible with Jewish nationality, then it were the duty of the Jews to sacrifice the former for the sake of the latter..." (Fourth Letter).

Jewish patriotism, for Hess, humanist though he is, is inseparable from Jewish religion; the former is the root of the latter: "All feast and fast days of the Jews, their deep piety and reverence for tradition, which almost apotheosises everything Hebraic, nay even the entire Jewish cult, all have their origin in the patriotism of the Jewish nation." (Fourth Letter)

For Judaism is "nothing else but a national historical cult developed out of family traditions" (Sixth Letter).

Reform Judaism, therefore, is anathema to Hess: "The threatening danger to Judaism comes only from the religious reformers who, with their newly-invented ceremonies and empty eloquence have sucked the marrow out of Judaism and left only its skeleton... Their reforms have only a negative purpose - if they have any aim at all - to firmly establish unbelief in the national foundation of the Jewish religion. No wonder that these reforms only fostered indifference to Judaism and conversions to Christianity. Judaism, like Christianity, would have to disappear as a result of the general state of enlightenment and progress, if it were not more than a mere dogmatic religion, namely a national cult. The Jewish reformers, however, those who are still present in some German communities, and maintain, to the best of their ability, the theatrical show of religious reform, know so little of the value of national Judaism, that they are at great pains to erase carefully from their creed and worship all traces of Jewish nationalism. They fancy that a recently manufactured prayer or hymn book, wherein a philosophical theism is put into rhyme and accompanied by music, is more elevating and soul-stirring than the fervent Hebrew prayers which express the pain and sorrow of a nation at the loss of its fatherland. They forget that these prayers, which not only created, but preserved for millennia, the unity of Jewish worship, are even today the tie which binds into one people all the Jews scattered around the world." (Seventh Letter)

Moreover, there is this difference between Judaism and other religions: it is forever tied to the ethnic Jew, implanted in his genes as it were: "In reality, Judaism as a nationality has a natural basis which cannot be set aside by mere conversion to another faith, as is the case in other religions. A Jew belongs to his race and consequently also to Judaism, in spite of the fact that he or his ancestors have become apostates. It may appear paradoxical, according to our modern religious opinions, but in life, at least, I have observed this view to be true. The converted Jew remains a Jew no matter how much he objects to it." (Seventh Letter).

"The Jewish religion, thought Heine, and with him all the enlightened Jews, is more of a misfortune than a religion. But in vain do the progressive Jews persuade themselves that they can escape this misfortune through enlightenment or

conversion. Every Jew is, whether he wishes it or not, solidly united with the entire nation; and only when the Jewish people will be freed from the burden which it has borne so heroically for thousands of years, will the burden of Judaism be removed from the shoulders of these progressive Jews, who will ultimately form only a small minority. We will all then carry the yoke of the 'Kingdom of Heaven' until the end...

The levelling tendencies of the assimilationists have remained and will always remain without influence on those Jews who constitute the great Jewish masses (Eleventh Letter).

The Jewish religion, according to Hess, is far superior to Christianity: "Christianity is, after all, a religion of death, the function of which ceased the moment the nations reawakened to life..." (Fifth Letter)

The new, life-giving religion is the religion of freedom - individual freedom and national freedom - that the French Revolution has given to the world.²⁸²

The Jewish religion, paradoxically, can come to life within the new context of this new religion bequeathed by the French: "The rigid forms of orthodoxy, the existence of which was justified before the century of rebirth, will naturally, through the power of the national idea and the historical cult, relax and become fertile. It is only with the national rebirth that the religious genius of the Jews... will be endowed with new strength again be reinspired with the prophetic spirit." (Fifth Letter)

"This 'religion of the future' of which the eighteenth-century philosophers, as well as their recent followers, dreamed, will neither be an imitation of the ancient pagan Nature cult, nor a reflection of the neo-Christian or the neo-Judaism skeleton, the spectre of which haunts the minds of our religious reformers. Each nation will have to create its own historical cult; each people must become like the Jewish people, a people of God." (Seventh Letter)

"As long as no other people possessed such a national, humanitarian cult, the Jews alone were the people of God. Since the French Revolution, the French, as well as the other peoples that followed them, have become our noble rivals and faithful allies" (Ninth Letter).

All this is leading to "the Messianic era", when "the Jewish nation and all other historical nations will arise again to new life, the time of the 'resurrection of the dead', of 'the coming of Lord', of the 'New Jerusalem', and of all the other symbolic expressions, the meaning of which is no longer misunderstood. The Messianic era is the present age, which began to germinate with the teachings of Spinoza, and finally came into historical existence with the great French Revolution. With the French Revolution, there began the regeneration of those nations which had

²⁸² Cf. Heine: "Freedom is the new religion, the religion of our time. If Christ is not the god of this new religion, he is nevertheless a high priest of it, and his name gleams beatifically into the hearts of the apostles. But the French are the chosen people of the new religion, their language records the first gospels and dogmas. Paris is the New Jerusalem, the Rhine is the Jordan that separates the consecrated land of freedom from the land of the Philistines" (in Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 346).

acquired their national historical religion only through the influence of Judaism" (Tenth Letter)

But how can the nation be resurrected if it has no land? And so Hess is led by the logic of his argument to a kind of proto-Zionism. "You," he addresses the Jews, "are an elemental force and we bow our heads before you. You were powerful in the early period of your history, strong even after the destruction of Jerusalem, and mighty during the Middle Ages, when there were only two dominant powers - the Inquisition and its Cross, and Piracy with its Crescent. You have escaped destruction in your long dispersion, in spite of the terrible tax you have paid during eighteen centuries of persecution. But what is left of your nation is mighty enough to rebuild the gates of Jerusalem. This is your mission. Providence would not have prolonged your existence until today, had it not reserved for you the holiest of all missions. The hour has struck for the resettlement of the banks of the Jordan..." (Eleventh Letter)

Not only is the return to Palestine a worthy aim: it is absolutely necessary for the regeneration of Jewry. "In exile, the Jewish people cannot be regenerated. Reform or philanthropy can only bring it to apostasy and to nothing else, but in this no reformer, not even a tyrant will ever succeed. The Jewish people will participate in the great historical movement of present-day humanity only when it will have its own fatherland... No Jew, whether orthodox or not, can conscientiously refrain from cooperating with the rest for the elevation of the entire Jewry. Every Jew, even the converted should cling to the cause and labour for the regeneration of Israel." (Eleventh Letter)

But the return to the fatherland can take place only *after the revolution*, which will shake out Western Jewry: "The rigid crust of orthodox Jewry will melt when the spark of Jewish patriotism, now smoldering under it, is kindled into a sacred fire which will herald the coming of the spring and the resurrection of our nation to a new life. On the other hand, Western Judaism is surrounded by an almost indissoluble crust, composed of the dead residue of the first manifestation of the modern spirit, from the inorganic chalk deposit of an extinct rationalistic enlightenment. This crust will not be melted by the fire of Jewish patriotism; it can only be broken by an external pressure under the weight of which everything which has no future must give up its existence. In contradistinction to orthodoxy, which cannot be destroyed by an external force without at the same time endangering the embryo of Jewish Nationalism that slumbers within it, the hard covering that surrounds the hearts of our cultured Jews will be Shattered only by a blow from without, one that world events are already preparing; and which will probably fall in the near future. The old framework of European Society, battered so often by the storms of revolution, is cracking and groaning on all sides. It can no longer stand a storm. Those who stand between revolution and reaction, the mediators, who have an appointed purpose to push modern Society on its path of progress, will, after society becomes strong and progressive, be swallowed up by it. The nurses of progress, who would undertake to teach the Creator himself wisdom, prudence and economy; those carriers of culture, the saviours of Society, the speculators in politics, philosophy and religion, will not survive the last storm. And along with the other nurses of progress our Jewish reformers will also close their

ephemeral existence. On the other hand, the Jewish people, along with other historical nations, will, after this last catastrophe, the approach of which is attested by unmistakable signs of the times, receive its full rights as a people... Just as after the last catastrophe of organic life, when the historical races came into the world's arena, there came their division into tribes, and the position and role of the latter was determined, so after the last catastrophe of social life, when the spirit of humanity shall have reached its maturity, will our people, with the other historical peoples, find its legitimate place in universal history." (Eleventh Letter)

Hess concludes with a warning against German nationalism: "the cause of national regeneration of oppressed peoples can expect no help and sympathy from Germany. The problem of regeneration, which dates not from the second restoration of the kingdom in France, but goes back to the French Revolution, the war, was received in Germany with mockery and derision; and in spite of the fact that the question is an urgent one and is uppermost almost everywhere, even in Germany itself, the Germans have named it the 'Nationality trick'. Our Jewish democrats, also, display their patriotism in accusing the French and the people sympathising with them, of conquering designs. The French, say the German politicians, as well as their allies, will only be exploited by the second Monarchy, for purposes of restraining liberty rather than promoting it. It is, therefore, according to the deep logic of these politicians, the duty of the German to be obedient to the Kaiser and the kings, in order that they should be able to defeat the conquering desires of the French. These politicians and patriots forget that if Germany were to conquer France and Italy today, it would only result in placing the entire German people under police law; and in depriving the Jews of their civil rights, in a worse manner than after the Way of Liberation, when the only reward granted by the Germans to their Jewish brethren in arms was exclusion from civil life. And, truly, the German people and the German Jews do not deserve any better lot when they allow themselves, in spite of the examples of history, to be entrapped by medieval reaction." (Appendix V. The Last Race Rule)

"The age of race dominance is at an end. Even the smallest people, whether it belongs to the Germanic or Romance, Slavic or Finnic, Celtic or Semitic races, as soon as it advances its claim to a place among the historical nations, will find sympathetic supporters in the powerful civilised Western nations. Like the patriots of other unfortunate nations, the German patriots can attain their aim only by means of a friendly alliance with the progressive and powerful nations of the world. But if they continue to conjure themselves, as well as the German people, with the might and glory of the 'German Sword', they will only add to the old unpardonable mistakes, grave new ones; they will only play into the hands of the reaction, and drag all Germany along with them." (Appendix VI. A Chapter of History)

Hess was notable for his combining different strands of nineteenth-century Jewish and Gentile thinking: the universalist nationalism of the French Revolution, the revolutionary socialism of Marx and Engels, and traditional Talmudic Judaism. He rejected only the extremes of assimilationism, which would destroy Judaism and therefore Jewry, and the particularist nationalism of the German type. And yet, paradoxically, his assertion that "once a Jew, always a Jew", even after conversion

to Christianity, appeared to confirm one of the principal theses of German anti-Semitism. And so he looked forward both to Zionism and to the Holocaust...

*

But was Hess's Messianic vision of the creation of a Jewish nation-state in Palestine in fact compatible with traditional Judaism? This question, which has so troubled the modern state of Israel, was obliquely addressed in 1836 by Samuel Raphael Hirsch in his *Nineteen Letters on Judaism*. This work, as Dan-Sherbok writes, was "a defence of Orthodoxy in the form of essays by a young rabbi to a friend who questioned the importance of remaining a Jews. The work began with a critique of Judaism of this period: 'While the best of mankind climbed to the summit of culture, prosperity, and wealth, the Jewish people remained poor in everything that makes human beings great and noble and that beautifies and dignifies our lives.'

"In response Hirsch maintained that the purpose of human life is not to attain personal happiness and perfection. Instead human beings should strive to serve God by doing his will. As an example of such devotion, the Jewish people was formed so that through its way of life all nations would come to know that true happiness lies in obeying God. Thus, Hirsch maintained, the people of Israel were given the Promised Land so that they would be able to keep the Covenant. When the nation was exiled, they fulfilled this mission by remaining loyal to God and the Torah despite continual persecution and suffering. According to Hirsch, the purpose of the divine commandments is not to repress physical gratification of material prosperity; rather the goal of following God's law is to lead a religious life and thereby bear witness to the messianic ideal of universal brotherhood. Given this vision of God's plan, Reform Judaism was denounced for abandoning this sacred duty. For Hirsch citizenship rights are of little importance, since Jews are united by a bond of obedience to God's laws until the time when the 'Almighty shall see fit in his inscrutable wisdom to unite again his scattered servants in one land, and the Torah shall be the guiding principle of a state, a model of the meaning of Divine revelation and the mission of humanity'."²⁸³

The question was posed again by two rabbis who came to be known as "the Forerunners of Zionism" - the Serbian Rabbi Alkalai and the Polish Rabbi Kalischer. Alain Dieckhoff writes: "Giving some role to the collective organisation of the Jews to promote their return [as was done by the two rabbis] was already in itself a major innovation. It implied a reinterpretation of Jewish Messianism which had adopted an increasingly quietist approach. As the political effacement of the Jewish nation in Palestine steadily progressed, sealed by the destruction of the Second Temple (70 CE) and the crushing defeat of Bar Kochba (135), belief in the coming of the Messiah who would deliver Israel from its exile and restore it to its past glory was consolidated, as a form of compensation. This Messianic hope adopted an apocalyptic content, both restoration oriented (a return to the original golden age) and utopian (establishment of an essentially different and better age); this made it easier to adopt an attitude of distance from, even indifference towards the contemporary world. Although the deliverance of Israel was certainly located in the

²⁸³ Dan Cohn-Sherbok, *An Atlas of Jewish History*, London: Routledge, 1996, pp. 147-148.

domain of the visible since it assumed the physical restoration of the Jewish nation in its land, it was also placed at the end of time (be-aharit ha-yamim), i.e. at the end of the course of human history. Therefore the enormous change to be inaugurated by the Messianic era could only be the miraculous work of God, from Whom man could only hope, by a life of prayer and holiness, that the final redemption would come without too great a delay.

"This spiritualization considerably weakened the political dimension of Messianism, which had been very present in the Biblical period - as illustrated by the Maccabees' struggle in the second century BCE - but was constantly eroded by rabbinical Judaism, which feared its destructive force. The epic story of Shabtai Zvi, who aroused a wave of enthusiasm across the Jewish world in 1665-7, further discredited Messianic activism. The abolition of fasting days, the proclamation of new festivals and transformations of the liturgy - all breaches of religious law - in any case somewhat undermined the Messianic legitimacy of Shabtai Zvi, who finally discredited himself by his sudden conversion to Islam. The antinomian and heretical aspect of Shabtaism, which was cultivated by his disciples and especially by Jacob Frank, led to a 'dogmatic' hardening in official Judaism and the condemnation of all human efforts to hasten the end of time (dehikat ha-ketz). So for reassessment of the human factor in the process of redemption it was necessary to reassert voluntarism, which had been discredited by Shabtaism, and to modify the 'Messianic code' at three levels. First of all, without denying God's supernatural intervention, Rabbis Alkalai and Kalischer considered that it would only be carried out after an initial phase where man would play an active and propitiatory role. This separation of two Messianic periods, one for which man would strive while the other would be decided by God, was explicitly proposed by Kalischer.

"The redemption of Israel, for which we continue to long, should not be imagined as a sudden miracle. The Holy One - may His name be blessed - will not come down suddenly from his heights to give His people their marching orders. Nor will He send the Messiah from the clouds in the twinkling of an eye to sound the great trumpets of the dispersed children of Israel and gather them together in Jerusalem. He will not surround the Holy City with a wall of fire and will not make the Holy Temple come down from the highest heaven.

"The bliss and the miracles promised by His servants the Prophets will certainly take place, for all will be accomplished, but we shall not flee in affliction and terror, for the redemption of Israel will come in successive stages, and rays of the deliverance will shine gradually.' [*Derishat Tzion*, 1862]

"Because redemption is gradual, two distinct and successive moments can be distinguished - the first natural, the second miraculous. This idea was particularly daring because it made the saving power of God depend on prior action by man. It directly challenged apocalyptic Messianism, which was defended by the majority of the rabbis of the time who expected the deliverance of Israel to come only by a cataclysmic entry of the Messiah.

"For what purpose was this human energy thus liberated to be used? Here again an original distinction made it possible for the Forerunners of Zion to justify an

active role for man. In Jewish tradition there was only one true remedy for sin: repentance (teshuva), i.e. explicit renunciation of evil and adoption of behaviour in accordance with the Law. The idea of inner repentance was so essential that it was supposed to have coexisted with the Law before the proclamation on Mount Sinai, and even to have existed before the creation of the world. This was above all of an individual nature in Talmudic literature, but took on a collective dimension from the sixteenth century, under the impetus of the Kabbala of Isaac Luria. After that the return to a life of holiness ensured not only the salvation of the individual soul, but also restored the original fullness of the world. Teshuva was no longer limited solely to the existential level, within the narrow confines of the individual; it also concerned the historic level of the national group, and beyond that the cosmic level of mankind. Alkalai went so far as to consider, differing from the classical idea, that collective repentance must necessarily precede individual repentance. There remained the final question: what did this general teshuva involve?

"It involved physical re-establishment of the Jews in the Land of Israel to recreate the national community. Playing on the double meaning of the word teshuva, which strictly means return, Kalischer stated that collective repentance meant a geographical return to Zion and not, at least not directly, a spiritual return. So Jews who returned to Palestine were not breaking the religious Law, since in the first instance their return was a purely material one. It was only later, when they were gathered in Zion, that by the grace of God the truly supernatural redemption would start, bringing with it the individual repentance of every Jew and union with God. This bold idea, based on exegesis of religious texts, was a powerful call to action. It meant that Jews could legitimately cooperate and meet together to prepare for and organise their settlement in the Holy Land. By turning to the traditional scholarly interpretation based on the Talmud and Midrash literature, the Forerunners of Zionism encouraged the adoption of an unconventional way ahead, in which the Jewish man had a direct responsibility for the way the world was to develop. Even if it was in a confused way and probably unconsciously, they started a Copernican revolution which Herzl's Zionism was to bring to full flower, placing man, not God, at the centre of Jewish destiny."²⁸⁴

[32. THE JEWS UNDER NICHOLAS I](#)

The Jewish problem was made more complex by the fact that there were large differences between the Sephardic Jews of the West, who were not particularly numerous and were in general striving for assimilation, and the more numerous, poorer and more religious Ashkenazi Jews of Eastern Europe, whose attitude to the Gentiles among whom they lived was disdainful and hostile. Correspondingly, governments in East and West took very different views of problem. In the West, the Jews were disliked, not so much for their Talmudic religious beliefs, of which

²⁸⁴ Dieckhoff, *The Invention of a Nation*, London: Hurst and Company, 2003, pp. 16-19.

most Westerners were profoundly ignorant, as for their racial characteristics, whether real or imaginary. In the East, however, the Jews were discriminated against, not on racial but on religious grounds, as is proved by the fact that the Karaite Jews, who rejected the Talmud, were freed of all restrictions by the Russian government...

In Russia, another motivation of government policy, as we have seen, was the desire to protect the Russian peasant in the western territories from exploitation by Jewish tavern-owners and money-lenders. Tsar Alexander had planned to settle the Jews as farmers on the new territories of Southern Russia. But this had proved to be a failure, in spite of very generous terms offered to them – terms that were not offered to Russian peasants.

In spite of this failure, writes Alexander Solzhenitsyn, in his *Statute* of 1835, which replaced Alexander's of 1804, Nicholas I "not only did not abandon Jewish agriculture, but even broadened it, placing in the first place in the building of Jewish life 'the setting up of the Jews on the basis of rules that would open to them a free path to the acquisition of a prosperous existence by the practice of agriculture and industry and to the gradual education of their youth, while at the same time cutting off for them excuses for idleness and unlawful trades'. If before a preliminary contribution of 400 rubles was required for each family [settling in the new territories] from the Jewish community, now without any condition 'every Jew is allowed "at any time" to pass over to agriculture', and all his unpaid taxes would immediately be remitted to him and to the community; he would be allowed to receive not only State lands for an unlimited period, but also, within the bounds of the Pale of Settlement, to buy, sell and lease lands. Those passing over to agriculture were freed from poll-tax for 25 years, from land tax for 10, and from liability to military service – for 50. Nor could any Jew 'be forced to pass over to agriculture'. Moreover, 'trades and crafts practised in their village life' were legalised.

"(150 years passed. And because these distant events had been forgotten, an enlightened and learned physicist formulated Jewish life at that time as 'the Pale of Settlement in conjunction with a ban [!] on peasant activity'. But the historian-publicist M.O. Gershenzon has a broader judgement: 'Agriculture is forbidden to the Jew by his national spirit, for, on becoming involved with the land, a man can more easily become rooted to the place'.)"²⁸⁵

In general, the *Statute* of 1835 "did not lay any new restrictions on the Jews', as the Jewish encyclopaedia puts it in a restrained way. And if we look into the details, then according to the new *Statute* 'the Jews had the right to acquire any kind of real estate, including populated estates, and carry out any kind of trade on the basis of rights identical with those granted Russian subjects', although only within the bounds of the Pale of Settlement. The *Statute* of 1835 defended all the rights of the Jewish religion, and introduced awards for rabbis and the rights of the merchants of the first guild. A rational age for marriage (18 and 16 years) was established [contrary to the rabbis, who married off young Jews at much younger ages]. Measures were undertaken that Jewish dress should not be so different, separating

²⁸⁵ A.I. Solzhenitsyn, *Dvesti Let Vmeste (Two Hundred Years Together)*, Moscow, 2001, p. 114.

Jews from the surrounding population. Jews were directed to productive means of employment (forbidding the sale of wine on credit and on the security of household effects), all kinds of manufacturing activity (including the farming of wine distilleries). Keeping Christians in servitude was forbidden only for constant service, but it was allowed 'for short jobs' without indication of exactly how long, and also 'for assisting in arable farming, gardening and work in kitchen gardens', which was a mockery of the very idea of 'Jewish agriculture'. The *Statute* of 1835 called on Jewish youth to get educated [up to then the rabbis had forbidden even the learning of Russian. No restrictions were placed on the entry of Jewish to secondary and higher educational institutions. Jews who had received the degree of doctor in any branch of science... were given the right to enter government service. (Jewish doctors had that right even earlier.) As regards local self-government, the *Statute* removed the Jews' previous restrictions: now they could occupy posts in dumas, magistracies and town councils 'on the same basis as people of other confessions are elected to them'. (True, some local authorities, especially in Lithuania, objected to this: the head of the town on some days had to lead the residents into the church, and how could this be a Jew? Or how could a Jew be a judge, since the oath had to be sworn on the cross? The opposition proved to be strong, and by a decree of 1836 it was established for the western provinces that Jews could occupy only a third of the posts in magistracies and town councils.) Finally, with regard to the economically urgent question linked with cross-frontier smuggling, which was undermining State interests, the *Statute* left the Jews living on the frontiers where they were, but forbade any new settlements.

"For a State that held millions of its population in serfdom, all this cannot be characterised as a cruel system..."²⁸⁶

This is an important point in view of the persistent western and Jewish propaganda that Nicholas was a persecutor of the Jews. And in this light even the most notorious restriction on the Jews - that they live in the Pale of Settlement - looks generous. For while a peasant had to live in his village, the Jews could wander throughout the vast territory of the Pale, an area the size of France and Germany combined; while for those who were willing to practise agriculture, or had acquired education, they could go even further afield.

Of particular importance were the Tsar's measures encouraging Jewish education, by which he hoped to remove the barriers built up around the Jews by the rabbis. "Already in 1831 he told the 'directing' committee that 'among the measures that could improve the situation of the Jews, it was necessary to pay attention to their correction by teaching... by the building of factories, by the banning of early marriage, by a better management of the kahals,... by a change of dress'. And in 1840, on the founding the 'Committee for the Defining of Measures for the Radical Transformation of the Jews in Russia', one of its first aims was seen to be: 'Acting on the moral formation of the new generation of Jews by the establishment of Jewish schools in a spirit opposed to the present Talmudic teaching'..."²⁸⁷

²⁸⁶ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 115-117.

²⁸⁷ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

“The masses, fearing coercive measures in the sphere of religion, did not go.

“However, the school reform took its course in... 1844, in spite of the extreme resistance of the ruling circles among the kahals. (Although ‘the establishment of Jewish schools by no means envisaged a diminution in the numbers of Jews in the general school institutions; on the contrary, it was often pointed out that the general schools had to be, as before, open for Jews’.) Two forms of State Jewish schools [‘on the model of the Austrian elementary schools for Jews’] were established: two-year schools, corresponding to Russian parish schools, and four-year schools, corresponding to uyezd schools. In them only Jewish subjects were taught by Jewish teachers. (As one inveterate revolutionary, Lev Deutsch, evaluated it: ‘The crown-bearing monster ordered them [the Jews] to be taught Russian letters’.) For many years Christians were placed at the head of these schools; only much later were Jews also admitted.

““The majority of the Jewish population, faithful to traditional Jewry, on learning or guessing the secret aim of Uvarov [the minister of enlightenment], looked on the educational measures of the government as one form of persecution. (But Uvarov, in seeking possible ways of bringing the Jews and the Christian population closer together through the eradication ‘of prejudices instilled by the teaching of the Talmud’, wanted to exclude it completely from the educational curriculum, considering it to be an antichristian codex.) In their unchanging distrust of the Russian authorities, the Jewish population continued for quite a few years to keep away from these schools, experiencing ‘school-phobia’: ‘Just as the population kept away from military service, so it was saved from the schools, fearing to give their children to these seed-beds of “free thought”’. Prosperous Jewish families in part sent other, poor people’s children to the State schools instead of their own... And if by 1855 70 thousand Jewish children were studying in the ‘registered’ heders [rabbinic schools], in the State schools of both types there were 3,200.”²⁸⁸

This issue of education was to prove to be crucial. For when, in the next reign, the Jews did overcome their “school-phobia”, and send their children to the State schools, these had indeed become seed-beds of “free-thinking” and revolution. It is ironic and tragic that it was the Jews’ education in Russian schools that taught them how to overthrow the Russian Orthodox Autocracy...

²⁸⁸ Solzhenitsyn, op. cit., pp. 123-124.

33. THE JEWS UNDER ALEXANDER II

In his coronation manifesto of 1856, Tsar Alexander II introduced two important reforms. First, the Jews were placed on the same basis as the rest of the population in relation to military service. And secondly, all their (very large) debts incurred in non-payment of taxes over the previous years were forgiven.

"More expansively than this," writes Alexander Solzhenitsyn, "Alexander II expressed his intention to resolve the Jewish question - and in the most general sense favourably [for the Jews]. For the whole way in which the question was posed was radically changed. If under Nicholas I the government had set itself the task, first, of reforming the inner way of life of the Jews, gradually clearing it up through productive labour and education, in this way leading to the removal of administrative restrictions; then under Alexander II, by contrast, the government began by removing external restrictions and impediments, without searching deeply into possible inner causes of Jewish isolation and sickness, and hoping that then all remaining problems would be solved of themselves; it began 'with the intention of merging this people with the native inhabitants of the country', as the sovereign command of 1856 put it."²⁸⁹

During the rest of the reign almost all the restrictions on the Jews were dismantled. Jews were now to be found in all parts of the empire, and the share of trade and industry owned by them rapidly increased - as did their overall numbers, to almost 4 million by 1880. The Jews also benefited from other reforms, such as the abolition of the poll-tax on urban dwellers in 1863.

However, the emancipation of the serfs hit the Jews hard in three ways. First, the social gap between the free Jews and peasant serfs was abolished - the peasants were now as free as the Jews. Secondly, the liberated peasants were now freed from the strict prohibition of buying and selling goods through an appointed middle-man - who in the western provinces was almost always a Jew. Thirdly, the government's establishment of agricultural credit at very reasonable rates, together with the development of consumer and credit associations, squeezed out the Jew's role as provider of credit (at extortionate rates).²⁹⁰

Alexander I's plan to draw the Jews into agriculture was abandoned by Alexander II. In 1866 he rescinded the special decrees on transforming the Jews into farmers in the South-Western region of "New Russia". Since they had proved incapable of working the land independently, the Jews were given the opportunity to become craftsmen and merchants. They were allowed to buy out the land plots they had been given, and then to resell them at great profit.

²⁸⁹ Solzhenitsyn, *Dvesti Let Vmeste* (Two Hundred Years Together), Moscow, 2001, volume 1, p. 136.

²⁹⁰ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 146-148.

However, this measure created some further problems. For the Russian peasants who were neighbours of the Jewish colonists were angry that, while they did not have enough land, the Jews had been given more than enough - and were then able to lease the land out to the Russians at a high price. It was this fact that led in part to the sacking of several Jewish settlements during the disturbances of 1881-1882.²⁹¹

Alexander's reforms with regard to Jewish military recruitment also did not reap the results hoped for. The Jews very often did not respond to the call-up. Thus in the period 1876-1883 31.6% of Jews called up did not respond - the figure throughout the Empire was 0.19%.

When the government offered privileges in military service to those with education, the Jews suddenly converted to the idea of accepting Russian education. By 1887 13.5% of all university students in the country were Jews, and the figures were much higher in cities such as Kharkov and Odessa.²⁹² According to the theory, this should have been a good thing - it was the government's aim to assimilate the Jews into Russian culture through education. However, Russian education in this period was rapidly becoming radicalized. And so the institutions that, as it was hoped, would make the Jews into model Russian citizens and patriots in fact turned them into - revolutionaries... Thus Solzhenitsyn writes: "It is precisely under Alexander II, when the restrictions on Jewish life in Russia were so weakened, that Jewish names begin to be encountered amidst the revolutionaries... In the student disturbances of 1861 we encounter Mikhoels, Utin and Gen."²⁹³

Again, David Vital writes: "A breakdown based on official records of the calling, social status, and origin of 1,054 revolutionaries arrested, tried, condemned, and sent into punitive exile or placed under police surveillance in the course of the round-up of dissidents in 1873-7 showed that 68 - 6.5 per cent - were Jews. Of 79 condemned to exile 12 were Jews: 15.2 per cent. These were not immensely large figures, but they do illustrate the fact that the Jewish contingent was already strikingly in excess of the Jewish proportion of the total population of the empire."²⁹⁴

In fact, the exposure of the younger generation of Jews to goy literature was the cause of a profound change within Jewry itself. Many young fanatics who had immersed themselves in the study of the Talmud now abandoned Talmudism, and even the external appearance of Talmudic Jewry, and immersed themselves instead in Turgenev, Belinsky, Dobroliubov, Chernyshevsky, Pisarev and Nekrasov. They became socialists and joined the populist movement [narodnichestvo], distancing themselves more and more from their own people.²⁹⁵

²⁹¹ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 154, 155.

²⁹² Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 165-166.

²⁹³ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

²⁹⁴ Vital, *A People Apart: The Jews in Europe 1789-1939*, Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 403.

²⁹⁵ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 218, 219, 220.

Meanwhile, most Jews remained fenced off by Talmudic edicts from Russian culture and even the Russian language. Even among the russified Jewish intelligentsia voices were heard warning against complete assimilation. Thus in 1868 Perets Smolenskin warned that, in adapting to the general culture, the Jews should preserve their national spiritual character. And the Petersburg newspapers *Rassvet* [*Dawn*] and *Russkij Evrej* [*Russian Jew*] "strengthened the attraction of Jewish youth towards the study of the Jewish past and present life. At the end of the 70s and beginning of the 80s there arose a watershed between the cosmopolitan and nationalist tendencies in Russian Jewry. 'In essence the leaders of *Rassvet* no longer believed in the truth of assimilation... *Rassvet*, without realizing it, went along the path of ... the excitation of national self-consciousness... it had a vividly expressed national bias... the illusions of russification... were dispelled..."²⁹⁶

In 1869 the baptized Jew Jacob Brafmann published *Kniga Kagala* (*The Book of the Kahal*), in which, on the basis of a detailed translation of the acts of the Minsk kahal at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries, he exposed and interpreted the kahal system, demonstrating the complete rightlessness of the majority of the members of the Jewish community. In 1976 the *New Jewish Encyclopaedia* confirmed that the material used by Brafmann "is genuine and the translation of it quite accurate". And in 1994 the *Russian Jewish Encyclopaedia* declared that "the documents published by Brafmann are a valuable source for the study of the history of the Jews in Russia at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th century".

"Brafmann asserted that 'State laws cannot annihilate that harmful power hidden in Jewish self-government... According to his words, this organization is not limited to local kahals... but encompasses, he says, the Jewish people throughout the world... and in consequence of this the Christian peoples cannot be delivered from Jewish exploitation until everything that aids the isolation of the Jews is destroyed'. Brafmann supported 'the view of the Talmud as not so much a codex of a religious-national character, but rather "a civil-political codex", which went "against the flow of the political and moral development of Christian countries"', creating 'a Talmudic republic'. He insisted that 'the Jews constitute a State within the State', that the Jews 'consider themselves not bound by State laws', the Jewish community has 'as one of its basic aims "the darkening of the mind of Christians" to turn them only into fictional owners of the property that belongs to them'. More broadly, he 'accused the Society for the Spreading of Enlightenment among the Jews and the Universal Jewish Union (the Alliance Israélite) of being a part of "a world-wide Jewish conspiracy" ...

"The State Council, 'softening the decisive phraseology of the *Book of the Kahal*', declared that the external distinguishing of the Jews from the rest of the population could be achieved by administrative measures, this 'will in no way guarantee the annihilation of the self-enclosed and almost anti-Christian feelings of the Jewish communities', but 'the isolation of the Jews which is so harmful for the State' can be 'annihilated, on the one hand, by a weakening, as far as possible, of the social links of the Jews among themselves and of the Jewish elders' abuse of their power, and on the

²⁹⁶ Solzhenitsyn, op. cit., pp. 177-178.

other hand, which is still more important, by the spread of enlightenment among the Jews'.²⁹⁷

"I.S. Aksakov, a constant opponent of complete emancipation for the Jews, already at the end of the 50s had tried to restrain the government 'from too bold steps' along this path. When a law was passed giving state service to Jews with degrees, he objected (1862), saying that the Jews were 'a handful of people who completely reject the Christian teaching, the Christian ideal and moral code (and consequently all the bases of the social existence of the country), and confess a teaching that is contrary and hostile to it'. He was not in favour of equality for the Jews in political rights, although he was completely in favour of their having equality in purely civil rights, so that the Jewish people 'should be provided with complete freedom of existence, self-government, development, education and trade... even... that they should be allowed to live throughout Russia'. In 1867 he wrote that economically 'one should not talk about the emancipation of the Jews, but about the emancipation of the Russians from the Jews'. He noted the deaf indifference of the liberal press to the peasants' condition and needs. And now Aksakov explained the way of pogroms in 1881 as the display of popular anger against 'the oppression of the Russian local population by Jewry', which is why during the pogroms there was 'no burglary', only the destruction of property and 'some kind of simple-minded conviction of the rightness of their actions'; and he repeated that the question should be put 'not about the equality in rights of the Jews with the Christians, but about the equality of the Christians with the Jews, and about the removal of the rightlessness of the Russian population before the Jews'...

"The writer D. Mordovtsev, who was sympathetic to the Jews, in his 'Letter of a Christian on the Jewish question', which was published in the Jewish newspaper *Rassvet [Dawn]*, pessimistically called on the Jews 'to emigrate to Palestine and America, seeing this as the only solution of the Jewish question in Russia'.²⁹⁸

Again, in 1879 Constantine Pobedonostev wrote to Dostoyevsky: "They are at the root of the revolutionary socialist movement and of regicide, they own the periodical press, they have in their hands the financial markets; the people as a whole fall into financial slavery to them; they even control the principles of contemporary science and strive to place it outside of Christianity".²⁹⁹

And Dostoyevsky himself wrote: "Jewry is thriving precisely there where the people are still ignorant, or not free, or economically backward. It is there that Jewry has a champ libre! And instead of raising, by its influence, the level of education, instead of increasing knowledge, generating economic fitness in the native population, - instead of this, the Jew, wherever he has settled, has still more humiliated and debauched the people; there humaneness was still more debased and the educational level fell still lower; there inescapable, inhuman misery, and with it despair, spread still more disgustingly. Ask the native populations in our border regions: What is propelling the Jew - has been propelling him for centuries? You will receive a unanimous answer:

²⁹⁷ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 167-168.

²⁹⁸ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 197, 198.

²⁹⁹ Pobedonostev, in Cohen and Major, *op. cit.*, p. 627.

mercilessness. 'He has been prompted so many centuries only by pitilessness for us, only the thirst for our sweat and blood.'

"And, in truth, the whole activity of the Jews in these border regions of ours consisted of rendering the native population as much as possible inescapably dependent on them, taking advantage of the local laws. They always managed to be on friendly terms with those upon whom the people were dependent, and, certainly, it is not for them to complain, at least in this respect, about their restricted rights compared with the native population. They have received from us enough of these rights over the native population. What, in the course of decades and centuries, has become of the Russian people where the Jews settled is attested by the history of our border regions. What, then? - Point to any other tribe from among Russian aliens which could rival the Jew by his dreadful influence in this connection! You will find no such tribe. In this respect the Jew preserves all his originality as compared with other Russian aliens, and, of course, the reason therefore is that status in statu of his, the spirit of which specifically breathes with pitilessness for everything that is not Jew, with disrespect for any people and tribe, for every human creature that is not a Jew. And what kind of justification is it that in Western Europe the nations did not permit themselves to be overwhelmed, and that thus the Russian people themselves are at fault? Because the Russian people in the border regions of Russia proved weaker than the European nations (and exclusively as a result of their cruel political circumstances), for this sole reason should they be completely crushed by exploitation, instead of being helped?

"And if reference is made to Europe, to France, for example, - there too, hardly has their status in statu been harmless. Of course, there, Christianity and its idea have been lowered and are sinking not because of the Jew's fault, but through their own fault; nevertheless, it is impossible not to note also in Europe the great triumph of Jewry which has replaced many former ideas with its own.

"Oh, it goes without saying that man always, at all times, has been worshipping materialism and has been inclined to perceive and understand liberty only in the sense of making his life secure through money hoarded by the exertion of every effort and accumulated by all possible means. However, at no time in the past have these tendencies been raised so cynically and so obviously to the level of a sublime principle as in our Nineteenth Century. 'Everybody for himself and only for himself, and every intercourse with man solely for one's self' - such is the ethical tenet of the majority of present-day people, even not bad people, but, on the contrary, laboring people who neither murder nor steal. And mercilessness for the lower classes, the decline of brotherhood, exploitation of the poor by the rich, - oh, of course, all this existed also before and always; however, it had not been raised to the level of supreme truth and of science - it had been condemned by Christianity, whereas at present, on the contrary, it is being regarded as virtue.

"Thus, it is not for nothing that over there the Jews are reigning everywhere over stock-exchanges; it is not for nothing that they control capital, that they are the masters of credit, and it is not for nothing - I repeat - that they are also the masters of international politics, and what is going to happen in the future is known to the Jews themselves: their reign, their complete reign, is approaching! We are approaching the

complete triumph of ideas before which sentiments of humanity, thirst for truth, Christian and national feelings, and even those of national dignity, must bow. On the contrary, we are approaching materialism, a blind, carnivorous craving for personal material welfare, a craving for personal accumulation of money by any means - that is all that has been proclaimed as the supreme aim, as the reasonable thing, as liberty, in lieu of the Christian idea of salvation only through the closest moral and brotherly fellowship of men.

"People will laugh and say that this is not all brought about by the Jews. Of course, not only by them, but if the Jews have completely triumphed and thriven in Europe precisely at the time when these new principles have triumphed there to the point of having been raised to the level of a moral principle, it is impossible not to infer that the Jews, too, have contributed their influence to this condition. The summit of the Jews is assuming stronger and firmer power over mankind seeking to convey to it its image and substance. Jews keep vociferating that among them, too, there are good people. Oh, God! Is this the point? - Besides, we are speaking not about good or bad people. And aren't there good people among those? Wasn't the late James Rothschild of Paris a good man? - We are speaking about the whole and its idea; we are speaking about Judaism and the Jewish idea which is clasping the whole world instead of Christianity which 'did not succeed'."³⁰⁰

Of course, the views of Dostoyevsky, Aksakov and other Russian "antisemites" are profoundly unfashionable today. Most critiques of Russian anti-Semitism simply ignore the facts about the Jews in Russia cited above. However, a more intelligent and interesting critique has been presented by Sir Geoffrey Hosking, who takes up the hint given here by Dostoyevsky that the Jewish idea took the place of Christianity, "which 'did not succeed'".

According to Sir Geoffrey Hosking, "Anti-Semitism was a kind of frustrated Slavophilism, conceived in awareness of the ways in which Russians had failed to fulfil their potential nationhood. In the interests of great-power status, the Russians had spurned their myth of the chosen people and the empire of truth and justice. The Jews, by contrast, continued to believe that they were a chosen people and to hold to their messianic prophecies. Where Slavophiles dreamed of a peasant commune based on Orthodox principles, the Jews seemed still to have successful communities ruled over by their religious leaders. They had succeeded where the Russians had failed: in making a messianic religion the essence of their national identity."³⁰¹

We may concede a degree of psychological truth in this analysis: the Russians *were* failing "to fulfil their potential nationhood", if that nationhood was perceived as being the mission of the Third Rome, that is, of being the bearer of "light from the East", the universal truth of Orthodox Christianity, to the benighted nations of Europe and Asia. Far from converting the Europeans to Orthodoxy, the Russians were being converted in large numbers to various westernizing ideologies. Nor, in spite of flourishing missions in Alaska and (a little later) Japan, were they much more successful in Asia,

³⁰⁰ Dostoyevsky, *The Diary of a Writer*, March, 1877, II, 3; translated by Boris Brasol, Haslemere: Ianmead, 1984, pp. 648-651.

³⁰¹ Hosking, *Russia: People & Empire*, London: HarperCollins, 1997, pp. 391-392.

where the very earthly motivations of great-power politics, little different from those of their great rivals, the British, prevailed.

Now a sense of failure can be treated in two ways: in the Orthodox way, by repentance and the confession of sin, and in the fallen way, by exaggerated self-assertion and the blaming of others. Slavophilism at its best, as we find it in Khomiakov and Kireyevsky, or, somewhat later, in Dostoyevsky and Tiutchev, implicitly contained a message of repentance: that Russia was falling away from her vocation as God's people, and she should return to the traditions of the pre-Petrine, Muscovite period, when she had been more faithful to her heavenly calling. But in some of its later varieties, as we shall see in more detail later, Slavophilism degenerated into mere nationalist self-assertion. Russia, it was maintained, was great not only, or even primarily, because she was the bearer of the one truth to all nations (messianism), but also in a purely secular, material sense, or as embodying the last and greatest in the historical series of world civilizations (Danilevsky).

The Jews were unique among Russia's national rivals in being no threat to her (yet) in purely political terms, but a direct threat in terms of messianic mission. For the Jews, like the Russians, claimed to be the nation *that knows the truth*, the bearer of God's saving message to the world. But the Jewish God was definitely not the Russians' God - not Jesus Christ. And Judaism was aimed at protecting the Jews against the influence of this Russian God, Who happened to be a Jew by race, but Whom the Jews had crucified and continued to anathematize. So in religious terms - and Russia's national "myth", to use Hosking's word, was nothing if not religious - there could be no compromise, no living together in amity between these two most religious of peoples. It was a matter of kto kogo?, to use Lenin's phrase: who would rule whom? - and the constant strife between Jews and Russians in the Western Borderlands was therefore both wholly predictable and essentially unavoidable. Moreover, as Hosking rightly points out, the relative success of the Jews in maintaining their religious identity was an implicit rebuke to the Russians, who were losing theirs. In fact, it was hardly a coincidence that the appearance of the Jews in large numbers in the Russian lands towards the end of the eighteenth century had coincided almost exactly with the nadir of Russian religious consciousness in the reign of Catherine II. It was as if God had introduced the Jews into Russia to remind the Russians: "Just as the Jews fell away from Me when they chose national self-assertion instead of Me, so you can fall away if you pursue great-power wealth and status at the expense of faithfulness to My commandments. And just as they fell from being My People to being My fiercest enemies, so it can happen to you."

34. L'ALLIANCE ISRAËLITE UNIVERSELLE

The Alliance Israélite Universelle (in Hebrew: Khaburi Menitsi Indrumim, "Brotherhood Arousing the Sleepy") was founded in 1860 in Paris with a Central Committee led by Adolphe Crémieux. It was the first of a series of national Jewish organisations, such as the Anglo-Jewish Association in Great Britain, the Hilfsverein der Deutschen Juden in Germany and the Israelitische Allianz zu Wien in Austria, which began to campaign for Jewish rights in this period. Although the Alliance considered itself to be motivated by universalist sentiments, it did not disguise the fact that its aim was the defence of the Jewish faith: "Universal union is among our aspirations without any doubt, and we consider all men our brothers, but just as the family comes before strangers in the order of affection, so religion inspires and memory of common oppression fortifies a family sentiment that in the ordinary course of life surpasses others... Finally, there is the decisive consideration for not going beyond the religious confraternity: all other important faiths are represented in the world by nations - embodied, that is to say, in governments that have a special interest and an official duty to represent and speak for them. Ours alone is without this important advantage; it corresponds neither to a state nor to a society nor again to a specific territory: it is no more than a rallying-cry for scattered individuals - the very people whom it is therefore essential to bring together."³⁰²

Alexander Solzhenitsyn writes that, "'insufficiently informed... about the situation of the Jews in Russia', the Alliance Israélite Universelle 'began to interest itself in Russian Jewry', and soon 'began to work for the benefit of the Jews in Russia with great constancy.' The Alliance did not have departments in Russia and 'did not function within her frontiers'. Besides charitable and educational work, the Alliance more than once directly addressed the government of Russia, interceding for Russian Jews, although often inopportunistically... Meanwhile, the newly-created Alliance (whose emblem was the Mosaic tablets of the law over the earthly globe), according to the report of the Russian ambassador from Paris, already enjoyed 'exceptional influence on Jewish society in all States'. All this put not only the Russian government, but also Russian society on their guard. [The baptised Jew] Jacob Brafmann also agitated intensively against the Alliance Israélite Universelle. He affirmed that the Alliance, 'like all Jewish societies, has a two-faced character (its official documents tell the government one thing, but its secret documents another)', that the Alliance's task was 'to guard Judaism from the assimilation with Christian civilisation that was harmful to it'...

"Fears about the Alliance were nourished by the original very emotional appeal of the Alliance's organisers 'to the Jews of all countries, and by forgeries. With regard to Jewish unity it declared as follows: Jews,... If you believe that the Alliance is for you - good, and that in constituting a part of various peoples, you nevertheless can have common feelings, desires and hope... if you think that your disunited attempts, good intentions and the strivings of individual people could become a powerful force, uniting into a single whole and going in one direction and to one goal... support us by your sympathy and cooperation'.

³⁰² Vital, op. cit., pp. 485-486.

"But later there appeared a secondary document which was printed in France - supposedly an appeal of Adolphe Crémieux himself 'To the Jews of the Whole World'. It is very probable that this was a forgery. It is not excluded that it was one of the drafts of an appeal that was not accepted by the organisers of the Alliance (however, it fell in with Brafman's accusations that the Alliance had hidden aims): 'We live in foreign lands and we cannot interest ourselves in the passing interests of these countries as long as our own moral and material interests are in peril... the Jewish teaching must fill the world...'³⁰³ A sharp controversy broke out in the Russian press, at the peak of which I.S. Aksakov in his newspaper *Rus'* concluded that 'the question of the inauthenticity... of the appeal does not in the present case have any particular significance in view of the *authenticity* of the Jewish views and hopes expressed in it'.

"The pre-revolutionary *Jewish Encyclopaedia* writes that in the 70s in the Russian press 'voices in defence of the Jews began to be heard less frequently... In Russian society the thought began to be entrenched that the Jews of all countries were united by a powerful political organisation, the central administration of which was concentrated in the Alliance Israélite Universelle'. So its creation produced in Russia, and perhaps not only in Russia, a reaction that was the reverse of that aimed at by the Alliance."³⁰⁴

The leader of this trend in Russian thought was I.S. Aksakov. Relying especially on Brafman's testimony, he wrote: "The Jews in the Pale of Settlement constitute a 'state within a state', with its own administrative and judicial organs, and with a national government - a state whose centre lies outside Russia, abroad, whose highest authority is the Alliance Israélite Universelle in Paris."³⁰⁵

Another country in which the Alliance's influence was felt was Romania. "At the beginning of the nineteenth century," writes Barbara Jelavich, "the Danubian Principalities had no problem with minorities as such. Their population was in the vast majority Romanian in nationality and Orthodox in religion. This situation changed, however, in the second half of the century, when Russian Jews moved in ever-increasing numbers into the Habsburg Empire and the Principalities. In 1859 about

³⁰³ "The Union which we want to create is not French, English, Swiss or German; it is Jewish, it is universal. The Jew will not become a friend of the Christian or the Muslim before the light of the Jewish faith, the only religion of reason, shines out everywhere among the other peoples and countries that are hostile to our manners and interests. We first of all want to be and remain Jews; *our nationality is the religion of our fathers, and we do not recognize any authority*. We lived in foreign lands and cannot about the changing desires of countries that are completely alien to us while our own material and moral tasks are in danger.

"The Jewish teaching must fill the whole world... The Christian churches are obstacles to the Jewish cause, and it is necessary in the interests of Jewry not only to fight the Christian churches, but also to annihilate them... Our cause is great and holy, and its success guaranteed. Catholicism, our age-old enemy, lies face down, wounded in the head. The net cast by Israel over the whole earthly globe will spread with each day, and the majestic prophecies of our sacred books will finally be fulfilled. The time is approaching when Jerusalem will become a house of prayer for all peoples, and the banner of Jewish monotheism will be unfurled on distant shores. We will take advantage of circumstances. Our power is huge. We shall learn how to apply it for our cause. What have we to be frightened of? Not far distant is the day when all the riches of the earth will pass into the possession of the children of Israel." (italics mine - V.M.).

³⁰⁴ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 178-180.

³⁰⁵ Aksakov, *Rus'*, October 10, 1881; in Cohen and Major, *op. cit.*, p. 627.

118,000 Jews lived in Moldavia and 9,200 in Wallachia. By 1899 the number had increased to 210,000 in Moldavia and 68,000 in Wallachia. They thus formed a minority of about a quarter of a million in a population of 6 million."³⁰⁶

According to David Vital, the Jews were in a worse situation in Romania than in Russia. "The Jews of Russia... were citizens. Theirs were diminished rights - as were, for different reasons and in different respects, those of the peasants of Russia as well. But they were not without rights; and both in theory and in administrative practice their legal situation and their freedoms were superior to those of the peasants... [However,] contrary to Russian practice, let alone that of the central and western European states, the new rulers of Romania set out not only to deny Jews ordinary civic rights, but to place them outside the law of the country altogether and to subject them to a system of arbitrary and punitive rule..."²⁹⁹

The Convention of Paris in 1858 had stipulated, as a condition of Romania's autonomy from Turkey, that "all Moldavians and Wallachians shall be equal in the eye of the law and with regard to taxation, and shall be equally admissible to public employments in both Principalities" (Article XLVI). However, under pressure from the Prince of Moldavia the Powers had agreed that only *Christians* in Moldavia and Wallachia should have political rights. And in 1866, as the central synagogue of Bucharest was being destroyed, the national parliament, led by Ion Bratianu, the minister of finance, enacted Article VII of the new constitution which declared that "only foreigners of the Christian religion may obtain the status of a Romanian".

"Jews were also prevented from buying rural property. Because of these limitations, they tended to congregate in the large cities, particularly in Bucharest and Ia_i, where they took up occupations such as that of merchant or small trader. In the countryside they could be found as stewards on large estates, as owners of inns selling alcoholic drinks, and as moneylenders - occupations that could bring them into conflict with the peasant population."³⁰⁷

At this point the Alliance became involved. "When a greatly agitated Adolphe Crémieux, now the grand old man of western European Jewry, turned to Napoleon III in 1867 to protest against [the Romanians'] conduct he was assured that 'this oppression can neither be tolerated nor understood. I intend to show that to the Prince [Charles].' As good as his word, the emperor telegraphed a reprimand to Bucharest, marginally softened by the ironic conclusion that 'I cannot believe that Your Highness's government authorizes measures so incompatible with humanity and civilization'. The Hohenzollern prince, only recently installed as ruler of the country, still sufficiently uncertain of his status and throne not to be embarrassed by the image Romania and he himself might be presenting to 'Europe', took action. Bratianu was made to resign. Émile Picot, one of the prince's private secretaries, was sent to Paris to meet the directors of the AIU in person (on 22 July 1867) and give them as good an account of the government's position as he was able. Crémieux presiding, the meeting passed off civilly enough although, as Picot's assurances of the good intentions of the Romanian government failed to correspond to what the AIU knew of the true conditions on the ground in Romania itself, the effort to mollify the Parisian notables failed. Crémieux

³⁰⁶ Jelavich, *History of the Balkans, vol. 2: Twentieth Century*, Cambridge University Press, 1983, p. 26.

³⁰⁷ Jelavich, *op.cit.*, p. 26.

then addressed himself directly to Prince Charles. Hardly less than imperious, his language speaks volumes both for the mounting indignation with which the condition of Romanian Jewry had come to be regarded by the leading members of the western European Jewish communities and for the historically unprecedented self-assurance with which many of them now approached their public duty. 'The moment has come, Prince,' Crémieux wrote, 'to employ [your] legitimate authority and break off this odious course of events.' Bratianu should be dismissed 'absolutely'. The savage measures taken against the Jews should be annulled. The unfortunates who had been torn violently from their homes must be allowed to return. For the rest, 'Inform [the country] that nothing will be neglected to erase the traces of this evil, pursue without respite the newspapers that have for the past year continually engaged in incitement to hatred, contempt, assassination, and expulsion of the Jews, dismiss all the cowardly officials who have lent a violent hand to this dreadful persecution and deal energetically with all violence directed at the Jews from this time on.'

"One may assume that this made unpleasant reading for Prince Charles, but it remained without real effect. Bratianu was not dismissed 'absolutely'. He was, on the contrary, given a new post. The press was not restrained. Officials engaged in active persecution of Jews were not removed from office. And after 1870 and the plummeting of French prestige, Émile Picot, a Frenchman, was out of favour in Bucharest anyway and the channel he had opened to western Jewry collapsed - as, of course, did the political weight ascribed in Bucharest to the AIU itself."³⁰⁸

However, the French had another chance at the Congress of Berlin in 1878, demanding that the independence of Romania would be recognised on the same terms as that of Bulgaria and Serbia - that is, acceptance of Article XLIV, which guaranteed equality of treatment in all places and in all circumstances for members of all religious creeds. The Russian Foreign Minister Gorchakov "tried to block the move, arguing that the Jews of Russia and Romania were a social scourge, not to be confused with the fine merchants of London, Paris, Berlin and Vienna".³⁰⁹ But the French, supported by Bismarck and Disraeli, won the day.

Since Article XLIV contravened the provisions of the constitution of 1866, it "required a special act of the assembly. Most Romanian leaders regarded the measure as an unwarranted interference in their internal affairs, an issue on which they were particularly sensitive. In fact, the government never fully complied with the intent of the treaty. In 1879, under great pressure, it was agreed that Jews could become naturalized citizens, but special action would have to be taken on each individual case. The Jewish question was to remain controversial and to cause many problems in the future..."³¹⁰

This seemed to demonstrate the impotence of the Jews in one part of Europe to help their compatriots in another. On the other hand, "the campaign mounted on behalf of Romanian Jewry had been remarkably well organized and well supported... The exertions of the notables and philanthropic organizations of western and central European Jewry on behalf of the Romanian Jews added more

³⁰⁸ Vital, *op. cit.*, pp. 495-496.

³⁰⁹ Glenny, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

³¹⁰ Jelavich, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

than a mite to the mythology of the 'international power' of the Jews"³¹¹ - if it was only a myth...

³¹¹ Vital, *op. cit.*, pp. 504, 505.

35. THE REVOLUTION FROM BELOW

Russia and Romania were the only two countries that refused to give full rights to the Jews – for reasons, as we have seen, that were fully comprehensible. If poor peasants were to be protected from merciless exploitation by the Jews, – indeed, if the poorer Jews themselves were to be protected from the dictatorial control of the rabbis, – then some restrictions had to be placed on the latter. The basis for these restrictions – in Russia, at any rate – was not racial, but religious: only Talmudic Jews, those who accepted the blood-curdling hatred of the Talmud, suffered restrictions. Other categories of Jews – for example, the Karaites, who rejected the Talmud – were free of all restrictions. Even for the Talmudists, the restrictions were very loosely applied, and did not prevent many Jews from getting a good education in Russian universities and enriching themselves.

However, the simple fact that the Russian State did not submit completely to the contemporary fashion for giving the Jews everything they asked for meant that it was enemy number one for the Jewish leadership. Moreover, as Mikhail Nazarov writes, there were other powerful reasons for the Jews to hate Russia: "Already Suvorov's campaign in Europe against the armies of revolutionary France in 1799 ('God save the kings!' said Paul I to the commander as he left), the victory of Russia over the 'usurper' Napoleon and the creation of the monarchist Sacred Union in 1815, the crushing of the bourgeois-democratic rebellion in Poland in 1831, the interference into the European bourgeois revolution of 1848-1849, when the Russian army gave help to the Austrian monarchy in Hungary – had demonstrated before the eyes of the powers behind the scenes that Russia was the withholding power of the old Christian world-order in Europe (in the sense of the Apostle Paul's words, cf. II Thessalonians 2.7)."³¹²

Only the power and independence of the Russian State meant that the methods of gradual infiltration and control of the financial levers of power that had proved so successful in Western Europe would be insufficient to overthrow Russia – there were no Rothschilds, and certainly no Disraelis in Russia! Revolution from above was impossible; so it had to be revolution from below. But this revolution did not have to be carried out by Jews or with the aim of establishing a Jewish kingdom. It could be carried out by Gentiles for intrinsically Gentile ideals, such as "Freedom, Equality and Fraternity". The important thing was that it should succeed in destroying the Russian State. It would then be up to the secret Jewish leaders living abroad to turn the destruction to their advantage, to the building of a Jewish kingdom.

This strategy of revolution from below was offered in two forms: the anarchist revolution favoured by the Russian nobleman Michael Bakunin, and the socialist revolution favoured by Marx and Engels.

³¹² Nazarov, "Krovavaia mest' slavianskim varvaram" (Bloody revenge on the Slavic barbarians), address to the international scientific conference, 'The Jewish-Bolshevik coup of 1917 as the precondition of the red terror and forced starvations', <http://www.livejournal.com/users/rocornews/174447.html>.

Marxism's main aims, as declared in *The Communist Manifesto* of 1848, were the destruction of private property, the destruction of the family and the destruction of religion as a prelude to the triumph of the proletariat and the coming of communism. However, the revolution of 1848 had been a failure from the socialist point of view. And after that failure a mild conservative reaction set in throughout Europe as some of the wealth generated by a period of rapid growth in the world economy trickled down to the workers and dulled their zeal for revolution. But as their numbers increased in direct proportion to the increase in factory production, so did their power. And it only took another downturn in the economy to bring them out on the streets.

In 1864 Marx founded the International Working Men's Association in London. In his Inaugural Address he showed how the industrial revolution had impoverished the English working class, and declared: "In all countries of Europe it has now become a truth demonstrable to every unprejudiced mind, and only denied by those whose interest is to hedge other people in a fool's paradise, that no improvement of machinery, no appliance of science to production, no contrivances of communication, no new colonies, no emigration, no opening of markets, no free trade, nor all these things put together, will do away with the miseries of the industrious masses." Marx continued to control this, the First Internationale, until its Congress in Basle in 1869, when the delegates were captivated by Michael Bakunin.³¹³

The basic difference between Marx and Bakunin was in their attitude to the State. While Marx called for the overthrow of the old regimes, he was not against the State as such, at any rate before the advent of the communist paradise, and believed that the State could be used to free the workers. And the importance of the State in his thinking, combined with a more "scientific" and collectivist approach, became more pronounced with time.

"It meant," as M.S. Anderson writes, "a fundamental change of emphasis in his thinking. The fulfilment and true freedom of the individual still remained the objective of revolution and the end of the historical process. As far as the making of revolutions was concerned, however, his 'alienation' and his revolutionary consciousness, so important in the early works of the 1840s and still important in those of the 1850s, were now threatened with submersion in a vast and impersonal process of social evolution governed by laws analogous to those of the physical world and quite impossible to divert or restrain."³¹⁴

Bakunin, however, believed that the State was simply another form of oppression and had to be destroyed. "I am not a Communist," he said, "because Communism, by concentrating all property in the State, necessarily leads to the concentration of all the power of society in the State. I want to abolish the State."³¹⁵ Like the French philosopher-anarchist Proudhon, Bakunin believed that all property was theft, and that included State property. Like Proudhon again, he believed that States would be replaced by local workers' organizations.

³¹³ Edmund Wilson, *To the Finland Station*, London: Phoenix, 2004, pp. 256-258, 259-260, 261.

³¹⁴ M.S. Anderson, *The Ascendancy of Europe, 1815-1914*, London: Longman, 1985, pp. 350-351.

³¹⁵ Bakunin, in Julius Braunthal, *History of the International 1864-1914*, 1966, p. 139.

Bakunin's most famous remark was: "The desire to destroy is also a creative desire." "The whole of Europe," he said, with St. Petersburg, Paris and London, will be transformed into an enormous rubbish-heap." "The miracles of the revolution," he said, "will come out of the depths of this fiery ocean. Russia is the aim of the revolution, its greatest forces will be unleashed there, and there it will attain its perfection." "The constellation of the revolution will rise high and beautiful in Moscow out of the sea of blood and will become the guiding star for the good of the whole of liberated humanity..."

In 1883 Engels criticised Bakunin's anarchism, writing: "The anarchists have put the thing upside down. They declare that the proletarian revolution must *begin* by doing away with the political organisation of the state... But to destroy it at such a moment would be to destroy the only organism by means of which the victorious proletariat can assert its newly-conquered power, hold down its capitalist adversaries and carry out that economic revolution of society without which the whole victory must end in a new defeat and in a mass slaughter of the workers similar to those after the Paris Commune."³¹⁶

True; and yet "Bakuninist" anarchism corresponded more closely to the spirit of the revolution than all the treatises of Marx, whose only purpose was to give a pseudo-scientific justification to an essentially destructive, satanic force. Thus the victory of Bakunin over Marx at the meeting of the First Internationale in Bâle was no accident - the delegates recognized in Bakunin the true incarnation of the spirit of the revolution. As Baron Wrangel said of his speech: "I no longer remember what Bakunin said, and it would in any case scarcely be possible to reproduce it. His speech had neither logical sequence nor richness in ideas, but consisted of thrilling phrases and rousing appeals. It was something elemental and incandescent - a raging storm with lightning flashes and thunderclaps, and a roaring as of lions. The man was a born speaker, made for the revolution. The revolution was his natural being. His speech made a tremendous impression. If he had asked his hearers to cut each other's throats, they would have cheerfully obeyed him."³¹⁷

One of those present at Bakunin's speech was Dostoyevsky. He said that the whole speech had been "without the slightest proof, all this learned by rote twenty years ago and not changed one bit. Fire and sword! And when all has been destroyed, then, in their opinion, there will be peace..." Dostoyevsky had no time for Bakunin's atheist slogans: "As long as God exists, man is a slave" and: "Man is rational, just, free, therefore there is no God." Already in *Notes from the Underground* (1864) Dostoyevsky had demonstrated that man in his fallen state was quite *irrational*, and would never be happy with rationalist schemes for his happiness. "I would not be at all surprised, for instance, if suddenly and without the slightest possible reason a gentleman of ignoble or rather reactionary and sardonic countenance were to arise amid all that coming reign of universal common sense and, gripping his sides firmly with his hands, were to say to us all. 'Well, gentlemen, what about giving all this common sense a great

³¹⁶ Engels, in Chomsky, *Understanding Power*, pp. 31-32

³¹⁷ Wrangel, in Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

kick and letting it shiver in the dust before our feet simply to send all these logarithms to the devil so that we again live according to our silly will?"³¹⁸

And yet Bakunin's anarchism was not just thunder and lightning. For him "the withering away of the State" was not, as in Marx and Engels, an essentially utopian idea that ill accorded with the central idea of class struggle³¹⁹: for him, it was the heart of the matter. Being a more consistent libertarian than any of the Marxists, he perceived that even the socialist State would be an instrument of oppression. In fact, he warned that the "red bureaucracy" would be "the vilest and most dangerous lie of the century". And in 1870 he accurately predicted what actually took place in 1917: "Take the most radical of revolutionaries and place him on the throne of all the Russias or give him dictatorial powers, and before the year is out he will be worse than the Tsar himself."

Bakunin's vision of socialism looked more likely than Marx's to triumph in the years 1869-1871, between the Basle Congress and the Paris Commune. However, Marx defeated Bakunin by claiming that the Paris Commune was the beginning of the new proletarian (as opposed to bourgeois) revolution, which would spread from France to Germany to all Europe. It did spread, but not in the way he predicted: its first success was in peasant Russia, not proletarian Germany - as Bakunin, not Marx, had predicted. For Bakunin was able to foresee, as Sir Isaiah Berlin wrote, "that [revolutions] were liable to develop not in the most industrialised societies, on a rising curve of economic progress, but in countries in which the majority of the population was near subsistence level and had least to lose by an upheaval - primitive peasants in conditions of desperate poverty in backward rural economies where capitalism was weakest, such as Spain and Russia."³²⁰

However, Marx and Engels had this in common with Bakunin: they saw clearly that the enemy that had to be destroyed for the revolution to succeed was Russia. As Engels said: "Not one revolution in Europe and in the whole world can attain final victory while the present Russian state exists."³²¹

³¹⁸ Dostoyevsky, *Notes from the Underground*, in *The Best Stories of Dostoyevsky*, New York, 1955, p. 136. Already in the eighteenth century the Scottish philosopher David Hume had argued that "reason alone can never be a motive to any action of the will," and reason "can never oppose passion in the direction of the will". For "'tis not contrary to reason to prefer the destruction of the whole world to the scratching of my finger" (*A Treatise of Human Nature*, book II, section 3).

³¹⁹ Gareth Stedman-Jones writes: "Visions of the disappearance of the state [in Marx] belonged to the 1840s: 1848 dashed these innocent hopes" ("The Routes of Revolution", *BBC History Magazine*, vol. 3 (6), June, 2002, p. 36).

³²⁰ Berlin, "Nationalism", in *The Proper Study of Mankind*, London: Pimlico, 1998, p. 584. In fact, the peasants of Russia were not as poor, comparatively speaking, as is often thought. See the recollections of English travellers in Krivosheev and Krivosheev, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

³²¹ Friedrich Engels, *Karl Marx and the Revolutionary Movement in Russia*.

36. A JEWISH WORLD GOVERNMENT?

In the second half of the nineteenth century, the Jewish undermining of Christian civilization was proceeding on many fronts: religious, political and economic, in the East and in the West, from above and from below. As the future over-procurator of the Russian Holy Synod, Constantine Pobedonostsev, wrote to Dostoyevsky in 1879: "They are at the root of the revolutionary socialist movement and of regicide, they own the periodical press, they have in their hands the financial markets; the people as a whole fall into financial slavery to them; they even control the principles of contemporary science and strive to place it outside of Christianity."

These developments were, of course, noted by many people in many countries. And the question that occupied these minds was: were all these assaults directed by a single hidden centre of operations? In other words, was there a universal Jewish conspiracy?

On the face of it, such a proposition seemed very unlikely. The Jews had never, since the fall of Jerusalem, been united territorially; they had no homeland, and no national capital. There were big cultural differences between the Ashkenazi Jews in the East and the Sephardic Jews in the West. From an ideological point of view the differences were still sharper; it was difficult to believe that both the devoutly religious and super-capitalist Rothschilds, on the one hand, and the fanatically anti-religious and anti-capitalist Marxists, on the other, were being controlled and manipulated by a single secret rabbinical centre.

Nevertheless, doubts remained... And they were fed by statements from some of the most prominent Jews themselves, who believed that members of their own race were striving precisely for world domination. Thus Disraeli "made sensational statements about Jewish and secret society conspiracies running Europe's public affairs. In *Coningsby*, a novel published in 1844, he had one character declare that 'The first Jesuits were Jews... that mighty revolution which is at this moment preparing in Germany,... and of which so little is yet known in England, is entirely developing under the auspices of Jews.' Two pages further, a character makes an even more ominous statement, one quoted time and again by conspiracy theorists: 'So you see, my dear Coningsby, that the world is governed by very different personages from what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes.' Nor did Disraeli confine himself to making such statements in fictional works. In a biographical work of 1852, he asserted that Jews 'wish to destroy that ungrateful Christendom.' He even took his conspiracism to the floor of Parliament, announcing in 1856 that 'a British Minister has boasted - and a very unwise boast it was - that he had only to hold up his hand and he could raise a revolution in Italy to-morrow. It was an indiscreet boast, but I believe it not impossible, with the means at his disposal, that he might succeed. What would happen? You would have a republic formed on extreme principles.'"³²²

³²² Daniel Pipes, *Conspiracy: how the paranoid style flourishes and where it comes from*, New York: The Free Press, 1997, p. 32.

Again, Adolphe Crémieux, one of the most westernized and successful Jews of the time, and at one time the minister of justice in the French government, wrote: "The Messianism of the new era must arise and develop; the Jerusalem of the New World Order, which is established in holiness between the East and Asia, must occupy the place of two forces: the kings and the popes... Nationality must disappear. Religion must cease to exist. Only Israel will not cease to exist, since this little people is chosen by God."³²³

In response to the question whether the Jews had a secret government Tikhomirov wrote: "The main defender of this thesis is Copen Albancelli. His argumentation is based not so much on any factual data, of which, in essence, there are none, as on logic.

"The question,' he writes, 'can be summarised in very few words. In order that the descendants of the ancient nation of the Jews should preserve the ideal of this nation, it is necessary that their generations should be bound amongst themselves in space and time by one organisation, one government. This is necessary for the simple reason that the Jewish race is ruled by the same laws of nature as all other races. This government, it is true, has not manifested itself since the 9th century (the end of the Resh Golut), but the conditions of existence ruling over the Jewish people from the time of its dispersal have been such that its government could not exist, if it were well-known. Since it had to exist, it had to become secret.' Perhaps, he says, the majority even of the Jews know nothing about it, but this does not prove its non-existence.

"But where are these ruling circles directing their nation? Since the matter is secret, of course, we can only make guesses, the more so in that no powerful organization and no government has set itself the task of making any kind of investigation into the question whether the Jews have any world plans and how these are to be achieved. In this area we have only the surmises of the anti-Semites, and in particular Copen Albancelli, which we cannot fail to mention for lack of any more positive material. Copen Albancelli's assertions come down to the following. But first we must note that Albancelli was a Freemason for quite a long time (eight years) and attained in it the degree of Rosicrucian, which is quite high in the degrees of classification - the 18th degree. True, Copen Albancelli considers that after the 33 degrees of capitularies a new layer of the organization of Masonry begins - an 'invisible' layer, and on top of that yet another layer of the now [purely] Jewish administration of Masonry. But although, in this way, Copen Albancelli was still far from the highest degrees, nevertheless with great skill he was able to notice and listen into a lot. However they may be, these are his presuppositions.

"First of all, he considers that the secret Jewish government has as its weapon of influence in the extra-Jewish world - precisely the Masonic organization, which subconsciously carries out the aims of the Jewish government. But the aim of the latter is the universal dominion of the Jews.

³²³ Crémieux, *Archives Israelites* (Israelite Archives), 1861, N 25.

"The aim of the Masonic machinations,' says Copen, 'is not the destruction but the submission of the Christian world. The Jewish Secret Government (Pouvoir Occulte) wishes to destroy *the Christian spirit* because the Christian spirit constitutes the true defense of the world born from it. In exactly the same way if this secret government destroyed the French monarchy, it was only because this monarchy was the best defense of France.' 'The dream [of universal mastery] is supported in the heart of the Jewish people by its religion. The Jews at first thought that mastery would come about sometime, would be given to their race by a triumphant Messiah. But now the idea has spread amongst them that the word 'Messiah' must be applied not to a certain son of the Israelite race, but to the race itself, and that the conquest of the world can be carried out without the use of weapons. They are now convinced that the future victor will be the Jewish people itself, and that the Messianic times are those in which this people will succeed in subduing to itself the world begotten by the Christian Messiah, who has for so long taken the place appointed for the true messiah, that is, the Jews themselves.'

"The dream of universal dominion, continues Copen, is not new to humanity. Other peoples also dreamed of universal dominion. 'Perhaps this idea was not always the ruling one for Israel to the extent that it is now.' It developed gradually. But to the degree that they seized the most powerful weapon - gold - this dream matured. The successes of Masonry strengthened it. 'Jewry has begun to see the growth of its might in every corner of the globe in proportion as the power of the solidarity, and consequently resistance of the Christian races has declined as the result of the loss of tradition. Its government sees everything while not being seen by anyone. For that reason it probably bursts out when nobody is even thinking of defending himself against it, since nobody knows of its existence. In such conditions it would be complete senselessness on the part of the Jewish government if it did not come to the idea of conquering the world which nothing or almost nothing is defending... Having accomplished a miracle - the keeping of the race that had wandered over the world in fidelity to its ancient national ideal - and seeing that the other races senselessly consider progress to be the abandonment of their ideals the Jewish government must have recognized itself capable of giving its own people rule over the whole world.'

"But in order to secure dominion a new organization of the subject races is needed. Every ruler over peoples strives to give them an organization adapted to the possibility of administering them. For the Jews in this respect it was necessary to destroy nationality. This is now taking place under the banner of progress. But in the place of an organization growing on the soil of nationality, another one is needed: it is being prepared in the form of socialism.

"We,' says Copen Albancelli, 'are going towards a universal republic because only under it can the financial, industrial and commercial kingdom of the Jews be realized. But under the mask of a republic this kingdom will be infinitely more despotic than any other. This will be absolutely the same mastery as that which man organizes over the animals. The Jewish race will hold us by means of our needs. It will lean on a well-chosen police force, well organized and richly rewarded. Besides this police force, in this new society there will be only

administrators, directors and engineers, on the one hand, and workers on the other. The workers will all be non-Jews, while the administrators and engineers will be Jews... The peoples themselves will facilitate the destruction in their midst of every power besides the State, while it will be insinuated to them that the State possessing everything is they themselves. They will not cease to work on their own enslavement until the Jews will tell them: "Excuse us, you have not understood us in the right way. The all-possessing State is not you, but *we*." Then the peoples will try to rebel, but it will be too late, for their moral and material springs that are necessary for action will already have disappeared. Flocks cannot resist dogs trained to watch over them. The only thing that the working world will be able to do is refuse to work. But the Jews will not be so stupid as not to foresee this. They will lay up enough stores for themselves and their guard dogs, while they will starve the resisters to death. If necessary, they will hurl onto the rebels their police force, which will be invincible and provided with the most advanced means of destruction.'

"That is the plan of the Secret Government,' says Copen Albancelli, 'the establishment of the universal dominion of the Jews by means of the organisation of collectivism under the form of a universal republic. Masonry will lead us to the realization of this.'"³²⁴

Nesta Webster confirmed this link between the Jews, Masonry and the world state: "The formula of the 'United States of Europe' and of the 'Universal Republic' [was] first proclaimed by the Illuminatus Anacharsis Cloutz", whose *La République universelle* was published in 1793. "It has long been the slogan of the French lodges."³²⁵ And "in 1867," writes Lebedev, "the Masons created the 'International League of Peace and Freedom' with Garibaldi at its head. In it for the first time the idea of *the United States of Europe* under Masonic leadership was put forward."³²⁶

"But of course," notes Tikhomirov, "the very forms of collectivism can give way to a single Jewish national organization."³²⁷ In other words, the Jewish leaders of Masonry might wish to destroy the various nationalisms of Europe in order to create a single socialist republic, but only as a steppingstone to the realization of their own nationalist dreams. For, as Baruch Levy wrote to Marx: "The Jewish people as a whole will be its own Messiah. It will attain world dominion by the dissolution of other races, by the abolition of frontiers, the annihilation of monarchy, and by the establishment of a world republic in which the Jews will everywhere exercise the privilege of citizenship. In this 'new world order' the children of Israel will furnish all the leaders without encountering opposition. The Governments of the different peoples forming the world republic will fall without difficulty into the hands of the Jews. It will then be possible for the Jewish rulers to abolish private property, and everywhere to make use of the resources of the state. Thus will the promise of the Talmud be fulfilled, in which it is said that

³²⁴ Tikhomirov, op. cit., pp. 377-378.

³²⁵ Webster, *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, Christian Book Club of America, 1924, p. 275.

³²⁶ Lebedev, *Velikorossia* (Great Russia), St. Petersburg, 1997, p. 35.

³²⁷ Tikhomirov, op. cit., pp. 378

when the Messianic time is come, the Jews will have all the property of the whole world in their hands."³²⁸

³²⁸ Levy, *La Revue de Paris* (Paris Review), June 1, 1928, p. 574; in Eddie Kadach, "The Jews' God", <http://www.stormfront.org/posterity/ci/tjg.html>.

37. THE JEWS UNDER ALEXANDER III

On March 1, 1881 Tsar Alexander II was assassinated out by a revolutionary organization called "The People's Will", which consisted mainly of Jews. This fact, in the words of Bishop Anthony (Khrapovitsky), "clarified for people who were capable of at any rate some thought that these murders and blasphemies were not at all the expression of the people's will, but on the contrary, a shameful spitting at that will. Moreover, they proceeded not so much from an honourable predilection for false theories as from the hands of the natural enemies of the fatherland – people of another race and nation, who were being rewarded with a corresponding financial payment."³²⁹

Paradoxically, however, the Jews who joined the revolutionary movement and killed the Tsar were not religious Jews who believed in the Talmud, but atheists – and their atheism had been taught them in Russian schools by Russian teachers who had abandoned their own, Orthodox faith and adopted the faith of the revolutionary thinkers of the West.

But this distinction was lost on the ordinary people, who suffered in their everyday life from (religious) Jews that exploited and deceived them, and believed that the (atheist) Jews who killed the Tsar must be of the same kind. Moreover, the violence of the act profoundly shocked them; for, as Alexander Solzhenitsyn explains, "that the deaths of the heirs or tsars of the previous century – Alexis Petrovich, Ivan Antonovich, Peter III, Paul – were violent remained unknown to the people. The murder of March 1, 1881 shocked the minds of the whole people. For the masses of the simple people, and especially the peasants, it was as if the foundations of their life were being shaken. But again, as the narodovoltsy had calculated, this could not fail to be reflected in some kind of explosion. And it was. But in an unpredictable way: in pogroms against the Jews in New Russia and Ukraine."³³⁰

On April 15 the first pogrom broke out in Elizavettgrad. It spread to Kiev and Kishinev and Odessa. The government reacted energetically: in Kiev 1400 people were arrested.

However, there were not enough policemen for the scale of the disturbances, and "the government recognised that it had been insufficiently active. An official declaration proclaimed that in the Kiev pogrom 'measures to rein in the crowd had not been undertaken quickly and energetically enough'. In June, 1881 the director of the department of police, V.K. Plehve, in his report to the sovereign on the situation in Kiev province named 'as one of the reasons "for the development of the disturbances and their not very speedy suppression" the fact that the military court "'was very condescending to the accused, and very superficial in

³²⁹ Khrapovitsky, "Dorogie vospominania" (Treasured Reminiscences), *Tsarskij Vestnik (Royal Herald)*, in Archbishop Nikon (Rklitskly), *Zhizneopisanie Blazhennejshago Antonia, Mitropolita Kievskago i Galitskago* (Biography of his Beatitude Anthony, Metropolitan of Kiev and Galich), New York, 1971, volume 1, p. 26.

³³⁰ Solzhenitsyn, *Dvesti let vmeste* (Two Hundred Years Together), Moscow, 2001, part 1, p. 185.

approaching the affair'. Alexander III commented on the report: 'This is unforgiveable'.³³¹

Many western historians have accused the Tsarist government of complicity in the pogroms. But in fact, as David Vital admits, "Alexander did display genuine dismay and dissatisfaction when reports of the weak and ineffective conduct of the security forces were brought to him; and fury when he learned of cases of military officers and men having actually joined the mob. *His* instructions were to deal firmly with rioters, to see to it that their leaders were severely flogged; and to make clear to the civil and military authorities alike that their business was to restore and maintain order before all else.... All in all then, while much was murky in official Russia at this time, the grounds for positing a momentarily disoriented, intrinsically inefficacious government not so much stimulating as failing to cope with simmering, popular, generalized discontent seem solid enough."³³²

Again, Dominic Lieven writes: "... The pogroms were terrible but they were a long way from the systematic ethnic cleansing, let alone genocide, of whole peoples which were to be the strategies of supposedly more civilized European people towards the Jews. Moreover, all recent research emphasizes that the tsarist central government itself did not organize or instigate pogroms, though local authorities sometimes winked at them and more often were slow to stamp on them. Tsarist ministers did not connive in murder and were in any case deeply uneasy at outbreaks of mass violence and very scared that the 'dark people's' uncontrollable propensity for anarchic settling of scores might easily target the ruling classes themselves. On the other hand, it is the case that knowledge of their superiors' frequent antipathy to the Jews could encourage junior officials to believe that failure to stop pogroms could go unpunished..."³³³

"The reasons for the pogroms were earnestly investigated and discussed by contemporaries. Already in 1872, after the Odessa pogrom, the governor-general of the South-Western region had warned in a report that such an event could happen again in his region, for 'here hatred and enmity towards the Jews is rooted in history and only the material dependence of the peasants on them at the present, together with the administration's measures, holds back an explosion of discontent in the Russian population against the Jewish race'. The governor-general reduced the essence of the matter to economics: 'I have counted and estimated the commercial-industrial property belonging to the Jews in the South-Western region, and at the same time have pointed to the fact that the Jews, having taken eagerly to the renting of landowners' lands, have leased them out again to the peasants on very onerous terms'. And this causal nexus 'was generally recognised in the pogrom years of 1881'.

"In the spring of 1881 Loris-Melikov had also reported to the Sovereign: 'At the root of the present disturbances lies the profound hatred of the local population

³³¹ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

³³² Vital, *A People Apart: The Jews in Europe 1789-1939*, Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 288, 289.

³³³ Lieven, *Empire*, London: John Murray, 2000, p. 277.

for the Jews who have enslaved them. But this has undoubtedly been used by evil-minded people.”³³⁴

This was true: the “evil-minded” revolutionaries, both Russian and Jewish, used the hatred to their own end. And yet it is little wonder that conservative opinion, while deploring the pogroms, saw the root cause of the Jews’ problems in the Jews themselves, in their economic exploitation of the peasants. When Loris-Melikov was succeeded in 1881 by Count N.P. Ignatiev, the latter, on the instructions of the emperor, sent him a memorandum on the causes of the pogroms. In it, writes Geoffrey Hosking, he outlined “his fears about domination by ‘alien forces’. In it he linked the whole Westernizing trend with the Jews and the Poles... ‘In Petersburg there exists a powerful Polish-Jewish group in whose hands are directly concentrated, the stock exchange, the *advokatura*, a good part of the press and other public affairs. In many legal and illegal ways they enjoy immense influence on officialdom and on the course of affairs in general.’ They used this influence to mould public opinion in the interests of their favourite schemes: ‘the broadest possible rights for Poles and Jews, and representative institutions on the western model. Every honest voice from the Russian land is drowned out by Polish-Jewish clamours that one must only listen to the ‘intelligentsia’ and that Russian demands should be rejected as old-fashioned and unenlightened.”³³⁵

Among the most important causes of the pogroms, write M. and Yu. Krivoshein, Ignatiev “mentioned the changed economic condition of the peasants after the reform of 1861: having become personally free, but unskilled in financial operations, the peasants gradually fell into dependence on the local Jewish usurers and, in this way, peasant gardens, lands, cattle, etc. began to pass over to the latter. Explosions of popular anger followed.

“In his turn the very prominent banker Baron G.O. Ginzburg interceded before the emperor for the usurers who had been beaten up by the peasants, imploring him not to allow repressions against his co-religionists. The banker’s reply was Count N.P. Ignatiev’s speech in the name of Alexander III before a deputation of Jewish society:

“... ‘Your situation is not comforting, but it depends to a great extent on you to correct it. Living amidst a population that is foreign to you, you have drawn upon yourselves such hatred that for several months I was forced to apply force merely to protect you. Investigations have by no means confirmed your favourite ploy, that they are attacking you as proprietors. Still less can what has happened in the south be ascribed to religious intolerance. The Russian people, like the state, is very tolerant in matters of faith – it takes a lot to draw it out of its tolerance. In the East there live many people of other races amidst the Russian population who are not Christians. However, it is not necessary to employ armies there in order to defend them.

³³⁴ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

³³⁵ Hosking, *op. cit.*, p. 390.

“While being profoundly sorrowful over the disorders that have taken place, and doing everything that depends on me to prevent them in the future, I warn you that I will not act in a one-sided manner. On reviewing the causes of the disorders, and having studied their details, it is impossible not to recognize that in many cases they have been elicited by the Jews themselves; lengthy cohabitation with the Jews has rooted the conviction in the local population that there is no law which the Jew would not be able to bypass.

“One can rely on the bayonet, but one cannot sit on it. Remember that you are being protected, but that it is impossible to tolerate a situation in which it is constantly necessary to protect the Jews from the consequences of popular anger. Try to search out for yourselves productive occupations, labouring with your own hands, abandon tavern-keeping and usury... I am willing and ready to assist you in everything that can accelerate your transition to agricultural, craft and factory work, but of course you will find in me a very powerful opponent if you, under the guise of crafts and other productive occupations, develop throughout the provinces of Russia the trades that you usually practise now.

“I will end the way I began: as long as you keep your kahal organization, your cohesion and your striving to take everything into your hands, while violating the laws of the country, you will in no way be able to count on privileges and a broadening of your rights or places of settlement, which will create fresh complications...”³³⁶

The importance of the kahal organization was especially emphasized by Archbishop Nicanor of Odessa and Kherson: “Religion is the basis of the powerful Jewish spirit. The more or less secret-open religious organisation of the kahal is that mighty, many-cylindered machine which moves the millions of Jews to secretly planned ends. Only a blind man could not see how terrible and threatening is this power! It is striving for nothing less than the enslavement of the world!... In the last century it has had horrific successes by relying on European liberalism, on equality before the law, etc. It is mixing up people of other faiths more and more closely, while it rules its own people like a machine. All the Jews are in essence like one man. We reason in a liberal way whether it is useful or harmful to ban bazaars on feast-days. But the secret Jewish power says to its own people: ‘Don’t you dare! Honour the Sabbath! Honour the law of your fathers! The law gives life and power to Jewry!’ And look: not a single Jew dares to go out on Saturday from Nikolaev to Kherson or Odessa. The railway trains are empty, while the steamer services between these great cities stop completely. It is strange and offensive for the Christian people and such a great Kingdom as ours! But what a foreign power! And how bold and decisive it is. This is a religious power coming from the religious organisation of the kahal.”³³⁷

³³⁶ Krivosheev Yu. & Krivosheev, V., *Istoria Rossijskoj Imperii, 1861-1894* (A History of the Russian Empire, 1861-1894), St. Petersburg, 2000, pp. 99, 106.

³³⁷ Archbishop Nicanor, in Fomin and Fomina, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 351. Of course, the kahal, that “state within a state”, was supposed to have been abolished in the reign of Nicholas I. Evidently, the Jews had managed to get round that law...

In May, 1882 the government issued new “temporary rules” which “forbade Jews to resettle or acquire property in rural areas, even within the Pale, while outside it the police were instructed to enforce restrictions on Jewish residence which had previously been widely flouted. In the following years Jews were barred from entering the advokatura and the military-medical professions, while a numerus clausus was imposed on their admission to secondary and higher education in general. They were also denied the vote in zemstvo and municipal elections. In 1891, at Passover, there was a mass expulsion of illegal resident Jews from Moscow, which deprived the city of two-thirds of its Jewish population.”³³⁸

The Jewish radicals of the previous reign had seen themselves as *joining* Russian culture, whose famous writers had been their idols. Unfortunately, however, the pogroms served to radicalize Jewish youth still further and in an opposite direction, so that their radicalism was now nationalist rather than internationalist, and anti-Russian rather than pro-Russian.

As Solzhenitsyn writes: “The general turning-point in Jewish consciousness in Russia after 1881-82 could not fail, of course, to be reflected to some extent also in the consciousness of the Jewish revolutionaries in Russia. These youths had first left Jewry, but afterwards many returned, ‘the departure from “Jew street” and return to the people’, ‘our historical destiny is bound up with the Jewish ghetto, and from it comes our national essence’. Until the pogroms of 1881-82 ‘it absolutely never entered the head of any of us revolutionaries to think about the necessity’ of publicly explaining the role of the Jews in the revolutionary movement. But the pogroms elicited ‘amongst... the majority of my compatriots an explosion of discontent’. And so ‘not only the intelligent Jews in general, but also some revolutionary Jews, who previously had felt not the slightest bond with their nationality... suddenly recognised themselves as obliged to devote their strength and abilities to their unjustly persecuted compatriots’. ‘The pogroms brought out previously hidden feelings and made the youth more sensitive to the sufferings of their people, and the people more receptive to revolutionary ideas.’³³⁹

And yet there is reason to believe that the great wave of Jewish emigration from Russia to the West in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries – about two million Jews emigrated to America alone before 1914³⁴⁰ – was not elicited primarily by the pogroms. A more important factor, probably, was the introduction of a state monopoly on the sale of alcohol in 1896.

Solzhenitsyn writes: “There is no doubt about it: the introduction of the state wine monopoly turned out to be a very powerful blow at the economy of Russian Jewry. And right up to the World War itself, when it more or less came to an end, the state wine monopoly continued to be a favourite target of public displeasure – although only it introduced strict control over the quality of the spirits sold in the country and their purity. And although the state monopoly also removed the livelihood of Christian publicans..., it was nevertheless made out to be primarily an anti-Jewish measure: ‘The introduction of the state sale of wines in the Pale of

³³⁸ Hosking, *op. cit.*, pp. 392-393.

³³⁹ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

³⁴⁰ Paul Johnson, *A History of the Jews*, London: Phoenix, 1995, p. 370.

Settlement at the end of the 90s deprived more than 100,000 Jews of their livelihood', 'the authorities counted on pushing the Jews out of their village localities', and from that time 'trade in alcohol did not have its former significance for the Jews'.

"And it is precisely from the end of the 19th century that the emigration of Jews from Russia intensified. Its statistical link with the introduction of the state sale of wines has not been established, but these 100,000 lost livelihoods point to it. In any case, the Jewish emigration (to America) did not increase substantially until 1886-87, jumped for a short time in 1891-92, and its long and massive rise began in 1897..."³⁴¹

However, other means of exploiting the Christian peasantry remained. 18% of the Jews before the revolution, about one million people, were occupied in the sale of bread. And sometimes they would hoard the harvest and refuse to sell it so that the prices should fall. "It is not by accident that in the 90s of the nineteenth century *agricultural cooperatives* (under the leadership of Count Haydn and Bekhteev) arose for the first time in Russia, forestalling Europe, in the southern provinces. [This was envisaged] as a counter-measure to this essentially completely monopolistic hoarding of peasant bread."³⁴²

The Jews were also heavily involved in the lumber, sugar, gold, oil and banking industries. And by 1900 they controlled one-third of all Russian trade. With such a heavy involvement in the country's economy, it is not surprising to learn that, of those Jews who emigrated between 1899 and 1907, only one per cent were educated.³⁴³ The educated had no reason to leave: there were plenty of opportunities for them in Tsarist Russia. We might also have expected that those who remained would be gradually assimilated. But no: the Jews chose emancipation (education), but not assimilation. They fought for equality of rights, but without the loss of their Jewishness.³⁴⁴

"From the beginning of the century a 'Bureau for the Defence' of the Jews in Russia was organized from prominent lawyers and publicists..."

"In these years 'the Jewish spirit was roused to struggle', and in many Jews there was 'a rapid growth in social and national self-consciousness' - but national self-consciousness no longer in a religious form: with the 'impoverishment at the local level, the flight of the more prosperous elements... among the youth into the cities... and the tendency to urbanization', religion was undermined 'among the broad masses of Jewry' from the 90s, the authority of the rabbinate fell, and even the yeshbotniks were drawn into secularization. (But in spite of that, in many biographies in the *Russian Jewish Encyclopaedia* we read about the generation that grew up on the cusp of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: 'he received a traditional Jewish religious education'.)

³⁴¹ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 293-294.

³⁴² Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 299.

³⁴³ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 311.

³⁴⁴ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 313-314.

“However, as we have seen, *Palestinophilia* began to develop in an unexpected form and with a strength that was unexpected for many...”³⁴⁵

“Anti-Jewish manifestations - both abroad and in Russia - were being passionately discussed already in 1884 by Vladimir Soloviev, who was disturbed by them: ‘The Jews have always treated us in a Jewish way; but we Christians, by contrast, have not yet learned to treat Judaism in a Christian way’; ‘with regard to Judaism the Christian world *in its majority* has so far displayed either zeal not according to reason or a decrepit and powerless indifferentism’. No, ‘Christian Europe does not tolerate the Jews - unbelieving Europe does’.

“Russian society felt the growing importance of the Jewish question for Russia as much as half a century after the government. Only after the Crimean war did ‘embryonic Russian public opinion begin to become conscious of the presence of the Jewish problem in Russia’. But several decades would have to pass before the *primary importance* of this question was recognized. ‘Providence implanted the largest and strongest part of Jewry in our fatherland,’ wrote Vladimir Soloviev in 1891.

“But a year earlier, in 1890, Soloviev, finding incitement and support in a circle of sympathizers, composed the text of a ‘Protest’. [He wrote] that ‘the only reason for the so-called Jewish question’ was ‘forgetfulness of justice and love of man’, ‘a mindless attraction to blind national egoism’. - ‘The incitement of tribal and religious enmity, which is so counter to the spirit of Christianity... radically corrupts society and can lead to moral savagery...’ - ‘It is necessary decisively to condemn the anti-Semitic movement’ - ‘already from the single feeling of national self-preservation’.

“S.M. Dubnov recounts how Soloviev collected more than a hundred signatures, including those of Lev Tolstoy and Korolenko. But the editors of all the newspapers received a warning: don’t publish this protest. Soloviev ‘addressed Alexander III with an ardent letter’. However, he was warned through the police that if he insisted he would be administratively persecuted. And he abandoned the idea.

“As in Europe, the many-faceted growth of Jewish strivings could not fail to elicit in Russian society - alarm in some, sharp opposition in others, but sympathy in yet others...

“And in others - a political calculation. Just as in 1881 the People’s Will revolutionaries had thought of the usefulness of playing on the Jewish question..., so, some time later, the Russian liberal-radical circles, the left wing of society, appropriated for a long time the usefulness of using the Jewish question as a weighty political card in the struggle with the autocracy: they tried in every way to re-iterate the idea that it was impossible to attain equality of rights for the Jews in Russia in any other way than by the complete overthrow of the autocracy. Everyone, from the liberals to the SRs and Bolsheviks, brought in the Jews again

³⁴⁵ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 314.

and again – some with sincere sympathy, but all as a useful card in the anti-autocratic front. And this card, without a twinge of conscience, was never let out of the hands of the revolutionaries, but was used right up to 1917...”³⁴⁶

³⁴⁶ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 317-318.

38. THE FOUNDING OF ZIONISM

The founder of the Zionist movement was an admirer of Moses Hess, Theodor Herzl. As Daniel Barenboim writes, Herzl was a successful journalist who, "confronted by the increasing anti-Semitism in Austria and France, was initially in favor of complete assimilation of the Jews. Interestingly, Herzl's choice of words was not fundamentally different from that of Wagner's in describing the situation of Jews in German society. In 1893 he wrote that 'to cure the evil' the Jews would have to 'rid themselves of the peculiarities for which they are rightly reproached.' One would have to 'baptize the Jewboys' in order to spare them excessively difficult lives. 'Untertauchen im Volk!': go underground amongst the people was his appeal to the Jewish population. Richard Wagner also spoke of the 'Untergang,' the sinking: 'consider that only one thing can be the deliverance from the curse that weighs on you: the deliverance of Ahasuerus -- sinking! (der Untergang)'. Wagner's conclusion about the Jewish problem was not only verbally similar to Herzl's; both Wagner and Herzl favored the emigration of the German Jews. It was Herzl's preoccupation with European anti-Semitism that spurred him on to want to found a Jewish state. His vision of a Jewish state was influenced by the tradition of European liberalism. In the novel *Altneuland* (1903), he describes what the settled Jewish community in Palestine might look like; Arabic residents and other non-Jews would have equal political rights."³⁴⁷

However, Herzl's views began to change on 5 January 1895, when Captain Alfred Dreyfus, the only Jew serving in the French army general staff, was publicly degraded.

Paul Johnson writes that he "had been accused, tried and convicted - on what subsequently emerged to be fabricated evidence - of handing secrets to the Germans. Watching the ceremony, one of the few journalists allowed to attend, was Theodore Herzl (1860-1904), the Paris correspondent of the Vienna liberal daily, *Neue Freie Presse*. Two weeks before he had attended the courtroom and heard Dreyfus pronounced guilty. Now he stood by as Dreyfus was brought before General Darras, who shouted: 'Alfred Dreyfus, you are unworthy to bear arms. In the name of the French people we degrade you!' Immediately, in a loud voice, Dreyfus shouted: 'Soldiers! An innocent man is being degraded! Soldiers! An innocent is dishonoured! Long live France - long live the Army!' A senior non-commissioned officer cut off Dreyfus' badges and buttons. He took out his sword and broke it across his knee. The prisoner was marched round the courtyard, still shouting that he was innocent. An immense and excited crowd, waiting outside, heard his cries and began to whistle and chant slogans. When Herzl left the building, it was beginning to scream 'Death to Dreyfus! Death to the Jews!' Less than six months later, Herzl had completed the draft of the book which would set in motion modern Zionism, *Der Judenstaat*."³⁴⁸

³⁴⁷ Barenboim, "Wagner, Israel and the Palestinians", <http://www.danielbarenboim.com/index.php?id=72>.

³⁴⁸ Johnson, *A History of the Jews*, London: Phoenix, 1995, pp. 379-380.

The Dreyfus affair, combined with Herzl's own experience of German and Austrian anti-Semitism, had an enormous impact on him. As he admitted to the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration in London in 1902: "Seven years ago, when I was living in Paris, I was so impressed with the state of Jewry throughout Europe that I turned my attention to the Jewish question and published a pamphlet which I called 'A Jewish State'. I may say that it was not my original intention to publish the pamphlet or to take part in a political movement. But, after placing before a number of influential Jews my views upon the Jewish question, and finding that they were utterly oblivious of the danger which I then foresaw - that they could not see the large black cloud gathering in the East - I published the pamphlet which resulted in the establishment of the Zionist movement."³⁴⁹

It demonstrated to him that for various reasons - envy at Jewish success, the influx of Jews from Eastern Europe, the increase of racist theories - the Jews would never be assimilated into the existing system of European statehood, and would have to seek a homeland, a territorial State, of their own if they were to survive. "It was against this threatening background that Herzl began to abandon his assimilationist position. He had previously considered all kinds of wild ideas to get the Jews accepted. One was a huge programme of social re-education for Jews, to endow them with what he termed 'a delicate, *extremely sensitive* feeling for honour and the like'. Another was a pact with the Pope, whereby he would lead a campaign against anti-Semitism in return for 'a great mass movement for the free and honourable conversion of all Jews to Christianity'. But all these schemes soon seemed hopeless in face of the relentless rise of anti-Semitic hatred...

"... In May 1895 [the antisemite] Lueger became Mayor of Vienna. To devise an alternative refuge for the Jews, who might soon be expelled from all over Europe, seemed an urgent necessity. The Jews must have a country of their own!

"Herzl completed the text of his book, *Der Judenstaat*, outlining his aims, in the winter of 1895-6. The first extracts were published in the *London Jewish Chronicle*, 17 January 1896. The book was not long, eighty-six pages, and its appeal was simple. 'We are *a people, one people*. We have everywhere tried honestly to integrate with the national communities surrounding us and to retain only our faith. We are not permitted to do so... In vain do we exert ourselves to increase the glory of our fatherlands by achievements in art and in science and their wealth by our contributions to commerce... We are denounced as strangers... If only they would leave us in peace... But I do not think they will...' So Herzl proposed that sovereignty be conceded to the Jews over a tract of land large enough to accommodate their people. It did not matter where. It could be in Argentina, where the millionaire Baron Maurice de Hirsch (1831-96) had set up 6,000 Jews in a series of agricultural colonies.

³⁴⁹ Vital, *op. cit.*, p. 439.

Or it could be Palestine, where similar Rothschild-financed colonies were in being. What mattered was the sanction of Jewish opinion; and they would take what was offered...

"Herzl began by assuming that a Jewish state would be created in the way things had always been done throughout the Exile; by wealthy Jews at the top deciding what was the best solution for the rest of Jewry, and imposing it. But he found this impossible. Everywhere in civilized Europe the Jewish establishments were against his idea. Orthodox rabbis denounced or ignored him...

"Nevertheless, what Herzl quickly discovered was that the dynamic of Judaism would not come from the westernised elites but from the poor, huddled masses of the Ostjuden, a people of whom he knew nothing when he began his campaign. He discovered this first when he addressed an audience of poor Jews, of refugee stock, in the East End of London. They called him 'the man of the little people', and 'As I sat on the platform... I experienced strange sensations. I saw and heard my legend being born.' In eastern Europe, he quickly became a myth-like figure among the poor. David Ben-Gurion (1886-1973) recalled that, as a ten-year-old boy in Russian Poland, he heard a rumour: 'The Messiah had arrived, a tall, handsome man, a learned man of Vienna, a doctor no less.'³⁵⁰ Unlike the sophisticated middle-class Jews of the West, the eastern Jews could not toy with alternatives, and see themselves as Russians, or even as Poles. They knew they were Jews and nothing but Jews... and what Herzl now seemed to be offering was their only chance of becoming a real citizen anywhere. To Chaim Weizmann (1874-1952), then a second-year student in Berlin, Herzl's proposals 'came like a bolt from the blue'. In Sofia, the Chief Rabbi actually proclaimed him the Messiah. As the news got around, Herzl found himself visited by shabby, excitable Jews from distant parts, to the dismay of his fashionable wife, who grew to detest the very word Zionism. Yet these were the men who became the foot soldiers, indeed the NCOs and officers, in the Zionist legion; Herzl called them his 'army of schnorrers'.³⁵¹

In spite of the importance of the Ostjuden, the Zionist movement remained, as Bernard Simms notes, "not only secular but very much German in character and orientation. Herzl himself was a fervent admirer of Bismarck, German was the working language of the Zionist movement, and Berlin soon became the informal capital of the World Zionist Executive. Zionists did not expect to be able to achieve their state on their own: they would need a great-power sponsor, and Herzl expected and hoped that that would be what he regarded as the most progressive polity in late-nineteenth-century Europe, Imperial

³⁵⁰ When Herzl ascended the podium at the first Zionist conference, "he looked like 'a man of the House of David, risen all of a sudden from his grave in all his legendary glory,' recalled Mordechai Ben-Ami, the delegate from Odessa. 'It seemed as if the dream cherished by our people for two thousand years had come true at last and Messiah the Son of David was standing before us.'" (Karen Armstrong, *A History of Jerusalem*, London: HarperCollins, 1997, p. 365). (V.M.).

³⁵¹ Johnson, op. cit., pp. 395, 396-397, 397-398, 398-399.

Germany. 'The character of the Jewish people,' Herzl wrote, 'can only become healthier under the protectorate of the great, powerful, moral Germany, with its practical administration and strict organization. Zionism will enable the Jews once more to love Germany, to which, despite everything, our hearts belong. 'We owe it to the German in us that we are Jews again,' the German Zionist Moses Calvary wrote. 'Here,' Calvary concluded, 'is the living proof of the extent of Germany's nurturing of our own creative being: political Zionism is Europe's gift to Judaism.'"³⁵²

In spite of his Germanophilia, Herzl was quick to change his great-power orientation to England, as also his orientation within the Zionist movement from the West European Jews to the Ostjuden. This latter conversion was not accidental. In his *Autoemancipation* (1882), the Russian Jewish doctor Lev Pinsker had appealed to Russian and German Jewry to abandon, in view of the pogroms of the previous year, the failed idea of emancipation and the last gleams of hope in the brotherhood of peoples. "For the living," he wrote, "the Jew is a dead man; for the natives, an alien and a vagrant; for property holders, a beggar; for the poor, an exploiter and a millionaire; for the patriot, a man without a country; for all classes a hated rival."

Another important East European Zionist was Usher Ginzberg, or Ahad-Gaam ("one of the people"). Solzhenitsyn writes: "He sharply criticized practical Palestinophilia as it then was. His position was: 'Before directing our efforts at "redemption on the land", it is necessary to care about "redemption of hearts", about the intellectual and moral perfection of the people'. 'To place in the centre of Jewry a living spiritual striving for the unification of the nation, its stirring up and free development in the national spirit, but on pan-human foundations'. This point of view later received the name of 'spiritual Zionism' (but not 'religious', this is important).

"In the same 1889 Ahad-Gaam, for the unification of those who were devoted to the redemption of Jewish national feelings, created a league - or order, as he called it, 'Bnei Moshe' ('the Sons of Moses'). Its constitution 'was in many ways like the constitutions of Masonic lodges: the entrant gave a promise on oath to fulfill exactly all the demands of the constitution; new members were initiated by a master, an 'elder brother'... The entering 'brother' bound himself selflessly to serve the idea of national redemption, even if he were sure that there was no hope for the speedy realization of the ideal'. In the manifesto of the order it was proclaimed that 'the national consciousness has primacy over religious [consciousness], and individual interests are subject to national [interests]', and it was demanded that he deepen his feeling of selfless love for Jewry above every other aim of the movement. The order prepared 'the ground for the reception of the political Zionism' of Herzl, which Ahad-Gaam did not want at all.

³⁵² Simms, *Europe: The Struggle for Supremacy*, London: Allen Lane, 2013, pp. 264-265.

"In 1891, 1893 and 1900 Ahad-Gaam also travelled to Palestine - and reproached the lack of organisation and rootlessness of the Palestinian colonization of that time, 'he subjected to severe criticism the dictatorial behaviour of those serving Baron' E. Rothschild.

"Thus in Europe Zionism was born a decade later than in Russia...

"At the first Congress the representatives of Russian Zionism 'constituted a third of the participants... 66 out of 197 delegates' - in spite of the fact that for some this might look like an oppositional move in relation to the Russian government... In this way 'Zionism drew its strength... from the circles of oppressed Eastern Jewry, which found only a limited support amongst the Jews of Western Europe'. But for this reason the Russian Zionists represented for Herzl the most serious opposition. Ahad-Gaam conducted a stubborn struggle with the political Zionism of Herzl (on whose side, however, there rose the majority of the old Palestinophiles). He sharply criticised the pragmatism of Herzl and Nordau and, as he thought, '[their] alienation from the spiritual values of Jewish culture and tradition'. He 'found political Zionism's hope of founding a Jewish autonomous State in *the near future* chimerical; he considered the whole of this movement to be exceptionally harmful for the work of the spiritual regeneration of the nation... Not to care about saving perishing *Judaism*, that is, not to care about spiritual-national and cultural-historical attainments, to strive not for the *regeneration* of the ancient people, but for the *creation* of a new one from the scattered particles of the old matter'. He used and even emphasised the word 'Judaism', but evidently not in a religious sense, but as an inherited spiritual system...

"The quarrels shook the Zionists. Ahad-Gaam sharply criticized Herzl, and in support of the latter Nordau accused Ahad-Gaam of 'secret Zionism'. Every year there took place Zionist World Congresses, and in 1902 there took place a Congress of Russian Zionists in Minsk, whither the quarrels crossed over.,

"At the beginning of the century the poet N. Minsky expressed the following thought: 'that Zionism is the loss of the pan-human measure, that it reduces the universal cosmopolitan dimensions of Jewry [!] to the level of ordinary nationalism. 'The Zionists, while talking about nationalism, in fact turn away from the genuine national face of Jewry and are zealous only that they should be like everyone, and become no worse than others.'

"It is interesting to compare this with the remark of the Orthodox [Christian] thinker S. Bulgakov, which was also made before the revolution: 'The greatest difficulty for Zionism consists now in the fact that it is not able to return the faith of the fathers that is being lost, and is forced to base itself on the national or cultural-ethnographic principle, on which no truly great nationality can establish itself.'³⁵³

³⁵³ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 257-258, 260-261, 262, 263.

So Herzl had considerable opposition from within Jewry: most assimilated Jews, the Jews who already had their own plans for Jewry in Palestine (like Baron Edmund Rothschild) and the religious Jews who rejected the idea of a secular Jewish nationalism, were against Zionism. However, he found unexpected support from some Gentile leaders, who were in favour of Zionism as a means of reducing the Jewish population of Europe.

Thus the Russian interior minister, V.K. Plehve, said to him in August, 1903: "You are preaching to a convert.., we would very much like to see the creation of an independent Jewish State capable of absorbing several million Jews."³⁵⁴

Again, the Kaiser said: "I am all in favour of the kikes going to Palestine. The sooner they take off the better..."³⁵⁵

Herzl even had support from Gentile Christians. "In fact," writes Walter Russell Mead, "American Protestant Zionism is significantly older than the modern Jewish version; in the nineteenth century, evangelicals repeatedly petitioned U.S. officials to establish a refuge in the Holy Land for persecuted Jews from Europe and the Ottoman Empire.

"U.S. evangelical theology takes a unique view of the role of the Jewish people in the modern world. On the one hand, evangelicals share the widespread Christian view that Christians represent the new and true children of Israel, inheritors of God's promises to the ancient Hebrews. Yet unlike many other Christians, evangelicals also believe that the Jewish people have a continuing role in God's plan. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, close study of biblical prophecies convinced evangelical scholars and believers that the Jews would return to the Holy Land before the triumphant return of Christ."³⁵⁶

However, the contemporary symbiotic relationship between America and Israel did not yet exist. More important at this stage were the British, who, as Karen Armstrong writes, had "developed a form of gentile Zionism. Their reading of the Bible convinced them that Palestine belonged to the Jews, and already in the 1870s sober British observers looked forward to the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine under the protection of Great Britain."³⁵⁷

Thus, as Geoffrey Hanks writes, "Herzl was actively assisted by an Anglican clergyman, William Hechler, whose motivation was quite different to that of Herzl. For Hechler, his reading of prophecy had led him to conclude that the

³⁵⁴ According to Vital (*op. cit.*, p. 468), Plehve's memorandum to Herzl was approved beforehand by the Tsar. However, little came of his promise because in July, 1904 Herzl died and Plehve himself was assassinated by the Social Revolutionaries.

³⁵⁵ In 1879 William Marr had written: "The Jewish idea of colonizing Palestine could be wholesome for both sides [Jews and Germans]" (in Pipes, *op. cit.*, p. 28).

³⁵⁶ Mead, "God's Country?", *Foreign Affairs*, September/October, 2006, p. 39.

³⁵⁷ Armstrong, *op. cit.*, p. 360.

Jews would be returned to their homeland which would be followed by the Second Coming. After reading Herzl's book, *The Jewish State*, he joined forces with the author to promote the Zionist cause by persuading the Sultan of Turkey to allow Jewish immigration to Palestine. He was able to arrange a meeting in 1898 between Herzl and the Kaiser in Jerusalem. When he failed to secure German support for the cause he next looked to England for help, which came in the form of the Balfour Declaration [of 1917].³⁵⁸

The support of England was to prove critical for the success of Zionism. As Paul Johnson writes, "Herzl rightly called it 'the Archimedean point' on which to rest the lever of Zionism. There was considerable goodwill among the political elite. A lot had read *Tancred*; even more *Daniel Deronda*. Moreover, there had been a vast influx of Russian Jewish refugees into Britain, raising fears of anti-Semitism and threats of immigrant quotas. A Royal Commission on Alien Immigration was appointed (1902), with Lord Rothschild one of its members. Herzl was asked to give evidence, and Rothschild now at last agreed to see him, privately, a few days before, to ensure Herzl said nothing which would strengthen the cry for Jewish refugees to be refused entry. Rothschild's change from active hostility to friendly neutrality was an important victory for Herzl and he was happy, in exchange, to tell the Commission (7 July 1902) that further Jewish immigration to Britain should be accepted but that the ultimate solution to the refugee problem was 'the recognition of the Jews as a people and the finding by them of a legally recognized home'.

"This appearance brought Herzl into contact with senior members of the government, especially Joe Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary, and the Marquess of Lansdown, Foreign Secretary. Both were favourable to a Jewish home in principle. But where? Cyprus was discussed, then El Arish on the Egyptian border. Herzl thought it could be 'a rallying-point for the Jewish people in the vicinity of Palestine' and he wrote a paper for the British cabinet bringing up, for the first time, a powerful if dangerous argument: 'At one stroke England will get ten million secret but loyal subjects active in all walks of life all over the world.' But the Egyptians objected and a survey proved unsatisfactory. Then Chamberlain, back from East Africa, had a new idea, Uganda. 'When I saw it,' he said, 'I thought, "That is a land for Dr. Herzl. But of course he is sentimental and wants to go to Palestine or thereabouts.' In fact Herzl would have settled for Uganda. So Lansdowne produced a letter: 'If a site can be found which the [Jewish Colonial] Trust and His Majesty's Commission consider suitable and which commends itself to HM Government, Lord Lansdowne will be prepared to entertain favourable proposals for the establishment of a Jewish colony of settlement, on conditions which will enable the members to observe their national customs.' This was a breakthrough. It amounted to diplomatic recognition for a proto-Zionist state. In a shrewd move, Herzl aroused the interest of the rising young Liberal politician, David Lloyd George, by getting his firm of solicitors to draft

³⁵⁸ Hanks, *Great Events in the History of the Church*, Tain, 2004, pp. 294, 295.

a proposed charter for the colony. He read Lansdowne's letter to the Sixth Zionist Congress, where it aroused 'amazement [at] the magnanimity of the British offer'. But many delegates saw it as a betrayal of Zionism; the Russians walked out. Herzl concluded: 'Palestine is the only land where our people can come to rest.' At the Seventh Congress (1905), Uganda was formally rejected."³⁵⁹

Even with the Zionist movement formally committed to Palestine as its only possible homeland, there was still strong opposition to the idea from within Jewry. "The Orthodox," writes Johnson, "argued that Satan, having despaired of seducing Israel by persecution, had been given permission to try it by even more subtle methods, involving the Holy Land in his wicked and idolatrous scheme, as well as all the evils of the enlightenment. Zionism was thus infinitely worse than a false messiah - it was an entire false, Satanic religion. Others added that the secular state would conjure up the godless spirit of the demos and was contrary to God's command to Moses to follow the path of oligarchy: 'Go and collect the elders of Israel'; 'Heaven forbid', wrote two Kovno sages, 'that the masses and the women should chatter about meetings or opinions concerning the general needs of the public.' In Katowice on 22 May 1912 the Orthodox sages founded the Agudist movement to coordinate opposition to Zionist claims. It is true that some Orthodox Jews believed Zionism could be exploited for religious purposes. Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook (1865-1935) argued that the new 'national spirit of Israel' could be used to appeal to Jews on patriotic grounds to observe and preach the Torah. With Zionist support he was eventually made Chief Rabbi of Jerusalem. But most of the religious Jews already in Erez Israel heard of Zionism with horror. 'There is great dismay in the Holy Land,' wrote Rabbi Joseph Hayyim Sonnenfeld (1848-1932), 'that these evil men who deny the Unique One of the world and his Holy Torah have proclaimed with so much publicity that it is in their power to hasten redemption for the people of Israel and gather the dispersed from all the ends of the earth.' When Herzl entered the Holy Land, he added, 'evil entered with him, and we do not yet know what we have to do against the destroyers of the totality of Israel, may the Lord have mercy'. This wide, though by no means universal opposition of pious Jews to the Zionist programme inevitably tended to push it more firmly into the hands of the secular radicals..."³⁶⁰

But the reverse process was also seen: the conversion of secular radicals to an almost mystical love of the land of Israel, a factor that makes Zionism more than just a form of secular nationalism.

For, as Karen Armstrong writes, "Jerusalem was still a symbol that had power to inspire these secular Zionists as they struggled to create a new

³⁵⁹ Johnson, op. cit., pp. 400-402. At the Sixth Congress Herzl had been forced to stand before the delegates, raise his right hand and quote the words of the psalmist: 'If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, may my right hand wither!' (Armstrong, op. cit., p. 366).

³⁶⁰ Johnson, op. cit., pp. 403-404.

world, even if they had little time for the city as an earthly reality. Yitzhak Ben-Zvi, who would become the second President of the State of Israel, was converted to Zionism while speaking at a revolutionary rally in Russia. Suddenly he felt dissociated from his surroundings and in the wrong place. 'Why am I here and not there?' he asked himself. Then he had a vision. There arose 'in my mind's eye the living image of Jerusalem, the holy city, with its ruins, desolate of its sons'. From that moment he thought no more of revolution in Russia but only of 'our Jerusalem'. 'That very hour I reached the absolute decision that our place is the Land of Israel, and that I must go there, dedicate my life to its upbuilding, and as soon as possible.'...

"The trouble was that Jerusalem was not 'desolate of its sons'. It already had sons, a people who had lived there for centuries and who had their own plans for the city. Nor was the city a ruin, as Ben-Zvi imagined... [Moreover,] its Arab resident had come to resent the Turkish occupation and were alarmed by the Zionist settlers. In 1891 a number of Jerusalem notables sent a petition to Istanbul, asking the government to prevent a further immigration of Jews and the sale of land to Zionists. The last known political act of Yusuf al-Khalidi had been to write a letter to Rabbi Zadok Kahn, the friend of Herzl, begging him to leave Palestine alone: for centuries, Jews, Christians, and Muslims had managed to live together in Jerusalem, and this Zionist project would end such coexistence. After the Young Turk revolt in 1908, Arab nationalists of Palestine began to dream of a state of their own, free of Turkish control. When the first Arab Congress met in Paris in 1913, a telegram of support was signed by 387 Arabs from the Near East, 130 of them Palestinians. In 1915, Ben-Gurion became aware of these Arab aspirations for Palestine and found them profoundly disturbing. 'It hit me like a bomb,' he said later. 'I was utterly confounded.' Yet, the Israeli writer Amos Elon tells us, despite this bombshell, Ben-Gurion continued to ignore the existence of the Palestinian Arabs. Only two years later, he made the astonishing suggestion that in a 'historical and moral sense,' Palestine was a country 'without inhabitants.' Because the Jews felt at home there, all other inhabitants of the country were merely the ethnic descendants of various conquerors. Ben-Gurion wished the Arabs well as individuals but was convinced that they had no rights at all..."³⁶¹

And so most of the elements necessary for the creation of the most insoluble political problem of modern times were already in place: Jewish Zionism, the "Christian Zionism" of the Anglo-Saxon nations, and Arab nationalism. Only one element was lacking (or rather: dormant): fundamentalist Islam.

³⁶¹ Armstrong, *op. cit.*, pp. 367-369.

39. THE KISHINEV POGROM

Alexander Solzhenitsyn writes: "Jewish pogroms were stirred up at all times and only in the South-West of Russia (as also was the case in 1881)." ³⁶² And on April 6, 1903 – the last day of the Jewish Pascha and the first day of the Orthodox Pascha – a pogrom broke out in Kishinev, capital of the province of Moldavia in South-West Russia. According to the official figures drawn up in the indictment by the procurator of the local court, V.N. Goremykin, it began with "the usual clashes between Jews and Christians which have always taken place in recent years at Pascha" and with "the hostility of the local Christian population towards the Jews". And then "two weeks before Pascha... rumours began to circulate in Kishinev that there would be a slaughter of Jews in the forthcoming feast". A particularly inflammatory role was played here by the newspaper *Bessarabets*, whose editor, Pavolachi Krushevan, also published *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.

The *Protocols* purported to be the minutes of a meeting of Jewish elders somewhere in the West, but are in fact largely plagiarized from Maurice Joly's *Dialogue aux Enfers entre Montesquieu et Machiavel*, published in 1864. When the forgery was demonstrated to Tsar Nicholas II, he said: "Drop the *Protocols*. One cannot defend a pure cause by dirty methods." ³⁶³

Krushevan's *Bessarabets* printed "from day to day sharp articles of an anti-Jewish tendency, which did not fail to leave a trace... among the salesmen and petty scribes, etc. of the uneducated people of Bessarabia. The latest provocative articles of *Bessarabets* contained communications about the murder in Dubossary of a Christian child supposedly carried out by Jews by ritual means..." ³⁶⁴

According to the indictment, 42 people were killed, including 38 Jews. About 500 Jewish shop fronts were destroyed. By April 9, 816 people had been arrested, of whom 664 were charged with crimes.

"The conclusion of the indictment was: the disorders 'grew to the indicated proportions only thanks to the incompetence of the police, who did not have the required leadership... The preliminary investigation has not unearthed any evidence that would indicate that the above-mentioned disorders were prepared beforehand.'

"And they were not unearthed by any subsequent investigation.

"But in spite of this, the Jewish 'Bureau of Defence' (with the participation of the very influential M. Vinaver, G. Sliozberg, L. Bramson, M. Kulisher, A. Braudo, S. Pozner and M. Krol), had no sooner heard about the pogrom in

³⁶² Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 321.

³⁶³ Norman Cohn, *Warrant for Genocide*, London: Serif, 1996, pp. 126, 285-289.

³⁶⁴ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 322.

Petersburg than they excluded from the beginning any other causes of it than a tsarist plot: 'Who gave the order for the organization of the pogrom, who directed the dark forces that carried it out?' - 'Immediately we learned under what circumstances the Kishinev slaughter took place, it became clear for us that this diabolic undertaking would never have taken place... if it had not been thought up in the Department of Police and carried out in fulfilment of orders from there'. Although, of course, writes the same M. Krol in the 40s of the 20th century, 'the scoundrels organized the Kishinev pogrom in strict secrecy, we are profoundly convinced that the Kishinev slaughter was organized from above, with the knowledge, and perhaps even on the initiative of Plehve. Only if we had the most indisputable evidence against them could we tear the mask from these highly-placed murderers and place them in a fitting light before the whole world. Therefore we decided to send the well-known lawyer Zarudny to Kishinev.' 'He was the most suitable person to carry out the mission that we had laid on him', he 'took it upon himself to discover the hidden springs of the Kishinev slaughter', after which the police 'to make a diversion arrested some tens of robbers and thieves'. (Let us recall that on the day after the pogrom 816 were arrested.) - Zarudny collected and took away from Kishinev 'exceptionally important material', that is to say: 'that the main culprit and organizer of the pogrom was the chief of the Kishinev garrison Levendal'".³⁶⁵

This "exceptionally important material" was never published anywhere. Goremykin looked into the accusations against Levendal and found them baseless. But Krushevan, whose inflammatory articles had indeed helped the pogrom on arriving in Petersburg two months later, was attacked and wounded with a knife by Pinkhas Dashevsky... The government sacked the governor of Bessarabia, while Plehve issued a circular to all governors, city bosses and heads of police expressing disturbance at the inactivity of the Kishinev authorities and calling for decisive action to cut of violence.

Nor was the Orthodox Church silent. The Holy Synod issued a circular ordering the clergy to take measures to root out hatred of the Jews. Fr. John of Kronstadt said: "Instead of a Christian feast they have arranged a disgustingly murderous feast to Satan." And Bishop Anthony (Khrapovitsky) said: "The terrible punishment of God will attain those evil-doers who shed blood asking for that of the God-man, His Most Pure Mother, the Apostles and Prophets'; 'that they should know that the Jewish race, which has been rejected up to now, is dear to the Spirit of God, and that every one who would want to offend it will anger the Lord.'"³⁶⁶

The Jews and radicals inside Russia, and the European and American press outside Russia, were loud in their accusations that the Russian government was responsible for the Kishinev pogrom. The newspaper magnate William Hurst even used the fateful word "holocaust"...³⁶⁷ On May 18 *The Times* of London

³⁶⁵ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 327-328.

³⁶⁶ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 329.

³⁶⁷ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 332.

published a letter of a “completely secret letter” of Plehve to the Kishinev governor von Raaben in which Plehve supposedly asked the governor not to put down any disturbances against the Jews but only to inform him about them.³⁶⁸ The letter turned out to be a forgery, as even pro-Semite sources accept.³⁶⁹ However, this did not prevent the 1996 edition of *The Jewish Encyclopaedia* from reiterating the accusation as if it were fact...³⁷⁰

³⁶⁸ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 333.

³⁶⁹ Vital, *op. cit.*, p. 513.

³⁷⁰ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 335.

40. THE JEWS AND THE RUSSIAN PRESS

The Russo-Japanese war is the first instance of a phenomenon that was to be of major importance in 1917: the financing of Russia's enemies by American Jews. Archpriest Lev Lebedev asserts that "at the end of 1903 the American Jewish banker Jacob Schiff, Morgan and also 'First National Bank' and 'National City Bank' loaned Japan 30 million dollars so that she should attack Russia³⁷¹... The Japanese information services were actively *helped by the Jews*. Some of them acted as spies in the Russian army, others tried to demoralize it, which is witnessed by the commander-in-chief of the armies in the Far East, General Kuropatkin. In 1906 the well-known journalist M.O. Menshikov wrote in *Novoe Vremia*: 'The [enemy in the] last terrible war... was armed with the most active participation of the Jews. In order to thrust Japan against Russia, it was necessary to arrange for Japan not only external loans, but also the most ardent sympathy [for Japan] in America and England. This sympathy, as has now been established beyond doubt, was artificially stirred up in the American press, which was almost completely in Jewish hands. In the course of a whole series of years an army of Jewish hacks has slandered Russia, poured an unbelievably dirty torrent of abuse on her, and stirred people up to hate and despise everything Russian. As a result public opinion, and not only in America, was confused. The huge reading world was pitifully deceived...' At the height of the war the Paris newspaper *Presse* noted: 'Japan has not been waging war against Russia alone. She has a powerful ally – Jewry.'..."³⁷²

After the wiping out of the Russian fleet at Tsushima in May, 1905, Russia sued for peace. In September, at Portsmouth, U.S.A., thanks to the very tough negotiating stance of Tsar Nicholas, skilfully carried out by Witte, favourable terms were won for Russia. She did not have to pay an indemnity, and lost only Port Arthur and the south of Sakhalin. Nevertheless, the loss of prestige was great, and gave renewed encouragement to the revolutionaries.

During the war, wrote S.S. Oldenburg, "the revolutionary newspaper *Liberation*, which was published abroad, counted up the forces of the 'liberation movement' and gave, with some exaggeration, the following reply to the question: 'What do we have?': 'The whole of the intelligentsia and part of the people; all the zemstva, the whole of the press, a part of the city Dumas, all the corporations (jurists, doctors, etc.)... The socialist parties have promised their support... The whole of Finland is with us... Oppressed Poland and the Jewish population languishing within the Pale of Settlement are for us.' But the same newspaper did not hide its fears: 'If the Russian armies defeat the Japanese... then freedom will be quietly strangled under the cries of "Hurrah!" and the tolling of the bells of the triumphant empire.'"³⁷³

³⁷¹ In all Schiff loaned \$200 million to Japan during the war, while preventing other firms from lending to Russia (Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 347). (V.M.)

³⁷² Lebedev, *Velikorossia* (Great Russia), St. Petersburg, 1999, pp. 417-418.

³⁷³ Oldenburg, *Tsarstvovanie Imperatora Nikolaia II* (The Reign of Emperor Nicholas II), Belgrade, 1939, p. 261.

“Already in the 70s,” writes Solzhenitsyn, “the ‘unbridledness of the Russian press’ had been noted more than once by Dostoyevsky. In relation to the State it displayed itself even at the conference of March 8, 1881 under the just-crowned Alexander III, and more than once after that: the journalists behaved like self-willed representatives of society.

“The expression: ‘Three hostile newspapers are more dangerous than 100,000 hostile soldiers’ has been ascribed to Napoleon. This phrase became very applicable to the Russo-Japanese war. The Russian press was openly defeatist throughout the war, in each of its battles. And, still more important: it did not hide its sympathy for terrorism and revolution...”³⁷⁴

On August 25, 1904 the Tsar made his first significant concession to the views of the newspaper publishers and their readership by appointing Prince P.S. Sviatopolk-Mirsky, a liberal conservative, as Minister of the Interior in place of the murdered Plehve. As Alexander Bokhanov writes, “the minister gave several interviews to the newspapers, met with representatives of liberal circles and popularized his political programme, whose main points were: religious tolerance, the broadening of local self-government, the provision of great rights to the press, a change in policy in relation to the border regions, an allowance of workers’ meetings for the discussion of economic questions. These declarations produced a sensation.

“Political activists of a liberal persuasion were very sceptical about them. They were convinced that the time of the autocracy was drawing to an end, and did not want to bind themselves with any obligations to the ‘departing authorities’. One of the most well-known activists among the liberals, Paul Nikolayevich Miliukov, wrote in the summer of 1904 on the pages of the illegal newspaper *Liberation*: ‘We shall be patriots for ourselves and for a future Russia, we shall remain faithful to the old ‘people’s proverb’ - ‘Down with the autocracy!’ This is also patriotic, and at the same time guarantees us freedom from the danger of being in the bad company of reactionaries.’

“At the very height of the ‘Sviatopolk spring’, at the end of September and beginning of October, 1904, a leading group of Russian liberals grouped around the newspaper *Liberation*, which had been published since 1902 under the editorship of P.B. Struve, first in Stuttgart, then in Paris, conducted a congress of opposition parties in Paris. Various liberal and radical unions took part in it. Of the most significant only RSDRP [the Russian Social Democrat Party] was absent. This meeting unanimously approved a resolution on the liquidation of the autocracy and replacing it with ‘a free democratic structure on the basis of universal suffrage’ and on the right of ‘national self-determination of the peoples of Russia’.

³⁷⁴ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 428.

“At the congress was present the flower of the Russian liberal intelligentsia, which later formed the core of the most powerful liberal party in Russia – the constitutional-democratic party (‘the cadets’). These gentlemen, fighters for freedom and ‘European rules’ considered it appropriate to define common actions with the extreme tendencies and groups that had stained themselves with bloody murders, for example, the party of the social revolutionaries (‘S-Rs’), which emerged in 1902 and placed terror at the head of the corner of its ‘strategy and tactics’.

“Already after the revolution, when all the noble-hearted liberal word-mongers had been scattered by the crude reality of Russian life, some of them came to their senses and confessed their criminal lightmindedness. In the emigration at the beginning of the 1930s the well-known cadet V.A. Maklakov wrote about the notorious Paris congress: ‘On the part of liberalism, this agreement was a union with the revolution that threatened it. The salvation of Russia was possible only through the reconciliation of the historical authority with liberalism, that is, the sincere transformation of the autocracy into a constitutional monarchy. By instead concluding this union with the revolution, the liberalism of *Liberation* lost this exit; it preferred to serve the triumph of the revolution.’

“Mirsky’s proclaimed ‘epoch of trust’ very soon began to demonstrate its hopelessness. It turned out that it was easy to make promises, but very difficult to fulfil them. In particular, right in the centre of the discussions and debates was the old and painful question of the creation of a pan-Russian representative organ, its competency and the path to its formation. It immediately came up against the problem of the unassailability of the monarch’s prerogatives. Prince N.D. Sviatopolk-Mirsky was convinced that the autocracy and representation were compatible, but many others in the ruling circles did not share this position. They feared that the creation of any unappointed, elected organ would inevitably generate confusion in the administration and would contribute to the paralysis of power, which the enemies of the throne and the dynasty would unfailingly use. At the end of 1904 there were more and more reasons for such fears.

“Passions fired up especially during and after the congress of zemstvo activists, which took place in Petersburg from November 7 to 9, 1904. The minister of the interior allowed the congress, but asked the participants to occupy themselves with ‘practical questions of zemstvo life’. However, in the atmosphere of social tension and of the sharp politicization of the whole of public life, the practical realization of such a direction was impossible.

“The zemstvo deputies discussed some of their specific questions briefly, but the centre of their attention was in the stream of general political problems. It was accepted that the convening of a ‘national representation’ was necessary, that a political amnesty should be introduced, that ‘administrative arbitrariness’ should be stopped, that the ‘decrees on intensified guard’ should be rescinded, that personal inviolability should be guaranteed, and that

religious tolerance should be affirmed. Although those assembled left for the authorities the initiative in carrying out transformations and rejected the calls of some participants to support the demand for the convening of a Constituent Assembly, nevertheless the event that took place was unprecedented. For the first time subjects of the tsar, gathered together in the capital of the empire, did not petition the monarch on personal matters, but spoke out with demands of a political character.

“The most blatant was one very important demand-resolution, ‘point ten’, which declared that only a constitutional order, limiting autocratic power, could satisfy public opinion and give Russia ‘peaceful development of state life’.

“This thesis elicited sharp objections from the moderate participants in the congress led by the well-known liberal zemstvo activist D.N. Shipov, who categorically declared that he did not share the constitutionalist point of view. In his lengthy speech he defended the old Slavophile thesis: ‘The people has its opinions, the tsar makes the decisions’, and did not allow any written agreements and guarantees between the authorities and the people, considering that their relations were built, not on juridical formal principles, but on unassailable moral principles. This reasoning was not influential, and during the voting the majority cast their votes for a constitution.

“The decisions of the zemstvo congress aroused considerable interest and became the subject of lively discussion in the press and in private gatherings. At first it was supposed that the deputation of zemstvo activists would be received by the Interior minister and the tsar, which would be seen as a turning of the authorities towards constitutionalism. The conservative traditionalists were angry. Great-Prince Sergius Alexandrovich wrote in his diary on November 10: ‘I heard about the details of the zemstvo congress in St. Petersburg: they voted for a constitution!! A deputation of zemstvo activists has been received by Mirsky, and will be received by the Tsar!! (It was not – A.B.) Unhappy man,” and he added: ‘It sometimes seems to me that I’m going out of my mind.’

“The authorities were shocked: it could not satisfy such extreme demands, since this de facto meant the self-liquidation of the historical power. But they could not leave things as they were before. At the beginning of December 1904 meetings of high officials of the empire took place in Tsarskoe Selo, at which urgent measures to transform the inner structure were discussed.

“At the centre of the discussions was a programme put forward by the Interior minister. The special attention of the participants was drawn to the point about elected representatives in the State Council (until then all members had been appointed personally by the monarch). The majority of those assembled expressed themselves against this. The over-procurator of the Most Holy Synod, C.P. Pobedonostsev, entreated the tsar in the name of God not to limit the autocracy, and this position was supported by the minister of finances

V.N. Kokovtsov, the president of the Committee of ministers, S.Yu. Witte and most of the others. The tsar wavered at the beginning, but soon unambiguously spoke for keeping the authority inviolable.

“At the end of the Tsarskoe Selo meetings, a decree of the Senate was issued containing resolutions on the broadening local self-government, on reviewing resolutions on the press and confirming the necessity of establishing religious toleration. The point about elected representatives was missing. But the liberals hoped that the elective principle would be specified there. However, the tsar considered that it was not yet time for sharp changes...”³⁷⁵

The press, which had done so much to stir up this constitutionalist mania, continued unchecked in 1905. Solzhenitsyn writes that it “was seen during the Duma period as, in the words of Witte, mainly ‘Jewish’ or ‘half-Jewish’: more precisely, with a predominance of leftist or radical Jews in the key correspondent and editors’ posts. In November, 1905 D.I. Pikhno, the editor of the Russian national newspaper *Kievolianin*, who had already been in this post for 25 years and studied the Russian press, wrote: ‘Jewry... has placed huge stakes on the card of the Russian revolution... The serious part of Russian society had understood that at such moments the press is a force, but it did not have this power – it was in the hands of its opponents, who spoke in its name throughout Russia and forced themselves to be read, because there were no other publications, and you can’t create them in one day... and [society] was lost in the multitude of lies in which it could not find its way.’

“L. Tikhomirov saw nothing national in this, but in 1910 he made the following comments on the character of the Russian press: ‘Tearing on the nerves... One-sidedness... They don’t want decency, gentlemanliness... They have no ideal, and have no understanding of it.’ And the public brought up by this press ‘demands glibness and hooliganism, it cannot value knowledge, and does not notice ignorance’.

“And, from completely the opposite political extreme, a Bolshevik publicist [M. Lemke], expressed himself as follows on the character of this press: ‘In our post-reformation era ideas have become cheap, while information, sensation and unabashed authoritarian ignorance fill the press.’

“Speaking, more specifically, about culture, Andrew Bely complained in 1909, although he was by no means a rightist or ‘chauvinist’: ‘The leaders of national culture turn out to be people who are foreign to this culture... Look at the lists of those working on the newspapers and journals of Russia: who are the musical and literary critics of these journals? You will see almost exclusively Jewish names: among these critics there are some talented and acute people, there are some among them who understand the tasks of a national culture, perhaps, more profoundly than the Russians: but they are exceptions. The general mass of Jewish critics are completely foreign to Russian

³⁷⁵ Bakhanov, *Imperator Nikolaj II*, Moscow, 1998, pp. 226-230.

art. They write in an Esperanto jargon and terrorize every attempt to deepen and enrich the Russian language.'

"In those same years the far-sighted Zionists Vl. Zhabotinsky complained about the 'leading newspapers sustained on Jewish money and filled with Jewish workers' and warned: 'When the Jews hurled themselves en masse to create Russian politics, we foretold them that nothing good would come out of it, neither for Russian politics, nor for Jewish.'

"The Russian press played a decisive role in the pre-revolutionary Cadet-revolutionary storming of the government: its mood was powerfully picked up and expressed by Duma deputy A.I. Shingarev: 'Let this power sink! We will not cast *this* power even a bit of rope!' It is appropriate to mention here that the First Duma stood up in memory of the victims of the Belostok pogrom (not agreeing... that this was an armed battle between anarchists and soldiers); the Second Duma - in honour of the murdered terrorist Iollos. But when Purishkevich suggested standing in honour of those killed at their posts as policemen and soldiers, he was forbidden to speak and excluded from the session: at that time it seemed unthinkable to the enflamed parliamentarians to sympathize with those who kept simple order in the State, which was necessary for all of them, and for a generally quiet life.

"A member of the Union of [Jewish] Complete Equality, A. Kulisher, drew the truthful conclusion - but late, looking back at the past in the émigré *Jewish Tribune* in 1923: 'In Russian-Jewish society before the revolution there really were people and whole groups whose activity can be characterized precisely as... the absence of a feeling of responsibility for the turmoil in the minds of Russian Jewry... the spreading of an indefinite and light-minded 'revolutionism'... The whole essence of their politics consisted in being more leftist than anyone else. Always remaining in the role of irresponsible critics, never going to the end, they saw their purpose in saying: 'Not enough!' ... These people were 'democrats'... But there were also democrats who called themselves 'The Jewish *Democratic* Group' who attached this adjective to every unsuitable noun, composing an intolerable Talmud of democratism... They created around themselves an irresponsible mood of groundless maximalism, with no precise limit to their demands. This mood manifested itself with destructive consequences in the revolution.' The destructiveness proceeding from this press was indeed one of the weakest, most vulnerable points in the Russian State by 1914 and 1917..."³⁷⁶

Indeed, the stream of slander turned out by the Jewish-controlled press against the Tsar (and especially the Tsarina) was one of the major causes of the revolution... In the role of the press, as in many other ways, we see how early-twentieth century Russia was a type, a microcosm, as it were, of the problems of modern civilization...

³⁷⁶ Solzhenitsyn, op. cit., pp. 428-431.

41. THE JEWS IN THE 1905 REVOLUTION

In October, 1905, the Tsar issued a Manifesto that bestowed a wide variety of freedoms on the Russian people, making it in fact a more liberal country in many respects than the Western democracies.³⁷⁷ However, the Manifesto, far from calming political passions, excited them to the utmost. Anarchy increased as young revolutionaries rampaged in the cities, the press, freed from all restraints and almost exclusively owned by Jews, raged against the government, and the police, overstretched and unsure of their rights under the new constitution, hesitated to apply strong measures. However, in Petersburg there was a new phenomenon: demonstrations in favour of the Tsar, the so-called “Black Hundreds”, or monarchist counter-revolution...

1905 is famous particularly for its pogroms. But the truth was different from the view generally accepted in the West that the “Black Hundreds” simply slaughtered masses of Jews. The general pattern was as follows. First the revolutionaries, usually led by young Jews, would call on the population to strike and free prisoners from the prisons, and would themselves tear down the symbols of tsarist authority, although “undoubtedly both Russians and Jews took part in the destruction of portraits and monograms”.³⁷⁸ Then, a day or two later, when it was clear that the authorities were unwilling or unable to restore order, the anti-Jewish pogrom would begin.

Thus in Kiev the pogrom began on October 18. “A crowd of Jews seized the building of the City Duma, tore down national flags and mocked the portraits of the Tsar. One of the Jews cut the head out of a portrait [of the Tsar], put his own [in the hole] and shouted: ‘Now I’m the Tsar!’ Others declared to the stunned Kievans: ‘Soon your St. Sophia cathedral will become our synagogue!’”³⁷⁹

“In its initial stage the pogrom undoubtedly had the character of revenge taken for the offence to national feeling. Subjecting the Jews they met on the street to blows, smashing shops and trampling the goods they took out of them into the dirt, the pogromists would say: “There’s your freedom, there’s your constitution and revolution; there are your tsarist portraits and crown”. And then on the following morning, the 19th, a thousand-strong crowd made its way from the Duma to St. Sophia square carrying the empty frames from the broken portraits of the tsar, the tsarist monogram and smashed mirrors. They went to the university, repaired the damaged portraits and served a moleben, while

³⁷⁷ Thus Duma deputy Baron A.D. Meyendorff admitted: “The Russian Empire was the most democratic monarchy in the world” (Lebedev, op. cit., p. 405). This view was echoed by foreign observers, such as Sir Maurice Baring: “There is no country in the world, where the individual enjoys so great a measure of personal liberty, where the ‘liberté de moeurs’ is so great, as in Russia; where the individual man can do as he pleases with so little interference or criticism on the part of his neighbours, where there is so little moral censorship, where liberty of abstract thought or aesthetic production is so great.” (in Eugene Lyons, *Our Secret Allies*, 1953).

³⁷⁸ Solzhenitsyn, op. cit., p. 375.

³⁷⁹ Lebedev, op. cit., p. 428.

'Metropolitan Flavian exhorted the crowd not to behave badly and to disperse to their homes'. 'But at the same time that the people constituting the centre of the patriotic demonstration... maintained exemplary order in it, people joining it from the street allowed themselves to commit all kinds of violence in relation to the Jews they met and to people wearing the uniforms of academic institutions [students].' Then the demonstrators were joined by 'black workers, homeless inhabitants of the flea market and bare-footed people from the river-bank', 'groups of pogromists smashed up Jewish flats and stalls and threw out property and goods onto the street. Then they would be partly destroyed and partly stolen.'... The pogromists passed by the stalls of the Karaite Jews without touching them, and also 'those Jewish flats where they were shown portraits of the emperor'. [On the 19th the wealthiest Jewish shops in the centre were looted.] Proceeding from the fact that 'almost two thirds of all the trade in the city was in the hands of the Jews', [Senator] Turau calculates the losses, including the homes of the rich, 'at several million roubles'. They set out to destroy not only Jewish houses, but also the flats of well-known liberal social activists...

"In all during the days of the pogrom, according to the approximate estimate of the police (some of those who suffered were taken away by the crowd), 47 people were killed, including 12 Jews, while 205 were wounded, one third of them Jews.

"Turau concludes his report with the conclusion that 'the main cause of the Jewish pogrom in Kiev was the long-existing enmity between the Little Russian and Jewish population, based on the difference in their world-views. The immediate cause was the insult to national feeling by the revolutionary manifestations, in which a prominent role belonged to Jewish youth.' The simple people saw 'the Jews alone as being to blame for the insults and imprecations against everything that was holy and dear to it. It could not understand the revolutionary movement after the concessions given it, and explained it by the striving of the Jews to gain "their own Yiddish freedom".' 'The failures of the war, at which Jewish youth always openly expressed its most lively joy, their avoidance of military service, their participation in the revolutionary movement, in a series of violent acts and murders of high-ranking people, and undoubtedly the irritation of the simple people against the Jews - that is why there were incidents in Kiev when many Russians openly gave refuge in their houses to poor Jews hiding from the violence, while sharply refusing to give it to young Jews.'

"The newspaper *Kievlianin* also wrote about this. 'Unfortunate Jews! What were these thousands of families guilty of?... To their own woe and misfortune the Jews have not been able to restrain their madmen... But, you know, there are madmen among us Russians, too, and we have not been able to restrain them.'

“The revolutionary youth went mad – and it was the elderly and peaceful Jews who had to pay for it...”³⁸⁰

Indeed, the older generation of Jewry did not support the young. “[Jewish] orthodoxy was in a struggle, not always open, but hidden, against the Jewish intelligentsia. It was clear that orthodoxy, in condemning the liberation movement in Jewry, was striving to win the goodwill of the government.’ But it was already late. By 1905 the autocracy had generally lost control in the country. While traditional Jewry by that year had completely lost a whole, and already not the first, *generation*, which had departed into Zionism, into secular liberalism, rarely into enlightened conservatism, and – the most significant in its consequences – into the revolutionary movement.”³⁸¹

“It is not surprising,” continues Solzhenitsyn, “that ‘in many places... an active struggle of prosperous religious elements in Jewry against the revolution was noticed. They helped the police to catch Jewish revolutionaries, and to break up demonstrations, strikes, etc.’ Not that it was nice for them to be on the side of the government. But... they not want to accept the revolutionary law, for they honoured *their own*. While for many young revolutionaries the religious ‘Union of the Jews’ in Bialystok and other places was ‘Blackhundredist’.”³⁸²

It must also be emphasized that the main motivation for this flood of Jews into the revolutionary movement was not the restrictions placed by the government on the civil rights of Jewry (which were in any case being quickly whittled down), but infection with the same liberal and revolutionary ideas as infected so many contemporary Russians. “‘The participation of Jews in the general Russian revolutionary movement can only to a very small degree be explained by their inequality... The Jews only shared the general mood’ of the struggle against the autocracy. Is that to be wondered at? The young members of intelligent families, both Russian and Jewish, had for years heard at home [such phrases as]: ‘the crimes of the authorities’, ‘a government of murderers’. They then rushed into revolutionary action with all their energy and ardour.”³⁸³

In Odessa, the Manifesto was published on the 17th. The next day, “General Kauldbars, the commander of the Odessa military district, in order to ‘give the population the unhindered opportunity to use the freedom given by the Manifesto in all its forms’, ordered all the soldiers not to appear on the streets, ‘so as not to spoil the joyful mood in the population’. However, ‘this mood did not last for long. From all sides individual groups, mainly of Jews and young students, streamed towards the centre of the city’ with red flags of shouts of “Down with the autocracy!” and “Down with the police!” And orators

³⁸⁰ Solzhenitsyn, op. cit., pp. 379-380, 383-384.

³⁸¹ Solzhenitsyn, op. cit., p. 358.

³⁸² Solzhenitsyn, op. cit., pp. 367-368.

³⁸³ Solzhenitsyn, op. cit., p. 361.

summoned them to the revolution. From a metallic image on the Duma of the words 'God save the Tsar!', the first two words were broken off. They rushed into the Duma hall, 'a huge portrait of his Majesty the Emperor was torn to pieces, while in the Duma the national flag was replaced with the red flag. They removed the hats from a protopriest, deacon and reader who were passing by in a cab to a pannikhida, and then later at the burial they stopped the procession 'and interrupted the singing of "Holy God" with shouts of "Hurrah!"'. 'They dragged along a dead cat and a scarecrow without its head and with the inscription "This is the autocracy", and collected money on the spot "for killing the Tsar" or "for the death of Nicholas"'. 'The young people, and especially the Jews, with an evident consciousness of their superiority began to point out to the Russians that freedom had not been given voluntarily, but had been snatched away from the government by the Jews... They openly said to the Russians: "Now we will rule you"', and also: 'We gave you God, we will also give you a tsar'.'³⁸⁴ Prophetic words when we remember that it was little more than twelve years to the Jewish Soviet "tsardom" ...

Soon the students were forcing workers to take off their hats in front of the red flag. When the workers refused, they were shot at. But though unarmed, they succeeded in dispersing the crowd. Then, however, another thousand-strong crowd of Jews began to fire at the workers, killing four. Thus "in various places there began fights and armed confrontations between Russians and Jews: Russian workers and people without fixed occupations, the so-called hooligans, began to catch and beat up Jews. They went on to break into and destroy Jewish houses, flats and stalls."³⁸⁵

The next day the "counter-pogrom" of the Russians against the Jews began in earnest. Crowds of Russians of all classes carrying icons and portraits of the tsar, and singing "Save, O Lord, Thy people" marched into the centre of the town. There the revolutionaries shot at them, a boy carrying an icon was killed, bombs were thrown...

Open warfare between Jews and Russians now began.

"On October 31 [21?] a crowd of Jews destroyed state emblems and seized the Duma, proclaiming a 'Danubian-Black Sea Republic' headed by the Jew Pergament. It was suggested that the Don and Kuban lands should be 'cleansed' of Cossacks and handed over to Jewish settlers. Moreover, Jewish organizations *armed* from four to five thousand warriors, and not a little blood was shed in conflicts with soldiers. All this was described by the correspondent of the [London] *Times*, who was a witness of the events, in an article entitled 'A Regime of Terror' (Jewish terror was meant). Then in London the chief rabbi of the Spanish communities Gasper came out in print denying *everything* ('Not one Jew insulted the Majesty' of the Tsar) and affirming that that Tsarist troops and police had killed four thousand completely innocent Jews! The *Times*

³⁸⁴ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 390-391.

³⁸⁵ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 393.

correspondent from Odessa refuted this fabrication: in general there had not been thousands of Jews killed. During the Odessa disorders only 293 Jews had been buried, of whom many died a natural death. 386 The Englishman also pointed out that the provocation had been arranged by the 'central Jewish organization in Switzerland which sent its emissaries from Poland to Odessa'. He quoted L.Ya. Rabinovich on how the transfer of arms had taken place. But such witnesses from objective foreign observers were extremely rare! On the other hand, the whole of the world's press was filled with descriptions of the horrors of the Jewish pogroms, which rolled in an especially powerful wave from October 18 to 21 in the cities of Orel, Kursk, Simferopol, Rostov-on-Don, Ryazan, Velikie Luki, Ivanovo-Voznesensk, Kaluga, Kazan, Novgorod, Smolensk, Tula, Ufa, Tomsk, Warsaw, many others and in all the cities of the 'Pale of Settlement'. Of course, nothing was said about how these pogroms had been *provoked by the Jews themselves* (especially often by firing at Russians from the windows of *well-known Jewish houses*). In our days it has become clearer that at that time *social-democratic* organizations led by Jews deliberately spread leaflets among the people calling on them to [start] *Jewish pogroms*."387

The wrath of the people was directed not only against the Jews but against leftists generally. Thus in Tver a crowd set fire to the theatre in which the leftists were sitting – 200 perished. Another crowd threatened to do the same thing in Balashov, but thanks to the courageous actions of the governor, Peter Arkadyevich Stolypin, there were no victims.

And yet, considering the scale of the disturbances, there were far fewer victims than might have been expected – 1000 dead and several thousand wounded, according to one Jewish source. Again, the Jew G. Sliozberg, a contemporary witness who was in possession of all the information, wrote: "Fortunately, all these hundreds of pogroms did not bring in their wake significant violence against the persons of Jews, and in the vast majority of places the pogroms were not accompanied by murders."388

For in 1905 faith and morality still held the great majority of the Orthodox people back from taking revenge against their persecutors.

On October 27 the Tsar wrote to his mother "that the pogromshchiki represented 'a whole mass of loyal people', reacting angrily to 'the impertinence of the Socialists and revolutionaries... and, because nine-tenths of the trouble-makers are Jews, the People's whole anger turned against them.' This analysis was accepted by many foreign observers, notably British diplomats like the ambassador at St. Petersburg, Sir Charles Hardinge, his

386 "According to information provided by the police, those killed numbered more than 500, of whom 400 were Jews, while the wounded registered by the police numbered 289... of whom 237 were Jews" (Solzhenitsyn, op. cit., p. 397). (V.M.).

387 Lebedev, op. cit., pp. 428-429.

388 Solzhenitsyn, op. cit., p. 401.

councillor, Cecil Spring Rice, and the Consul-General in Moscow, Alexander Murray.”³⁸⁹

This analysis was also supported by Senator Kuzminsky, who concluded that “the October disturbances and disorders [in Odessa] were caused by factors of an undeniably revolutionary character and were crowned by a pogrom of Jews exclusively as a result of the fact that it was the representatives of this nationality who took the dominant part in the revolutionary movement”.³⁹⁰

Alexander Solzhenitsyn has shown by extensive quotations from Jewish sources that the Jews were well aware of the true state of affairs. Even the more honest Jews had to admit that 1905 was in essence “a Jewish revolution”. “Thus in November, 1905 a certain Jacob de Haas in an article entitled ‘The Jewish Revolution’ in the London Zionist journal *Maccabee* wrote directly: ‘The revolution in Russia is a Jewish revolution, for it is the turning point in Jewish history. This situation stems from the fact that *Russia is the fatherland of about half of the overall number of Jews inhabiting the world...*’”³⁹¹

The restoration of order in Russia was accomplished largely through the efforts of one of the great servants of the tsarist regime, the Interior Minister and later Prime Minister Peter Arkadyevich Stolypin. In the Duma his military field tribunals, which decreed capital punishment for the leading revolutionaries, were fiercely criticized. But he replied to one such critic: “Learn to distinguish the blood on the hands of a doctor from the blood on the hands of an executioner...”

And so the 1905 revolution was crushed. But the revolutionary spirit remained alive, and the country remained divided. Moreover, the threat it faced from the Jews and revolutionaries had by no means disappeared. Thus “between January 1908 and May 1910, 19,957 terrorist attacks and revolutionary robberies were recorded; 732 government officials and 3,052 private citizens were killed, and nearly another 4,000 wounded.”³⁹² The Orthodox Christian Empire had struck back against the Jewish revolution; but the bell was tolling for the Empire...

³⁸⁹ Niall Ferguson, *The War of the World*, London: Penguin Books, 2006, p. 68.

³⁹⁰ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 398-399.

³⁹¹ Lebedev, *op. cit.*, p. 421.

³⁹² Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

42. THE BEILIS TRIAL

In 1911, a Christian boy, Andrew Yuschinsky, was killed in Kiev. In connection with this, the trial took place, in 1913, of a Jew named Beilis, which became an international cause célèbre. The verdict of the court was that the boy had been ritually murdered. However, Beilis himself was acquitted (because witnesses and jurors were suborned, according to many).³⁹³ In order to understand the significance of this trial, it is necessary briefly to review the roots of “the Jewish question” in Russia and of the so-called Jewish “blood libel”.

By 1914 there were about seven million Jews in the Russian empire – the largest non-Slavic ethnic minority. Most of them lived in the Pale of Settlement, a very large area in the west of Russia approximately the size of France and Germany combined. Russian law, very loosely observed, confined them to this area, but on religious, not racial grounds – the sacred book of the Jews, the Talmud, is so hostile to Christ and Christians that those who follow it were deemed to be a threat to the lives and livelihoods of Christians. That these restrictions were indeed religious and not racial is proved by the fact that the Karaite Jews, who did not accept the Talmud, the Mountain Jews of the Caucasus, who were strongly tainted with paganism, and Jews who became Christians of any denomination, were given equal rights with the rest of the population.³⁹⁴

Moreover, permission to live outside the Pale was given to various categories of Jews: Siberian colonists, domestic servants, artisans, university graduates (one-fifth of the students of Kharkov university were Jews), businessmen, industrialists, bankers and others. This meant that in spite of the discriminatory laws there were considerable colonies of Jews throughout the empire and even in the capital, which enabled them to play a prominent role in the cultural and commercial life of pre-revolutionary Russia. In all, Jews made up about a third of Russia’s total trading community.

In spite of the considerable opportunities thus presented to Jews in the Russian Empire, the traditionalist, rabbi-dominated Talmudic Jews of the Pale continued to think of Christians and Christian society as unclean and despicable. “The eminent Jewish-Russian lawyer, Genrikh Sliozberg,” write Kyril Fitzlyon and Tatiana Browning, “never forgot the ‘real grief’ of his family and relations when they discovered that his father had sent him to a Russian grammar school. His school uniform they found particularly irritating, sinful even. It was, they thought, ‘an apostate’s garb’, and his mother and grandmother cried bitterly every time they saw him in it.’ Again, ‘the Russian-

³⁹³ See M.V. Danilushkin, *Istoria Russkoj Pravoslavnoj Tserkvi, 1917-70* (A History of the Russian Orthodox Church, 1917-70, St. Petersburg, 1997, vol. 1, pp. 784-793; Solzhenitsyn, op. cit., pp. 444-451.

³⁹⁴ “Let us remember,” writes Solzhenitsyn: “the legal restrictions on the Jews in Russia were never racial [as they were in Western Europe]. They were applied neither to the Karaites [who rejected the Talmud], nor to the mountain Jews, nor to the Central Asian Jews.” (op. cit., p. 292).

Jewish revolutionary, Lev Deutsch, writing in 1923, clearly remembered the time when the Jews 'considered it sinful to learn Russian, and its use was allowed only if absolutely essential and, of course, only for speaking to Christians (the goyim).'³⁹⁵

It was in this fanatical atmosphere that both Communist and Zionist propaganda made inroads into Jewish youth. As Chaim Weitzmann recalled in his *Autobiography*, zealots of both types were to be found in his own family, being united only in their hatred of Orthodox Russia.³⁹⁶ Such sentiments were bound to lead to a reaction on the part of the surrounding population. Moreover, Jewish money-lenders exploited Russian peasants who wished to buy their freedom after Alexander II's emancipation of the serfs in 1861. The government tried to help with generous, low-interest loans, and on several occasions cancelled the debts outright; but the remaining need was filled by less generous Jews, who stepped in with much tougher, high-interest loans.

The pogroms of the oppressed Ukrainian peasantry against the oppressor Jewish money-lenders provided the excuse which international Jewry, together with its "Christian" front, needed. Soon a vast campaign was being whipped up against "the sick man of Europe", the so-called "prison of the peoples". Jewish and Socialist propaganda distorted the significance of these events, obscuring their causes, hiding the extremely provocative behaviour of Jewish gangs, and quite unjustly accusing the Church and the State, and in particular the Tsar, of complicity in these crimes.

The innocence of the Tsar is illustrated by their reaction to the assassination by the Jewish revolutionary Bogrov of Prime Minister A.A. Stolypin in Kiev Opera House in 1911. Robert Massie writes: "Because Bogrov was a Jew, the Orthodox population was noisily preparing a retaliatory pogrom. Frantic with fear, the city's Jewish population spent the night packing their belongings. The first light of the following day found the square before the railway station jammed with carts and people trying to squeeze themselves on to departing trains. Even as they waited, the terrified people heard the clatter of hoofs. An endless stream of Cossacks, their long lances dark against the dawn sky, rode past. On his own, Kokovtsev had ordered three full regiments of Cossacks into the city to prevent violence. Asked on what authority he had issued the command, Kokovtsev replied: 'As head of the government.' Later, a local official came up to the Finance Minister to complain, 'Well, Your Excellency, by calling in the troops you have missed a fine chance to answer Bogrov's shot with a nice Jewish pogrom.' Kokovtsov was indignant, but, he added, 'his sally suggested to me that the measures which I had taken at Kiev were not sufficient... therefore I sent an open telegram to all governors of the region demanding that they use every possible means - force if necessary - to prevent

³⁹⁵ Fitzlyon and Browning, *Russia Before the Revolution*, London: Penguin books, 1977, p. 46.

³⁹⁶ *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weitzmann*, New York: Harper, 1949.

possible pogroms. When I submitted this telegram to the Tsar, he expressed his approval of it and of the measure I had taken in Kiev."³⁹⁷

In 1906 the future Hieromartyr Fr. John Vostorgov said: "The Jews are restricted in their rights of residence not as a confessional unit, but as a predatory tribe that is dangerous in the midst of the peaceful population because of its exploitative inclinations, which... have found a religious sanction and support in the Talmud... Can such a confession be tolerated in the State, when it allows its followers to practise hatred and all kinds of deceit and harm towards other confessions, and especially Christians? ... The establishment of the Pale of Settlement is the softest of all possible measures in relation to such a confession. Moreover, is it possible in this case not to take account of the mood of the masses? But this mood cannot be changed only by issuing a law on the complete equality of rights of the Jews. On the contrary, this can only strengthen the embitterment of the people..."³⁹⁸

Now stories of ritual murder of Christian children by Jews have surfaced in many countries in many ages, leading to many formal trials and convictions. As we saw in chapter 11, although these are completely dismissed by western authors, who speak about the "blood libel" against the Jews, there is in fact strong evidence that the practice existed. We here cite two more sources, this time from Russian rather than West European sources.

In 1855 Bishop Porphyrius (Uspensky) of Chigirinsk wrote: "Just as the Christian peoples have retained many pagan superstitions, so the Jews - it goes without saying, not all of them - continue to shed the blood of children and youths who are not of their tribe according to very ancient tradition, which points to the redemption of their whole race in a bloody human sacrifice... In the East everyone is convinced that the killing of Christian boys by the Jews is ordered in such a way that this evil is accomplished in one year in Thessalonica, for example, in another in Damascus, in a third in Spain, or Russia, or Wallachia, etc., and that the towels soaked in the blood of the unfortunate victim are burned, and their ashes are scattered to all the synagogues so that they can be baked into the paschal bread... Judge, after this, how difficult it is to catch the terrible crime... I sorrow over the existence of such a horror among the Jews... And Jews have penetrated onto Athos, and one of them in the rank of hieromonk and spiritual father killed monks coming to him for confession, and hid their corpses under his floor..."³⁹⁹

A still more important witness is that of Monk Neophytus, who was until the age of 38 a Jewish rabbi but then joined the Greek Church. He exposed, not only of the real existence of this horrific practice, but also the religious rationale behind it. His book, entitled *A Refutation of the Religion of the Jews and their Rites*

³⁹⁷ Massie, *Nicolas and Alexandra*, London: Book Club Associates, 1967, p. 229.

³⁹⁸ Vostorgov, in Fomin and Fomina, *Rossia pered Vtorym Prishestvoiem* (Russia before the Second Coming), Sergiev Posad, 1993, vol. II, p. 624.

³⁹⁹ Uspensky, in Fomin and Fomina, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 632.

from the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, originally appeared in Moldavia in 1803 and was translated into Russian in 1913, the year of the Beilis trial:-

“The secret use of blood, which the Jews collect from Christians killed by them is a rite which they consider to have been commanded by God Himself and indicated in certain mysterious expressions in the Scriptures.

“Many scholars have written works aimed at proving, with the help of the Bible, the appearance of the true Messiah promised by God to our fathers, Who is the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the All-Pure Virgin Mary. An innumerable quantity of works have also been written to refute the superstitious beliefs of the Jews and their false teachings. Many of these authors were native Jews who converted to the Christian Faith. Meanwhile, nobody has yet published anything serious concerning this barbaric mystery of blood, which is kept and used by the synagogue. If some book hinting at this mystery happens to fall into the hands of Christians, and they make reference to it, the Jews never reply in any other way than with feigned mockery or evasions, like the following: ‘But how would we kill Christians if the law forbids us to eat blood?’

“In my opinion, the reason preventing the Jews, even those converted to Christianity, from clearly exposing this is hidden either in the fact that they really were not initiated into the mystery, or in the fact that they still foolishly pity our unfortunate people, and fear to attract to it the powerful vengeance of the Christian peoples.

“But I, having by the mercy of God received Holy Baptism and monasticism, have no fear, in the interest of Christians, to declare everything that I know about these rites, which I myself zealously carried out and kept in the strictest secrecy all the time that I was a haham, or rabbi.

“But first of all it is necessary to explain that the mystery of blood is not known to all Jews, but only to the hahams, or rabbis, the scribes, or Pharisees, who for that reason are called the keepers of the mystery of the blood – a mystery which, moreover, is not contained in clear words in any of their books and which they pass on exclusively by oral tradition.

“The fathers of families initiated into the mystery pass it on only to that one of their sons whose secrecy they have tested. Also, they insist that he is obliged to pass on the mystery only under those condition and in that form, and that he should never disclose it to a Christian, even in the cruellest woes, and even for the saving of life. This revelation is accompanied by the most terrifying curses on anyone who gives away the secret. Here, for example, is how I was initiated into it myself.

“When I reached the age of thirteen, - the age at which the Jews have the custom of laying a wreath called the wreath of glory on the heads of their sons, - my father went apart with me and had a long talk with me, instilling hatred

for the Christians into me as a duty laid down by God. This hatred was to go as far as killing them. Then he told me of the custom of collecting the blood of the murdered, and he added, embracing me: 'So, my son, in this way I have made you my confidant and as it were my second I.' Then he put the wreath on my head and in great detail explained to me the mystery of the blood as the holiest of the holies and the important rite of the Jewish religion. 'My son,' he continued, 'I abjure you by all the elements of heaven and earth always to keep this secret in your heart and not to entrust it to anyone, neither your brothers, nor your sisters, not your mother, nor, later, your wife, - not to any mortal, and especially women. If God gives you even eleven grown sons, do not reveal the secret to all of them, but only to one - the one whom you recognise to be the cleverest and the most capable of keeping the secret, just as I am now acting with you. You must take great care that this son of yours should be devoted and zealous for our faith. Once more I adjure you: beware of trusting women, even your daughters, your wife and your mother, but trust only the son whom you consider worthy of trust.' 'O my son,' he cried finally, 'may the whole earth refuse to accept your corpse and thrust you out from its depths, if, even in conditions of the most extreme necessity, you reveal this secret of blood to anyone besides him of whom I have spoken. Even if you become a Christian for the sake of profit or for other reasons. See that you do not betray your father by giving away this divine secret which I have revealed to you today. Otherwise may my curse strike you at the very hour at which you sin, and may it accompany you all the days of your life until death and to the ages of ages.'

"May the Father Whom I have acquired in heaven and Who is the Lord Jesus Christ turn away these curses from the head of him who writes exclusively for the sake of the benefit of the Church and the triumph of the Truth.

"The bases of this barbaric custom are the following: 1) hatred for Christians, 2) superstition, and 3) faith in the spiritual reality of Christian blood. I shall explain each of these points.

"On the first reason, which is hatred for Christians.

"The Jews as it were from their mother's breast instil hatred of Christianity into their sons from the earliest childhood. On receiving these convictions from their fathers over a whole series of generations, they are really and sincerely convinced that to despise Christians and even to kill them is very pleasing to God, thereby exactly justifying the words of Divine redemption: 'everyone who kills you will think that he is thereby serving God' (John 16.20).

"On the second reason, which is superstition.

"The second reason is based on the superstitious beliefs which the Jews hold and which relate to the sphere of magic, sorcery, the kabbala and other mysterious rites. They believe that Christian blood is necessary for these diabolical operations. Out of all these superstitions I will indicate only one, which concerns the curse of God that fell on the unhappy people of Israel and

which was prophesied by Moses himself in the following expressions: 'the Lord will strike you with Egyptian leprosy... a foul leprosy on the knees and shins from which you will not be able to be healed' (Deuteronomy 28.27, 35).

"This terrible illness always was and is very common among the Jews – much more common than they think... And when the haham visits the sick who have been struck down by it, and gives them medicines, he at the same time sprinkles them with Christian blood, if he has any, as the only means of healing...

"On the third and principal reason, which is the faith of the Jews in the spiritual reality of Christian blood.

"The main reason which compels the Jews to kill Christians and collect their blood is the faith, secretly preserved especially by the hahams, or rabbis, that Jesus Christ, the Son of Mary from Nazareth, who was condemned by our ancestors to death on the Cross, is, in all probability, the true Messiah who was for so long expected and invoked by the patriarchs and prophets. There are enough prophecies to convince them of this; especially important is the passage from Jeremiah: 'Be amazed, O heavens, tremble and be seized with horror, says the Lord, for two evils have My people committed: they have abandoned Me, the source of living water, and have cut out for themselves broken cisterns which cannot hold water' (Jeremiah 2.12,13).

"This prophecy is well-known and is understood in its true meaning by many rabbis, as it was very well known by Annas and Caiaphas. But, like them, from pride and hardness of heart, the rabbis do not want to recognise it, and therefore, resorting to pitiful interpretations, they have composed new rules – a real parody on the most important mysteries of the Church, so as to be saved by Christian blood, in which they see the blood of the Messiah Himself.

"In consequence of their conviction... the Jews use Christian blood at circumcision, which represents baptism; at marriage, which corresponds to this mystery among the Christians; in the unleavened bread of Pascha, which represents the Eucharist; at burials, imitating holy unction; in their lament over the destruction of Jerusalem, which represents the mystery of repentance. This is the basis of the secret, which I knew and sometimes applied with extraordinary zeal. I shall stop on each of these explanations.

"Marriage. When a marriage is concluded between Jews, the bride and bridegroom prepare for it with a strict fast for 24 hours, abstaining even from water until the setting of the sun. It is then that the rabbi appears. He takes a just-boiled egg, removes the shell and divides it in half. Then he sprinkles it, not with salt, but with a special ash, which I will say more about later. He gives half of this sprinkled egg to each spouse.

"Let us now say what this ash is. It is used not instead of salt, but instead of fresh Christian blood, being in actual fact changed Christian blood. It is

precisely with the blood left over from the sacrifices carried out for the feast of unleavened bread, the more the better, that the rabbis infuse a corresponding quantity of flax or cotton thread, then they dry it and burn it. The ash is kept in bottles that are carefully sealed and given to the synagogue's treasurer. The latter distributes it gradually to the rabbis who ask for it, or for their own use, or for sending to those countries where it is impossible to obtain Christian blood, whether because there are no Christians there or because the police have been roused to be more watchful and the Christians more careful.

"In any case, fresh blood is always preferable, but it is necessary only for the unleavened bread, and in the case of insurmountable obstacles the indicated dark ash represents an acceptable substitute.

"Circumcision. A rabbi also appears for the circumcision of children on the eighth day after birth. He puts into a cup some of the best wine he can get hold of and pours one drop of Christian blood into it. It has been collected from torture, but if that is not available, some of the above-mentioned ash is used, into which a drop of the blood of the circumcised child is added. When this is well mixed with the wine, the rabbi immerses the finger of the child into the cup and says: 'I declare to you, child: your life is in your blood.' And he twice repeats this rite and these words.

"Here is a superstitious explanation which the rabbis give for this ceremony amongst themselves. The Prophet Ezekiel twice said: "'Live in your blood!'" Thus I say to you: "Live in your blood!" (Ezekiel 16.6). By these words the prophet perhaps wanted to indicate the blood of Jesus Christ, Who freed from bonds the souls of the holy fathers who did not receive a water baptism; and in such a case the souls of the Jews, although also themselves deprived of the water of baptism, will be saved by the blood of a Christian baptised in water. But one of the reasons why this blood must be collected amidst the cruel sufferings of the victim is precisely the necessity of representing thereby the Passion of Christ. On the contrary, if the Prophet Ezekiel wanted to speak only about every man's blood of circumcision, then the Jewish child will be saved by the power of the single drop of blood mixed by the rabbi in the wine with the Christian blood. What a pitiful nation!

"The anniversary of the taking of Jerusalem. The Jews again use the ash of which I have spoken on the ninth day of July, when they weep over the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. On this anniversary they use it in two ways: first, they wipe their forehead with it, which they thought would be unseemly to do with fresh blood, and secondly, they sprinkle an egg with it, and on that day every son of Israel without exception must eat a hard-boiled egg sprinkled with this ash...

"Death. A haham immediately goes to the house of him of whose death he just learned. He takes the white of an egg, mixes into it some Christian blood and a little ash and puts this mixture into the breast of the corpse, uttering the supposed words of Ezekiel: 'I shall sprinkle you with pure blood and you will

be cleansed from all your filthiness' (Ezekiel 36.25). Ezekiel, it is true, said, not 'pure blood', but 'pure water'... But by dint of this corruption of the text the Jews convince themselves that the dead man will undoubtedly be admitted to paradise.

"The feasts of Pascha and Purim. These two feasts demand the same blood ritual.

"On paschal days the Jews must eat unleavened bread, small breads prepared only by hahams, into which Christian blood has been poured. Everyone, nobles and simple people, young and old, even those without teeth, must taste of this bread, even if it only a crumb the size of an olive...

"The feast of Purim was established in memory of the deliverance from the dominion of Haman by means of Esther and Mordecai, as this is recounted in the book of Esther. As is known, this feast comes in February. The initiated Jews are then occupied, wherever they can, with seizing as many Christians as possible, especially children. However, in this night they sacrifice only one, reproducing the torments of Haman. But for this reason, while the body is hanging, all those present cover it with thousands of insults, as if they were addressing Haman himself. The collected blood is poured out by the rabbi into flour that has already been dissolved with honey, from which he then makes small breads in the form of a triangle for the sake of ridiculing the mystery of the Holy Trinity. These breads are meant, not for the Jews, but through boundless cunning they are distributed to the most eminent families, which must give them away - and these gifts are considered the height of kindness - to their friends from among the Christians. This rite is called the Bread of Purim.

"We should note that this rite does not require the application of too heavy tortures to the victim precisely because the collected blood does not have any other purpose than the one I have indicated.

"The rest of kidnapped Christians, however, are kept in secret hiding-places until the day of Pascha, which comes shortly after Purim. At this time they are all offered in sacrifice in the cruellest and most barbaric manner, and they collect their blood partly for the unleavened bread and partly for other necessities which come up in the course of the year and have been indicated above. These torments at Pascha have a definite aim - to renew the sufferings of Christ, and for that reason they must be carried out mainly on children who through their innocence and virginity better symbolize the Saviour.

"In these depressing pourings out of blood the words of Jeremiah written in prophecy about the Jews are justified: 'Even on the hems of your clothes is found the blood of poor innocent people' (Jeremiah 2.34), and still better the words of Ezekiel: 'You eat with blood... and shed blood' (Ezekiel 33.25). In consequence of these innumerable murders Israel was expelled from various

states, in particular from Spain, thereby justifying another prophecy of Ezekiel: 'Blood calls you to court' (Ezekiel 30.6)."⁴⁰⁰

Such is the testimony of Monk Neophytus... It is the tendency of pro-semite authors to dismiss all this as "anti-semitic lies". However, even if all the historical evidence of Jewish atrocities could be dismissed, it would be surprising indeed if a religion steeped in such hatred against Christ and Christians as Talmudic Judaism did not produce *acts* of hatred. As long as incitement to such acts exists in the "sacred" book of the Judaistic religion, there must be a presumption that some of its followers may be tempted to carry them out.

On the other hand, it cannot be denied that Christians also acted with hatred and committed atrocities, as in the pogroms in the Rhineland in 1096 or in Spain leading to the expulsion of all the Jews from Spain in 1492. Hatred of enemies is forbidden by the Gospel of Christ; so such acts, whether or not they were provoked by hatred on the Jews' side, cannot be condoned. But the justified horror at Christian antisemitism which has become so de rigueur in the modern world, must always be balanced by a similar horror at the antigentilism and antichristianity of the Talmud, the most hateful of all "sacred" books.

Archbishop Anthony (Khrapovitsky)'s attitude to Jewish blood rituals in general, and the Beilis trial in particular, was expressed in an interview he gave to A. Chizhevsky. After reminding his readers of how, at the request of Rabbi Skomorovsky, he had twice, in 1903 and 1905, spoken up against the antisemite pogroms in Zhitomir, he went on: "But in both of the above-mentioned cases of my conversation with the rabbi, I decisively refused to say that I did not recognize the existence of ritual murders carried out by Jews, but on the contrary I expressed to my interlocutor my conviction that these murders exist, perhaps as belonging to one or another sect of the Jewish religion, perhaps as a secret of the highest spiritual government of the Jews, but there undoubtedly have been cases of ritual murders both in recent times and in antiquity.

"When my Jewish academic acquaintances pointed to the fact that Jewish law forbids the drinking of the blood even of animals, so that the thought of their mixing Christian blood with the paschal matsa was absurd, I replied that what seemed more probable to me was the link between the ritual killings and, not the Jewish feast of Pascha, but the feast that precedes it of 'Purim', in which the story of Esther, Haman and Mordecai is remembered, when the Persian king, having executed the enemy of the Jews, Haman, allowed them, who had not long before been condemned to general killing, to kill their enemies themselves. Purim in 1911 [the year of the ritual killing of Andrew Yuschinsky] took place on March 14 and 15, while the Jewish Pascha was from March 15-18...

⁴⁰⁰ Platonov, op. cit., pp. 748-754.

“Already in deep antiquity the Jews were causing various disorders against various symbols hostile to them during this feast. Thus in 408 and 412 the Byzantine emperor issued two special decrees forbidding the Jews from celebrating Purim and mocking Christian crosses instead of Haman. I think that Christian children were also killed on this feast...”⁴⁰¹

The Beilis trial polarized Russian society and, through the Jewish press, had international ramifications. Liberal opinion throughout the world pilloried Russia, which was now the country, supposedly, not only of the cruellest tyranny and retrograde religion, but also of systematic persecution and slander of the Jews. Unfortunately, these criticisms, though unjust, helped to create the very phenomenon they decried. Racial anti-semitism, as opposed to religious anti-Judaism and anti-Talmudism, had been rare in Russia – rarer than in most western countries. But in the decade that followed the Beilis trial, under the stress of war and revolution and the undoubted fact that the revolution was led mainly by Jews, real anti-semitism took root in Russia during the Civil War, with massacres far exceeding anything seen in the times of the tsars...

⁴⁰¹ Archbishop Anthony, in *Zhizn' Volynii* (The Life of Volhynia), № 221, 2 September, 1913.

43. THE JEWS IN THE 1917 REVOLUTION

The root of the revolution was a nihilistic-messianic-chilastic kind of faith built out of many strands of European and Jewish thought. As for the actual composition of forces that brought about the revolution, this was no less varied. We need to distinguish between at least three levels at which the revolution took place.

First, there was the level of the out-and-out revolutionaries, intelligenty who were supported by many from the industrial proletariat and the revolutionary-minded peasantry, who were aiming to destroy Russian tsarism and Russian Orthodox civilization completely before embarking on a world revolution that would dethrone God and traditional authority from the hearts and minds of all men everywhere. This level was led by Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin; it was composed mainly of Jews, but also contained numbers of Russians, Latvians, Georgians, Poles and other nationalities. They were possessed by the revolutionary faith to the greatest extent, and owed no allegiance to any nation or traditional creed or morality.

Secondly, there were the Freemasons, the aristocratic and middle-class Duma politicians and their supporters in the country at large, who were not aiming to destroy Russia completely, but only to remove the tsar and introduce a constitutional government. This level was led by Guchkov, Rodzyanko and Kerensky; it was composed mainly of Russians, but also contained most of the intelligentsia of the other nations of the empire. They believed in the revolutionary faith, but still had moral scruples derived from their Christian background.

Thirdly, there were the lukewarm Orthodox Christians, the great mass of ordinary Russians, who did not necessarily want either world revolution or a constitutional government, but who lacked the courage and the faith to act openly in support of Faith, Tsar and Fatherland. It is certain that if very many Russians had not become lukewarm in their faith, God would not have allowed the revolution to take place. After the revolution, many from this level, seeing the terrible devastation that their lukewarmness had allowed to take place, bitterly repented and returned to the ranks of the confessing Orthodox Christians.

The extraordinary prominence of Jews in the revolution is a fact that must be related, at least in part, to the traditionally anti-Russian and anti-Christian attitude of Jewish culture, which is reflected in both of its major political offspring – Bolshevism and Zionism. The theist Jews who triumphed in Israel in 1917, and especially in 1948 after the foundation of the State of Israel, came from the same region and social background – the Pale of Settlement in Western Russia – as the Jews who triumphed in Moscow in 1917, and sometimes even from the same families. For, as Chaim Weitzmann, the first president of Israel, showed in his *Autobiography*, the atheist Bolshevik Jews and the theist Zionist Jews came from the same milieu, often the very same families. Thus

Weitzmann's own mother was able to witness her sons' triumph both in Bolshevik Moscow and Zionist Jerusalem...⁴⁰²

The simultaneous triumph of the Jews in Russia and Palestine was indeed an extraordinary "coincidence": Divine Providence drew the attention of all those with eyes to see this sign of the times when, in one column of newsprint in the London *Times* for November 9, 1917, there appeared two articles, the one announcing the outbreak of revolution in Petrograd, and the other – the promise of a homeland for the Jews in Palestine (the Balfour declaration). M. Heifetz also points to the coincidence in time between the October revolution and the Balfour declaration. "A part of the Jewish generation goes along the path of Herzl and Zhabotinsky. The other part, unable to withstand the temptation, fills up the band of Lenin and Trotsky and Stalin." "The path of Herzl and Bagritsky allowed the Jews to stand tall and immediately become not simply an equal nation with Russia, but a privileged one."⁴⁰³ Indeed, the Russian revolution may be regarded as one branch of that general triumph of Jewish power which we observe in the twentieth century in both East and West, in both Russia and America and Israel. The mainly Jewish nature of the world revolution cannot be doubted.

Thus Winston Churchill wrote: "It would almost seem as if the Gospel of Christ and the gospel of anti-Christ were designed to originate among the same people; and that this mystic and mysterious race had been chosen for the supreme manifestations, both of the Divine and the diabolical... From the days of 'Spartacus' Weishaupt to those of Karl Marx, and down to Trotsky (Russia), Bela Kun (Hungary), Rosa Luxembourgh (Germany) and Emma Goldman (United States), this worldwide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilization and for the reconstitution of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence and impossible equality, has been steadily growing. It played, as a modern writer, Mrs. Nesta Webster, has so ably shown, a definitely recognizable part in the tragedy of the French Revolution. It has been the mainspring of every subversive movement during the nineteenth century; and now at last this band of extraordinary personalities from the underworld of the great cities of Europe and America have gripped the Russian people by the hair of their heads and have become practically the undisputed masters of that enormous empire. There is no need to exaggerate the part played in the creation of Bolshevism and in the bringing about of the Russian Revolution by these international and for the most part atheistical Jews. It is certainly a very great one; it probably outweighs all others."⁴⁰⁴

Liberals ascribed the revolutionary character of the Jews to antisemitism, and, in the Russian case, to pogroms and the multitude of restrictions placed on the Jews by the Russian tsars. However, as we have seen, far fewer Jews

⁴⁰² Weitzmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weitzmann*, New York: Harper, 1949.

⁴⁰³ Heifetz, "Nashi Obschie Uroki", 22, 1980, N 14, p. 162; in Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

⁴⁰⁴ *Illustrated Sunday Herald*, February 8, 1920; quoted in Douglas Reed, *The Controversy of Zion*, Durban, S.A.: Dolphin Press, 1978, pp. 272-273. The most detailed data on the domination of the Jews over Russia can be found in Winberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 359-372.

died in the pogroms than Russian officials in terrorist attacks (1845 by the year 1909), while the restrictions were placed on the Jews in order to protect the Russian peasant, who was ruthlessly exploited by them. As the future Hieromartyr John Vostorgov said in 1906: "The Jews are restricted in their rights of residence not as a confessional unit, but as a predatory tribe that is dangerous in the midst of the peaceful population because of its exploitative inclinations, which... have found a religious sanction and support in the Talmud... Can such a confession be tolerated in the State, when it allows its followers to practise hatred and all kinds of deceit and harm towards other confessions, and especially Christians? ... The establishment of the Pale of Settlement is the softest of all possible measures in relation to such a confession. Moreover, is it possible in this case not to take account of the mood of the masses? But this mood cannot be changed only by issuing a law on the complete equality of rights of the Jews. On the contrary, this can only strengthen the embitterment of the people..."⁴⁰⁵

"Let us remember," writes Solzhenitsyn: "the legal restrictions on the Jews in Russia were never racial [as they were in Western Europe]. They were applied neither to the Karaites [who rejected the Talmud], nor to the mountain Jews, nor to the Central Asian Jews."⁴⁰⁶ In other words, restrictions were placed only on those Jews who practised the religion of the Talmud, because of its vicious anti-Christianity and double morality. Moreover, the restrictions were very generously applied. The boundaries of the Pale (a huge area twice the size of France) were extremely porous, allowing large numbers of Jews to acquire higher education and make their fortunes in Great Russia.

Indeed, so great was the Jewish domination of Russian trade and, most ominously, the Russian press by the time of the revolution that Stolypin wanted to remove the restrictions on the Jews. But in this case the Tsar resisted him, as his father had resisted Count Witte before him.⁴⁰⁷ This was not because the Tsar felt no responsibility to protect the Jews - he spoke about "my Jews", as he talked about "my Poles", "my Armenians" and "my Finns" - but because he also had to protect "my Russians"...

In the end, the Pale of Settlement was destroyed, not by liberal politicians, but by right-wing generals. In 1915, as the Russian armies retreated before the Germans, some Jews were accused of spying for the enemy and were shot, while the Jewish population in general was considered unreliable. And so a

⁴⁰⁵ Vostorgov, in Fomin, S. and Fomina, T., *Rossia pered vtorym prishestviem* (Russia before the Second Coming), Moscow, 1994, vol. II, p. 624.

⁴⁰⁶ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 292.

⁴⁰⁷ As Witte recorded in his *Memoirs*: "'Are you right to stand up for the Jews?' asked Alexander III. In reply Witte asked permission to answer the question with a question: 'Can we drown all the Russian Jews in the Black Sea? If we can, then I accept that resolution of the Jewish question. If not, the resolution of the Jewish question consists in giving them a chance to live. That is in offering them equal rights and equal laws.'" (Edvard Radzinsky, *The Last Tsar*, London: Arrow, 1993, p. 69). But Witte's reply misses the point, as if the choice lay between killing all the Jews or giving them complete equality. No State can give *complete* freedom to a section of the population that does not respect the law and endangers the lives or livelihoods of the majority.

mass evacuation of the Jews from the Pale was ordered by the authorities. But the results were disastrous. Hordes of frightened Jews fleeing eastwards blocked up vital roads along which supplies for the front were destined. Landing up in large cities such as Moscow and Petrograd where there had been no large Jewish population before, these disgruntled new arrivals only fuelled the revolutionary fires. And so was created precisely the situation that the Pale of Settlement had been designed to avert. As the Jews poured from the western regions into the major cities of European Russia, they soon acquired prominent executive positions in all major sectors of government and the economy...

*

As Alexander Solzhenitsyn wrote, February brought only harm and destruction to the Russian population. However, it was different for the Jews: "Jewish society in Russia received in full from the February revolution everything that it had fought for, and the October coup was really not needed by it, except that cutthroat part of the Jewish secular youth that with its Russian brother-internationalists had stacked up a charge of hatred for the Russian state structure and was rearing to 'deepen' the revolution." It was they who through their control of the Executive Committee of the Soviet – over half of its members were Jewish socialists – assumed the real power after February, and propelled it on – contrary to the interests, not only of the Russian, but also of the majority Jewish population, - to the October revolution.⁴⁰⁸

Nevertheless, at the time of the October revolution only a minority of the Jews were Bolsheviks (in the early 1900s they constituted 19% of the party). "At the elections to the Constituent Assembly 'more than 80% of the Jewish population of Russia voted' for Zionist parties. Lenin wrote that 550,000 were for Jewish nationalists. 'The majority of the Jewish parties formed a single national list, in accordance with which seven deputies were elected – six Zionists' and Gruzenberg. 'The success of the Zionists' was also aided by the [published not long before the elections] Declaration of the English Foreign Minister Balfour [on the creation of a 'national centre' of the Jews in Palestine], 'which was met by the majority of the Russian Jewish population with enthusiasm [in Moscow, Petrograd, Odessa, Kiev and many other cities there were festive manifestations, meetings and religious services]'.⁴⁰⁹

The unprecedented catastrophe of the Russian revolution required an explanation... For very many this lay in the coming to power of the Jews, and their hatred for the Russian people. However, Archbishop Andrew of Ufa, the future hieromartyr, wrote: "In defence of the Russian people, they try to say that the people have been confused by the Jews, or deceived by their own leaders... A bad excuse! It's a fine people and a fine Christian religious disposition that can be confused by any rogue that comes along!..."

⁴⁰⁸ Solzhenitsyn, *Dvesti Let Vmeste* (Two Hundred Years Together), vol. 2, Moscow, 2002, pp. 41, 43.

⁴⁰⁹ Solzhenitsyn, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

Nevertheless, that the revolution brought power to the Jews, who had been plotting against the Russian state for decades, if not centuries, is undeniable. According to Donald Rayfield, in 1922, the Jews “reached their maximum representation in the party (not that they formed a coherent group) when, at 15 per cent, they were second only to ethnic Russians with 65 per cent.”⁴¹⁰ But it was in the *higher reaches* of the Party and Government apparatus that the preponderance of the Jews was so striking. Douglas Reed writes: “The Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party, which wielded the supreme power, contained 3 Russians (including Lenin) and 9 Jews. The next body in importance, the Central Committee of the Executive Commission (or secret police) comprised 42 Jews and 19 Russians, Letts, Georgians and others. The Council of People’s Commissars consisted of 17 Jews and five others. The Moscow Che-ka (secret police) was formed of 23 Jews and 13 others. Among the names of 556 high officials of the Bolshevik state officially published in 1918-1919 were 458 Jews and 108 others. Among the central committees of small, supposedly ‘Socialist’ or other non-Communist parties... were 55 Jews and 6 others.”⁴¹¹

Richard Pipes admits: “Jews undeniably played in the Bolshevik Party and the early Soviet apparatus a role disproportionate to their share of the population. The number of Jews active in Communism in Russia and abroad was striking: in Hungary, for example, they furnished 95 percent of the leading figures in Bela Kun’s dictatorship. They also were disproportionately represented among Communists in Germany and Austria during the revolutionary upheavals there in 1918-23, and in the apparatus of the Communist International.”⁴¹²

The London *Times* correspondent in Russia, Robert Wilton, reported: “Taken according to numbers of population, the Jews represented *one* in ten; among the commissars that rule Bolshevik Russia they are *nine* in ten; if anything the proportion of Jews is still greater.”⁴¹³

On June 9, 1919 Captain Montgomery Shuyler of the American Expeditionary Forces telegraphed from Vladivostok on the makeup of the presiding Soviet government: “... (T)here were 384 ‘commissars’ including 2 negroes, 13 Russians, 15 Chinamen, 22 Armenians, and more than 300 Jews. Of the latter number, 264 had come to Russia from the United States since the downfall of the Imperial Government.”⁴¹⁴

The Jews were especially dominant in the most feared and blood-thirsty part of the Bolshevik State apparatus, the Cheka, which, writes Brendon, “consisted

⁴¹⁰ Rayfield, *Stalin and his Hangmen*, London: Viking, 2004, p. 74.

⁴¹¹ Reed, *The Recompense of Zion*, Durban, 1978, p. 274. The most detailed analysis of the ethnic composition of the Soviet government was provided by Vinberg, *op. cit.*

⁴¹² Pipes, *Russia under the Bolshevik Regime, 1919-1924*, London: Fontana, 1995, pp. 112-13.

⁴¹³ Reed, *op. cit.*, p. 276.

⁴¹⁴ Vladimir Kozyreff, “Re: A New One”, orthodox-tradition@yahogroups.com, June 11, 2006.

of 250,000 officers (including 100,000 border guards), a remarkable adjunct to a State which was supposed to be withering away. In the first 6 years of Bolshevik rule it had executed at least 200,000. Moreover, the Cheka was empowered to act as 'policeman, gaoler, investigator, prosecutor, judge and executioner'. It also employed barbaric forms of torture."⁴¹⁵

So complete was the Jewish domination of Russia as a result of the revolution that it is a misnomer to speak about the "Russian" revolution; it should more accurately be called the Russian-Jewish revolution. That the Russian revolution was actually a *Jewish* revolution, but at the same time part of an *international* revolution of Jewry against the Christian and Muslim worlds, is indicated by an article by Jacob de Haas entitled "The Jewish Revolution" and published in the London Zionist journal *Maccabee* in November, 1905: "The Revolution in Russia is a Jewish revolution, for it is a turning point in Jewish history. This situation flows from the fact that Russia is the fatherland of approximately half of the general number of Jews inhabiting the world... The overthrow of the despotic government must exert a huge influence on the destinies of millions of Jews (both in Russia and abroad). Besides, the revolution in Russia is a Jewish revolution also because the Jews are the most active revolutionaries in the tsarist Empire."

But what was it in their upbringing and history that led them to adopt the atheist revolutionary teachings of Russia's "superfluous young men" more ardently than the Russians themselves? Hatred of Christ was, of course, deeply imbedded in the Talmud. But the angry young men that began killing thousands of the Tsar's servants even before the revolution of 1905 had rejected the Talmud as well as the Gospel, and even all religion in general.

Donald Rayfield writes: "The motivation of those Jews who worked for the Cheka was not Zionist or ethnic. The war between the Cheka and the Russian bourgeoisie was not even purely a war of classes or political factions. It can be seen as being between Jewish internationalism and the remnants of a Russian national culture..."

"...What was Jewish except lineage about Bolsheviks like Zinoviev, Trotsky, Kamenev or Sverdlov? Some were second- or even third-generation renegades; few even spoke Yiddish, let alone knew Hebrew. They were by upbringing Russians accustomed to a European way of life and values, Jewish only in the superficial sense that, say, Karl Marx was. Jews in anti-Semitic Tsarist Russia had few ways out of the ghetto except emigration, education or revolution, and the latter two courses meant denying their Judaism by joining often anti-Jewish institutions and groups."⁴¹⁶

This can be seen in the deathbed confession of the Tsar's murderer, Yurovsky: "Our family suffered less from the constant hunger than from my

⁴¹⁵ Piers Brendon, *The Dark Valley. A Panorama of the 1930s*, London: Pimlico, 2001, p. 11.

⁴¹⁶ Rayfield, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

father's religious fanaticism... On holidays and regular days the children were forced to pray, and it is not surprising that my first active protest was against religious and nationalistic traditions. I came to hate God and prayer as I hated poverty and the bosses."⁴¹⁷

At the same time, the Bolshevik Jews did appear to sympathize with Talmudism more than with any other religion. Thus in 1905, as we have seen, the Jewish revolutionaries in Kiev boasted that they would turn St. Sophia cathedral into a synagogue. Again, in 1918 they erected a monument to Judas Iscariot in Sviazhsk⁴¹⁸, and in 1919 - in Tambov!⁴¹⁹ And when the Whites reconquered Perm in 1918 they found many Jewish religious inscriptions in the former Bolshevik headquarters - as well as on the walls of the basement of the Ipatiev House in Yekaterinburg where the Tsar and his family were shot.

Moreover, while rejecting the Talmud and all religion, the revolutionaries did not reject the unconscious emotional energy of Talmudic Judaism, which was concentrated in a fiercely proud nationalism that was more passionately felt by virtue of the Jews having once truly been the chosen people of God. Having fallen away from that chosen status, and been scattered all over the world by the wrath of God, they resented their replacement by the Christian peoples with an especially intense resentment. Roma delenda est - Christian Rome had to be destroyed, and Russia as "The Third Rome", the Rome that now reigned, had to be destroyed first of all. The atheist revolutionaries of the younger generation took over this resentment and hatred even while rejecting its religio-nationalist-historical basis...

L.A. Tikhomirov wrote: "For nineteen centuries now we have been hearing from Jewish thinkers that the religious essence of Israel consists not in a concept about God, but in the fulfilment of the Law. Above were cited such witnesses from Judas Galevy. The very authoritative Ilya del Medigo (15th century) in his notable *Test of Faith* says that 'Judaism is founded not on religious dogma, but on religious acts'.

"But religious acts are, in essence, those that are prescribed by the Law. That means: if you want to be moral, carry out the Law. M. Mendelsohn formulates the idea of Jewry in the same way: 'Judaism is not a revealed religion, but a revealed Law. It does not say 'you must believe', but 'you must act'. In this constitution given by God the State and religion are one. The relationships of

⁴¹⁷ Yurovsky, in Radzinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

⁴¹⁸ The Danish writer Halling Keller was present at the unveiling of the monument to Judas in Sviazhsk. He wrote: "The local Soviet discussed to whom to raise a statue for a long time. It was thought that Lucifer did not completely share the idea of communism. Cain was too much of a legendary personality, so they decided on Judas Iscariot since he was a completely historical personality. They represented him at full height with his fist raised to heaven." (M. Nazarov, "Presledovania Tserkvi i dukhovnaia sut' bol'shevizma" (The Persecutions of the Church and the spiritual essence of Bolshevism), in *Vozhdiu Tret'ego Rima* (To the Leader of the Third Rome), chapter 3)

⁴¹⁹ See *Leningradskaia Panorama* (Leningrad Panorama), N 10, 1990, p. 35.

man to God and society are merged. It is not lack of faith or heresy that attracts punishment, but the violation of the civil order. Judaism gives no obligatory dogmas and recognizes the freedom of inner conviction.'

"Christianity says: you must believe in such-and-such a truth and on the basis of that you must do such-and-such. New Judaism says: you can believe as you like, but you have to do such-and-such. But this is a point of view that annihilates man as a moral personality..."⁴²⁰

Thus Talmudism creates a personality that subjects faith and truth to the imperative of *action*. That is, it is the action that is first proclaimed as necessary – the reasons for doing it can be thought up later. And this corresponds exactly both to the philosophy of Marx, for whom "the truth, i.e. the reality and power, of thought must be demonstrated *in action*"⁴²¹, and to the psychological type of the Marxist revolutionary, who first proclaims that Rome (i.e. Russia) must be destroyed, and then looks for an ideology that will justify destruction. Talmudic Law is useful, indeed necessary, not because it proclaims God's truth, but in order to secure the solidarity of the Jewish people and their subjection to their rabbinic leaders. In the same way, Marxist theory is necessary only in order to unite adherents, expel dissidents and in general justify the violent overthrow of the old system.

This point has been well developed by Richard Pipes: "Important as ideology was,... its role in the shaping of Communist Russia must not be exaggerated. If any individual or a group profess certain beliefs and refer to them to guide their conduct, they may be said to act under the influence of ideas. When, however, ideas are used not so much to direct one's personal conduct as to justify one's domination over others, whether by persuasion or force, the issue becomes confused, because it is not possible to determine whether such persuasion or force serves ideas or, on the contrary, ideas serve to secure or legitimize such domination. In the case of the Bolsheviks, there are strong grounds for maintaining the latter to be the case, because they distorted Marxism in every conceivable way, first to gain political power and then to hold on to it. If Marxism means anything it means two propositions: that as capitalist society matures it is doomed to collapse from inner contradictions, and that this collapse ('revolution') is effected by industrial labor ('the proletariat'). A regime motivated by Marxist theory would at a minimum adhere to these two principles. What do we see in Soviet Russia? A 'socialist revolution' carried out in an economically underdeveloped country in which capitalism was still in its infancy, and power taken by a party committed to the view that the working class left to its own devices is unrevolutionary. Subsequently, at every stage of its history, the Communist regime in Russia did whatever it had to do to beat off challengers, without regard to Marxist doctrine, even as it cloaked its actions with Marxist slogans. Lenin succeeded

⁴²⁰ Tikhomirov, *Religiozno-Filosofskie Osnovy Istorii* (The Religio-Historical Foundations of History), Moscow, 1997, pp. 379, 380.

⁴²¹ Marx, *Eleven Theses on Feuerbach*, 1845.

precisely because he was free of the Marxist scruples that inhibited the Mensheviks. In view of these facts, ideology has to be treated as a subsidiary factor: an inspiration and a mode of thinking of the new ruling class, perhaps, but not a set of principles that either determined its actions or explains them to posterity. As a rule, the less one knows about the actual course of the Russian Revolution the more inclined one is to attribute a dominant influence to Marxism..."⁴²²

So the Russian revolution was Jewish not so much because of the ethnic composition of its leaders as because the Satanic hatred of Christ and all Christians that is characteristic of the Talmudic religion throughout its history was transferred - as Moses Hess, the teacher of Marx, had planned in his famous book, *Rome and Jerusalem*, that was examined in chapter 30 above - from the nationalist Talmudic fathers to their internationalist atheist sons.

⁴²² Pipes, *op. cit.*, pp. 501-502.

PART V. JEWISH STATEHOOD RESTORED

44. THE BALFOUR DECLARATION

The Balfour Declaration, so called after the British Foreign Secretary Lord Arthur Balfour, who published it on November 2, 1917, was one of the most portentous documents in world history, whose consequences are still being played out today – and not only in the Arab-Israeli conflict. It ranged one of the great powers of the time – the power, moreover, that was about to conquer Jerusalem in the following month – in alliance with Zionism, thereby laying the foundation for the creation of the modern State of Israel in 1948 and tying in the interests of what is now called “the international community” with the interests of Israel. But, as we shall see, its significance was still greater than that.

“The Balfour Declaration,” writes Jonathan Schneer, “was the result of a process that some consider practically inevitable. Certainly it is true that conditions created by the war enabled Chaim Weizmann and his colleagues to work wonders. During 1914-17 they gained access to the elite among British Jews and converted some of them to Zionism. They defeated advocates of Jewish assimilation, such as Lucien Wolf of the Conjoint Committee, whose *raison d’être*, lobbying the Foreign Office on behalf of foreign Jews, especially Russian and Romanian, had been swept away by the war. They gained entrance to British governing circles and converted some of their most important members too.

“During this period Weizmann and those who worked with him acted as inspired opportunists. Finally they could argue convincingly that a community of interest linked Zionist aspirations with those of the Entente. Zionists wanted the Ottomans out of Palestine; Britain and France wanted them out of the Middle East altogether. Zionists wanted a British protectorate in Palestine; Britain did too (although initially Sir Mark Sykes had bargained it away in negotiations with Georges-Picot of France).

“More generally, Weizmann and his colleagues persuaded powerful men in Britain, France and Italy that support of Zionism would benefit their wartime cause and the peace to follow. ‘International Jewry’ was a powerful if subterranean force, they claimed..., whose goodwill would reap dividends for the Allies. Specifically, they suggested that Jewish finance in America and Jewish influence upon anti-war forces in Russia, could help determine the conflict’s outcome. Weizmann warned the Foreign Office that Germany recognized the potential of Jewish power and had begun to court it already. He advised the Allies to trump their enemy by declaring outright support for Zionism. His arguments worked upon the minds of anti- and philo-Semites alike among the British governing elite, who were desperate for any advantage in the wartime struggle. Eventually, to gain Jewish backing in the war, they promised to support establishment of a homeland for Jews in Palestine...”⁴²³

⁴²³ Schneer, *The Balfour Declaration*, London: Bloomsbury, 2011, pp. 365-366.

“The Balfour Declaration,” wrote the Zionist Jew Samuel Landman in 1936, “originated in the War Office, was consummated in the Foreign Office and is being implemented in the Colonial Office”⁴²⁴. This sounds as if it were entirely a British idea; and it is true that without the enthusiastic support of certain Gentile Englishmen in the British government, especially Sir Mark Sykes, Under-Secretary at the War Cabinet and co-author of the famous Sykes-Picot Agreement, the Declaration would probably never have come into being. Nevertheless, the real motors behind the coup were two Russian Zionist Jews living in Britain – Chaim Weizmann and Nathan Sokolow.

They had an uphill task ahead of them. For until well into the war the British government was not interested in Zionism – and had in any case semi-officially promised Palestine to *the Arabs* in exchange for their support against the Ottomans. Also, the leaders of British Jewry, the “Conjoint Committee” led by Lucien Wolf, who initially had the ear of the government, were fiercely opposed to Zionism since it endangered their goal – secure assimilation within western society. Moreover, the Zionists themselves were divided into the politicals under Weizmann and the practicals or culturalists under the Romanian Moses Gaster. The political Zionists were looking to create a Zionist state, while the culturalists wanted only to strengthen Jewish culture and the Hebrew language in Palestine and throughout the Diaspora.

In April 1915 an important debate took place between the Zionists and the Assimilationists. “[The Russian Zionist] Tschlenow, in a long introductory speech, pointed out that at the peace conference following the war, even small nationalities such as Finns, Lithuanians and Armenians would ‘put forward their demands, their wishes, their aspirations.’ He then asked his anti-Zionist friends: ‘Shall the Jewish “people”, the Jewish “nation”, be silent?’

“Note here that Wolf, in his written account of the meeting, placed the words ‘people’ and ‘nation’ in quotation marks. Those tiny vertical scratches signalled the profound chasm separating the two camps. Wolf believed that asserting that the Jews constituted a distinct nation would fatally undercut his argument that British Jews really were Jewish Britons. It would deny the possibility of a genuine Jewish assimilation in Britain or anywhere else. It contradicted his liberal assumptions. He refused to make the required assertion...

“... On the crucial issue of Jewish nationality, neither side budged. Consultation and discussions would continue, and memoranda would be written from both sides, but the gulf remained unbridgeable. Henceforth their competition for the ear of the government would grow increasingly fierce. And although Wolf began from the better-established and therefore more

⁴²⁴ Landman, *Great Britain, The Jews and Palestine*, London: The Zionist Association, 1936; quoted in Vicomte Léon De Poncins, *State Secrets*, Chulmleigh: Britons Publishing Company, 1975, pp. 9, 11-14.

advantageous position, Weizmann was an absolute master of the political game..."⁴²⁵

The triumph of Weizmann and the Zionists was the result of many factors. One, undoubtedly, was the personal charm of Weizmann himself. According to A.N. Wilson, "the importance of personal charm in history is sometimes forgotten. Chaim Weizmann had it in abundance, and this largely explains Arthur Balfour's 1917 Declaration."⁴²⁶ However, no less important was the particular character of Russian, as opposed to Western Jewry – and the peculiar conjunction of political circumstances in 1914-1917.

Russian Jewry, unlike its West European counterparts, lived as a state within a state, a self-created ghetto, enslaved, not so much by the Russian authorities as by its own rabbinic kahal and the multiplicity of rules imposed on them by the Talmud, seeking no contact with Gentiles and despising them. This Jewish isolationism is recognized by Jews and Gentiles alike⁴²⁷. As such, the Russian Jews were naturally drawn to Zionism, to emigration to Palestine and the formation of a state within a state *there* – with the Arabs, whom they would exclude from their political ghetto, making them, like their old Canaanite enemies, into mere hewers of wood and carriers of water...

However, Zionism would never have succeeded at this time without the endorsement of the British; and the British endorsed it primarily because they thought that in this way they could buy the financial support of the American Jews, and especially of the leading American Jewish banker, Jacob Schiff, the head of the New York bank of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. Schiff was a Zionist who financed several Zionist projects in Palestine. He also, like most Zionists, had a visceral hatred of Russian tsarism: in 1904 he had given a huge loan of \$200 million to the Japanese in their war with Russia, for which the Japanese gave him several awards, and as a result of which they became among the most fervent believers in the idea that the world was ruled by the Jews... In 1916, in response to Russian requests for a war loan, he made it clear that he would satisfy this request only if the Tsar's government gave the Jews of Russia full equality immediately.⁴²⁸

⁴²⁵ Schneer, *op. cit.*, pp. 147-151.

⁴²⁶ Wilson, *After the Victorians*, London: Hutchinson, 2005, p. 510. See Sir Isaiah Berlin's hero-worshipping essay, "Chaim Weizmann's Leadership", in *The Power of Ideas*, London: Chatto & Windus, 2000, pp. 186-194.

⁴²⁷ Thus, on the one hand, Sir Isaiah Berlin writes: "They had, unlike their Western brothers, grown to be a kind of State with a State, with their own political, social, religious and human ideals... They were surrounded by Russian peasants, against whom they felt no hatred, but whom they regarded as a species of lower being with whom their contacts were restricted" ("The Origin of Israel", in *The Power of Ideas*, p. 14). On the other hand, M.O. Menshikov, wrote: "The real Ghetto of the Jews is Judaism itself, an old creed that congeals its followers in a serfdom heavier than that of ancient Egypt" (*Monthly Review* (London), February, 1904; in David Vital, *A People Apart: The Jews in Europe, 1789-1939*, Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 535).

⁴²⁸ S.S. Oldenburg, *Tsartstvovanie Imperators Nikolaia II* (The Reign of Emperor Nicholas II), Belgrade, 1939, vol. II, pp. 196-197.

Later, after the fall of the Tsar, Schiff was to finance Lenin and Trotsky...

At the beginning of the war, however, it was by no means certain which side he would back. After all, America did not join the side of the Allies (France, Britain and Russia) until April, 1917: before then she had adopted a posture of strict neutrality. Moreover, there was a powerful minority, the German Americans, whose sympathies were naturally with Germany, and another powerful minority, the Irish Americans, whose feelings (especially after the Dublin Uprising of 1916) were decidedly anti-English. Now Schiff was a *German Jew*. Therefore it was reasonable to expect that not only his anti-Russianism but also his German roots would incline him towards favouring the Germans.

Another important factor here was the policy adopted by the Russian generals during their retreat through Poland in 1915 of evacuating the Jewish population from the front line areas towards the East on the grounds of their unreliability. There were some grounds for the Russian decision. Apart from the well-known hostility of the Jews to all things Russian, which had led to the murder of thousands of Russians in pogroms since 1881, the largest Jewish organization in Russia, the Bund, had signed Trotsky's Zimmerwald Manifesto in September, 1915 against the war - an action that contrasted with the strongly patriotic support of almost all Jews in other warring countries for the country in which they lived. Nevertheless, as we have seen, the policy was disastrous. First, it inflicted unjust suffering on many innocent Jews (several hundreds of them were shot as spies). Secondly, it clogged up the transport system in Western Russia, thereby hindering the war effort at a critical time. And thirdly, it for the first time involved the transportation of large numbers of discontented Jews beyond the Pale and into Central and Eastern Russia, thereby raising the revolutionary temperature there.

No less seriously, reports of their ally's actions in evacuating the Jews eastwards seriously embarrassed the efforts of the French and the English to raise loans in America. As the French Professor Basch reported from there: "The great point of departure is now religious persecution [in Russia] and it is the two million Jews of America, a million and a half of whom are to be found in New York, and a million and a half of whom are Russian and Polish Jews who have escaped pogroms, who lead the campaign against Russia. The organs of anti-Russian propaganda are the Yiddish-language newspapers.; the popular speakers; the rabbis; and finally the great bankers of Wall Street headed by the greatest financial force of all in America, Jacob H. Schiff...."⁴²⁹

Even anti-Zionist Jews like Lucien Wolf recognized that the Allies had to do something to elicit the sympathy of the Jews if they were to offset the Russian factor.

⁴²⁹ Basch, in Vital, *op. cit.*, p. 664.

“‘In any bid for Jewish sympathies today,’ he told Lord Robert Cecil [on December 16, 1915], ‘very serious account must be taken of the Zionist movement. In America the Zionist organizations have lately captured Jewish opinion, and very shortly a great American Jewish Congress will be held virtually under Zionist auspices.’ He wished to make it clear that he himself ‘deplored the Jewish National Movement. ‘To my mind the Jews are not a nationality. I doubt whether they have ever been one in the true sense of the term.’ But he did not doubt that this was ‘the moment for the Allies to declare their policy in regard to Palestine’ and to do so in a spirit that was acceptable to Zionist ears. The Zionists probably recognized that the Allies could not ‘make a Jewish State of a land in which only a comparatively small minority of the inhabitants are Jews’. But Britain and France could say to them ‘that they thoroughly understand and sympathise with Jewish aspirations in regard to Palestine, and that when the destiny of the country came to be considered, those aspirations will be taken into account’. He thought too that assurances of ‘reasonable facilities for immigration and colonisation’, for the establishment of a Jewish University, and for the recognition of Hebrew ‘as one of the vernaculars of the land’ could be given. Were all that done, the Allies, Wolf did not doubt, ‘would sweep the whole of American Jewry into enthusiastic alliance to their cause’. It was true that this still left the question of the *political* disposition of the country itself open. The Zionists, he had reason to believe, would look forward to Great Britain becoming ‘the mistress of Palestine’. No doubt, as he himself recognized, it might be difficult for the British themselves to touch on the subject in view of the well-established French claims to Syria and the equally well-established French view that Palestine itself was part of ‘Syria’. But again, if the assurances about Britain’s sympathy for Zionism and its willingness to guarantee rights of immigration and settlement in Palestine to Jews that he proposed were proclaimed, the purpose immediately in view, namely the attachment of American Jewry to the Allied cause, would be achieved.”⁴³⁰

By March, 1916 the Foreign Office was converted to Wolf’s “Palestine idea”.

“The Russians and the French were invited to join Britain in considering ‘an arrangement in regard to Palestine completely satisfactory to Jewish aspirations’. The definition of ‘Jewish aspirations’ Wolf had offered to the Foreign Office, was forwarded to the Allied governments for examination as it stood along with the terms on which the Foreign Office itself proposed that an offer to the Jews be made. Wolf’s terms were modest: ‘In the event of Palestine coming within the sphere of Great Britain or France at the close of the war, the Governments of those Powers will not fail to take account of the historic interest that country possesses for the Jewish community. The Jewish population will be secured in the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, equal political rights with the rest of the population, reasonable towns and colonies inhabited by them as may be shown to be necessary.’

⁴³⁰ Vital, *op. cit.*, pp. 665-666.

“The Foreign Office, however, wished the French and the Russians to know that they themselves favoured a substantially stronger formulation: ‘We consider... that the scheme might be made far more attractive to the majority of Jews if it held out to them the prospect that when in the course of time Jewish colonies in Palestine grow strong enough to cope with the Arab population they may be allowed to take the management of the internal affairs of Palestine (with the exception of Jerusalem and the Holy Places) into their own hands.’

“The Russian response turned out to be friendly. Sazonov, the foreign minister, told the British ambassador (Buchanan) that Russia welcomed the migration of Jews out of Russia to Palestine or anywhere else. Their only proviso was that the (Christian) Holy Places be placed under an international regime. In contrast, the French response was ferociously negative, first and foremost because it seemed to them that the ‘Palestine Idea’ touched impermissibly, even if only obliquely (but perhaps not unintentionally), on their own strategic and colonial ambitions in the area...”⁴³¹

This Anglo-French rivalry over Palestine recalls the similar struggle at the beginning of the nineteenth century, when Napoleon set out to conquer Palestine from Egypt and was foiled by Admiral Nelson’s destruction of his fleet at the battle of the Nile. Now it was a British army under General Allenby that would set out from Egypt to conquer Palestine, thereby threatening French colonial designs in the region.

For a while, the British put aside the Palestine Idea so as not to endanger relations with France. But in December, 1916, Lloyd George became Prime Minister and Lord Balfour became Foreign Secretary, and the Palestine Idea was resurrected... The decisive factor here was the close friendship between Lloyd George and Weizmann. The two men had in common that neither was English, but both had a passionate belief in the civilizing mission of the British empire. Together, therefore, they were able to overcome the fear of antagonizing the French that had prevailed heretofore in British government circles. Moreover, Lloyd George was already a Zionist sympathizer. As Simon Sebag Montefiore writes, he “cared greatly about the Jews, and had represented the Zionists as a lawyer ten years earlier. ‘I was taught more in school about the history of the Jews, than about my own land,’ he said.”⁴³² For there was much sympathy for Zionism in British Protestantism. “‘Britain was a Biblical nation,’ wrote Weizmann. ‘Those British statesmen of the old school were genuinely religious. They understood as a reality the concept of the Return. It appealed to their tradition and their faith.’ Along with America, ‘Bible-reading and Bible-thinking England,’ noted one of Lloyd George’s aides, ‘was the only country where the desire of the Jews to return to their ancient homeland’ was regarded ‘as a natural aspiration not to be denied’.”⁴³³

⁴³¹ Vital, *op. cit.*, p. 671.

⁴³² Montefiore, *Jerusalem: The Biography*, London: Phoenix, 2011, p. 494.

⁴³³ Montefiore, *op. cit.*, p. 495.

Other Zionists helped to persuade the sceptics: Sokolow in Paris, Supreme Court Justice Brandeis in Washington. They in turn were helped by a changing political situation in 1917. First, with the fall of the Tsar in February, it was now necessary to secure the support of the newly-emancipated Jews *inside* Russia, many of whom wanted the Provisional Government to conclude a separate peace with Germany. Secondly, the emancipation of the Jews in Russia removed one of the main obstacles to Schiff wholeheartedly supporting the Allies with his money – and also eased the way for the entry, not only of American money, but also, still more importantly, of American *troops*, into the war on the Allied side.⁴³⁴ Thirdly, “approval of Zionism accorded neatly... with what was now the accepted western view of the matter of nationalities. By this stage of the war there was no question at all in either of the major Allied capitals that when the time came for a general political settlement it would be necessary, as Balfour put it to the cabinet on one occasion, to set about ‘the rearranging of the map of Europe in closer agreement with what we rather vaguely call “the principle of nationality”’. Unlike the French, members of the English political class had never been reluctant to think of the Jews of Europe (when they thought of them at all) in terms analogous to those in which they thought of the other submerged nations of the continent, and also increasingly, by extension, of the peoples of the Near East as well.”⁴³⁵

There was still frantic opposition from anti-Zionist British Jews such as Edwin Montagu (who was a minister), Montefiore, Wolf and others. And among the leading English Gentile sceptics was Lord Curzon. Thus “the matter of the true seriousness and popularity of Zionism, the known poverty of Palestine itself (as Curzon stated: ‘A less propitious seat for the future Jewish race could not be imagined’), and the question of the country’s other inhabitants (Curzon asking: What was to happen to them? Were they to be got rid of?) were all brought up as the cabinet moved towards a decision. Balfour, Sykes providing the arguments, assured his colleagues that the Jews would be

⁴³⁴ “During the critical days of 1916 and of the impending defection of Russia, Jewry, as a whole, was against the Czarist regime and had hopes that Germany, if victorious, would in certain circumstances give them Palestine. Several attempts to bring America into the War on the side of the Allies by influencing influential Jewish opinion were made and had failed. Mr. James A. Malcolm, who was already aware of German pre-war efforts to secure a foothold in Palestine through the Zionist Jews and of the abortive Anglo-French *démarches* at Washington and New York; and knew that Mr. Woodrow Wilson, for good and sufficient reasons, always attached the greatest possible importance to the advice of a very prominent Zionist (Mr. Justice Brandeis, of the US Supreme Court); and was in close touch with Mr. Greenberg, Editor of the *Jewish Chronicle* (London); and knew that several important Zionist Jewish leaders had already gravitated to London from the Continent on the qui vive awaiting events; and appreciated and realized the depth and strength of Jewish national aspirations; spontaneously took the initiative, to convince first of all Sir Mark Sykes, Under-Secretary to the War Cabinet, and afterwards M. Georges Picot, of the French Embassy in London, and M. Goût of the Quai d’Orsay (Eastern Section), that the best and perhaps the only way (which proved so to be) to induce the American President to come into the War was to secure the co-operation of Zionist Jews by promising them Palestine, and thus enlist and mobilize the hitherto unsuspectedly powerful forces of Zionist Jews in America and elsewhere in favour of the Allies on a quid pro quo contract basis.” (Landman, op. cit.)

⁴³⁵ Vital, op. cit., p. 689.

able to work out their own salvation there and were anxious to do so. And such anxiety as there was about the fate of the existing Arab population was met by the insertion of a clause affirming that 'nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities'. No one suggested that the *political* rights of the 'existing non-Jewish communities' deserved discussion, let alone assurance..."⁴³⁶

*

The final draft of the Balfour Declaration was secretly approved by the American president on October 19, 1917, and then approved by the British cabinet on November 2. It read: "His Majesty's Government views with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use its best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

"The Declaration was designed to detach Russian Jews from Bolshevism but the very night before it was published [on November 9], Lenin seized power in St. Petersburg. Had Lenin moved a few days earlier, the Balfour Declaration may never have been issued. Ironically, Zionism, propelled by the energy of Russian Jews – from Weizmann in Whitehall to Ben-Gurion in Jerusalem – and Christian sympathy for their plight, was now cut off from Russian Jewry until the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991..."⁴³⁷

Meanwhile, General Allenby was advancing on Jerusalem, defeating the Turkish, German and Austrian troops that opposed him. Desperate to retain the support of his Arab allies under Prince Feisal, he suppressed news of the Declaration.⁴³⁸ At the same time, he allowed the Jewish legion under Zhabotinsky to force the crossing of the Jordan...⁴³⁹

The last Turk left Jerusalem on December 7, the first day of the Jewish feast of Hannukah, which celebrated the Maccabean liberation of Jerusalem. On December 11 Allenby, accompanied by Lawrence of Arabia, entered the city (on foot, as a sign of respect).

"We thought we were witnessing the triumph of the last Crusade," said the American Colonist Bertha Spafford. "A Christian nation had conquered Palestine!"⁴⁴⁰

On October 1, 1918 he conquered the whole of Palestine at the Battle of Megiddo, and by the end of the month the Ottoman Empire had surrendered

⁴³⁶ Vital, *op. cit.*, pp. 696-67.

⁴³⁷ Montefiore, *op. cit.*, p. 498.

⁴³⁸ Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

⁴³⁹ "Jewish Legion", http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jewish_Legion.

⁴⁴⁰ Montefiore, *op. cit.*, p. 504.

on all fronts. In 1919, at the Versailles peace conference, Palestine was made a British mandate territory, and the Sykes-Picot Agreement was amended (by the Franco-British Convention of December 1920) so that the Jewish National Home should comprise the whole of Palestine. The British were now the masters in the Holy Land, and were in a position to put its highly ambiguous provisions into effect... But they soon found that the Jews were determined to throw both them and the Palestinian Arabs out, and in 1948 they were forced to withdraw...

However, in the longer term and on a global scale their bargain with the Zionists was very profitable to them. The Germans fully appreciated the value of this bargain to the Allies. As Ludendorff is alleged to have said to Lord Melchett, the Balfour Declaration was the cleverest thing done by the Allies in the way of propaganda, and he wished Germany had thought of it first...⁴⁴¹

However, the real significance of the Balfour Declaration was concealed in its *timing*. Divine Providence drew the attention of all those with eyes to see to this sign of the times when, in one column of newsprint in the London *Times* for November 9, 1917, there appeared two articles, the one announcing the outbreak of revolution in Petrograd, and the other – the promise of a homeland for the Jews in Palestine (the Balfour declaration). This showed that the two events were different aspects - the internationalist-atheist and nationalist-theist aspects respectively, - of a single event, *the Jewish revolution*. In fact, both the Bolshevik and the Zionist revolutionaries came from the same region of Western Russia, often from the same families. Thus Weizmann's own mother was able to witness Chaim's triumph in Zionist Jerusalem, and that of another son – in Bolshevik Moscow...⁴⁴² As M. Heifetz pointed out, "a part of the Jewish generation goes along the path of Herzl and Zhabotinsky. The other part, unable to withstand the temptation, fills up the band of Lenin and Trotsky and Stalin..."⁴⁴³

The events of 1917-18 were only the beginning. With the removal of "him who restrains" the coming of the Antichrist, the Orthodox Christian emperor (II Thessalonians 2.7), and with anti-Christian Jewish power established in both East and West, in both Russia and America and Israel, there was now no earthly power in existence that could stop the onslaught of Jewish power throughout the world. The last times had begun...

⁴⁴¹ Landman, op. cit.

⁴⁴² Weitzmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weitzmann*, New York: Harper, 1949.

⁴⁴³ Heifetz, "Nashi Obschie Uroki", 22, 1980, N 14, p. 162; in Solzhenitsyn, op. cit., p. 112.

45. THE BRITISH MANDATE

A year after the end of the war, Lord Balfour said: "The four great powers are committed to Zionism and Zionism, be it right or wrong, good or bad, is rooted in age-long tradition, in present needs, in future hopes, of far profounder import than the desire and prejudices of the 700,000 Arabs who now inhabit that ancient land."⁴⁴⁴ However, thanks to T.E. Lawrence among others, there was an increasing appreciation of the rights of the Arab population...

"The San Remo Convention of the victorious powers decided on April 18, 1920,... to grant Britain the Mandate for Palestine and give it responsibility for implementing the Balfour Declaration. The Balfour Declaration thus ceased to be a unilateral British declaration and became the policy of the Entente Powers, with international legal status. Because of the pro-Arab leanings of the military government, it was decided at San Remo to transfer power from the military to a civil government. Herbert Samuel, a keen British Zionist and former minister - a man of great talent and administrative experience, and also a man of action - was appointed Palestine's first high commissioner. This was a clear pro-Zionist statement by the British government, still headed by Lloyd George."⁴⁴⁵

Thus the British civil government tended to favour the Jews - at first. However, in 1921 the high commissioner Samuel Montagu encouraged the appointment of Haji Amin as Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, which "turned out to be one of the most tragic and decisive errors of the century. It is not clear whether a Jewish-Arab agreement to work together in Palestine would have been feasible even under sensible Arab leadership. But it became absolutely impossible once Haji Amin became Grand Mufti. Samuel compounded his initial misjudgement by promoting the formation of a Supreme Moslem Council, which the mufti and his associates promptly captured and turned into a tyrannical instrument of terror. Still worse, he encouraged the Palestinian Arabs to make contact with their neighbours and promote pan-Arabism. Hence the mufti was able to infect the pan-Arab movement with his violent anti-Zionism. He was a soft-spoken killer and organizer of killers. The great majority of his victims were fellow Arabs. His prime purpose was to silence moderation in Arab Palestine, and he succeeded completely. He became Britain's outstanding opponent in the Middle East, and in due course he made common cause with the Nazis and strongly supported Hitler's 'Final Solution'. But the principal victims of his unbalanced personality were the ordinary people of Arab Palestine. As the historian Elie Kedourie has well observed, 'It was the Hussainis who directed the political strategy of the Palestinians until 1947 and they led them to utter ruin.'⁴⁴⁶

⁴⁴⁴ Balfour, in Peter Mansfield, *A History of the Middle East*, London: Penguin, 2003, pp. 164-165.

⁴⁴⁵ Anita Shapira, *Israel. A History*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2014, p. 75.

⁴⁴⁶ Paul Johnson, *A History of the Jews*, London: Phoenix, 1995, pp. 418-419.

The Balfour Declaration, writes Tombs, “had paid lip service to the interest of both Jews and Arabs, but by encouraging Jewish immigration and land purchase, it inevitably fuelled conflict. By the late 1920s the governor had concluded that the Jews were ungrateful, the Arabs impertinent, and the Balfour Declaration a ‘colossal blunder’. Arab uprisings in the 1930s were treated with harsh but ineffective repression combined with a promise to limit Jewish immigration and create an independent two-state Palestine, which satisfied neither side.”⁴⁴⁷

Jewish immigration increased towards the end of the 1920s. In 1929 the Palestinian Arabs responded with a major riot. For each year, writes Dan Cohn-Sherbok, “there were more than 30,000 arrivals [of Jewish immigrants], and in 1935 the number grew to 62,000. In response, in April 1936 a major Arab uprising took place. On 7 July 1937 a commission headed by Lord Peel recommended that Jewish immigration be reduced to 12,000 a year, and restrictions were placed on land purchases. In addition a three-way partition was suggested: the coastal strip, Galilee and the Jezreel valley should be formed into a Jewish state, whereas the Judaeian hills, the Negev and Ephraim should be the Arab state. The plan was rejected by the Arabs, and another revolt took place in 1937. In the following year, the Pan-Arab Conference in Cairo adopted a policy whereby all Arab communities pledged that they would take action to prevent further Zionist expansion.

“After the failure of the tripartite plan in London in 1939 the British abandoned the policy of partition. In May 1939 a new White Paper was published stating that only 75,000 more Jews could be admitted over five years, and thereafter none except with Arab agreement...”⁴⁴⁸ The White Paper was issued at a sensitive time when Hitler was persecuting the Jews, and very few countries were admitting Jewish refugees. Not surprisingly, the Zionists did not like it. As Vital writes, it “pointed to the ambiguity in the expression ‘a national home for the Jewish people’ as the fundamental cause of unrest and hostility between Arabs and Jews. Affirming the 1922 interpretation given by Colonial Secretary Churchill [appointed in 1922] that the government ‘at no time contemplated the subordination of the Arabic population, language, or culture in Palestine,’ this White Paper declared ‘it was not part of their policy that Palestine should become a Jewish state... This would be contrary to their obligations under the Mandate, as well as to the assurances which have been given to the Arab people in the pact that the Arab population of Palestine should not be made the subjects of a Jewish state against their will.’ The goal was described as an independent Palestine within ten years, in which ‘Arabs and Jews could share in such a way as to ensure that the essential interests of each are safeguarded.’ In such a Palestinian state, it was envisioned that ‘Jews and Arabs would be as Palestinian as English and Scottish in Britain are British...”⁴⁴⁹

⁴⁴⁷ Tombs, *The English and their History*, New York: Alfred Knopf, 2014, p. 661.

⁴⁴⁸ Cohn-Sherbok, *Atlas of Jewish History*, London: Routledge, 1996, p. 188.

⁴⁴⁹ Vital, *A People Apart. The Jews of Europe, 1789-1939*, Oxford University Press, p. 33.

“The British issued the White Paper,” writes Michael Burleigh,⁴⁵⁰ to ensure that the wider Arab world, from which Britain derived 60 per cent of its oil, did not switch to the Axis side during the imminent war. As [Colonial Secretary Malcolm] MacDonald explained, ‘We could not let emotion rule our policy. We must accept the facts of the extremely dangerous prospect with absolute, unsentimental and, some people would say, even cynical realism. The Jews would be on our side in any case in the struggle against Hitler. Would the independent Arab nations adopt the same attitude?’

“While this local example of appeasement did not lead to a recrudescence of the Anglo-Arab alliance of the First World War, it did mean that no major trouble jeopardized trans-Jordanian oil pipelines or threatened British bases in Egypt, even when the British heavy-handedly deposed the Egyptian Prime Minister. Nor, given the Nazis’ pathological hatred of the Jews, did the British have cause to worry where the latter’s sympathies might lie. The Zionist-Fascists led by Vladimir Jabotinsky were a tiny if noisy minority, although one of Jabotinsky’s most devoted disciples was Menachem Begin, later leader of the Irgun terrorist organization. The majority Zionist response to a war that was existential for the Jewish people was encapsulated by David Ben-Gurion’s formula that ‘we shall fight with Great Britain in this war as if there were no White Paper, and we shall fight the White Paper as if there were no war.’”⁴⁵⁰

⁴⁵⁰ Burleigh, *Small Wars, Far Away Places*, London: Pan, 2013, pp. 95=96.

46. THE STATE OF ISRAEL

The horrors of the Jewish Holocaust gave a great moral boost to the Zionist cause, and many thousands of survivors after the war decided to emigrate to what was shortly to become the Zionist state of Israel. "Between 1931 and 1945," writes Dominic Sandbrook, "the numbers of Jews in Palestine swelled to a staggering 608,000 people, accounting for about a third of the population."⁴⁵¹ However, the British, who still controlled the Holy Land under a UN Mandate, and who had had extreme difficulties in preserving the peace between the Jews and the Arabs, were determined to stop this new exodus from Europe into the country. Illegal immigrants were prevented from landing, and were deported – usually to detention camps in Cyprus. The Zionists of course protested against this, and world opinion, appalled at the revelations of the Holocaust, was on the whole on their side.

But the problem went deeper than a simple refugee crisis. During the war, the British and Americans had agreed on a plan to give refuge to displaced Jews – some to their former countries of origin, and very many to prosperous countries around the globe. In August, 1945 America offered to take 100,000 Jews – an offer that was upped to 400,000 in 1947 in a bill put forward by Congressman William G. Stratton. But the Zionists would have none of it. To put displaced Jews anywhere other than Palestine would have endangered the plan of a Jewish state, for it would have eradicated the necessity for such a state. It also meant that there would be less money going from America to Israel – and the Jews there would have to live on remittances for the foreseeable future. So it could be argued that the real interests of the Jewish survivors of the Holocaust were sacrificed by Zionist Jews for the sake of the dream of a Zionist state.⁴⁵² Although they rejected the Americans' offer to allow them to emigrate en masse to America, the Zionist lobby in America was to prove crucial to the success of Zionism; for the Jews had let down deep roots in America.

"The first Jews to arrive in America," writes Andrew Roberts, had been "twenty-three refugees from Brazil, who stepped ashore at New Amsterdam [New York] in 1654. They were immediately distrusted by the colony's governor, Peter Stuyvesant, who suspected that they would live by 'their customary usury and deceitful trading with the Christians'. Yet by the time of the American Revolution, five Jewish communities were thriving in New York, Philadelphia, Rhode Island, Georgia and South Carolina.

"Large-scale Jewish immigration into America began in the 1820s from Germany and then continued from Eastern Europe through the rest of the nineteenth century... By the 1920s the community – based mainly on the cities of the east coast – was strong and thriving, contributing to almost every aspect of American life. *Fortverts* (later *Forward*), a Yiddish newspaper edited from New York's Lower East side, sold almost 200,000 copies daily...

⁴⁵¹ Sandbrook, "A Century of Blood", *Daily Mail*, November 4, 2017, p. 19.

⁴⁵² Alfred M. Lilienthal, *The Zionist Connection*, New York: Dodd, Mead & co., 1987, p. 57.

“Overall they thrived better in the English-speaking world than anywhere else before the creation of the State of Israel in 1948.

“The twentieth-century Jewish contribution to finance, science the arts, academe, commerce and industry, literature, charity and politics in the English-speaking world has been astonishing, relative to their tiny numbers. Although they make up less than half of 1% of the world’s population, between 1901 and 1950 Jews won 14% of all the Nobel Prizes awarded for Literature and Science, which increased to 29% between 1951 and 2000...”⁴⁵³

Doing so well in the West, it is not surprising that most Jews did not want to emigrate to Israel. However, the American Zionist lobby worked together with Zionist terrorism inside Palestine to undermine British resolve; and all Jews, whether Zionist or not, were pressurized to support the cause. Three future leaders of the Israeli state – David Ben-Gurion, Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir – at different times took up arms against the British in order to drive them out of their promised land and open the gates to unrestricted Jewish immigration. In July, 1946 Begin’s Irgun blew up the King David hotel in Jerusalem, and Shamir’s Stern Gang committed even worse atrocities against soldiers lying in their beds. The Zionist state of Israel would be brought into existence by Jewish terrorism against both British and Arabs...

Chaim Weitzmann and the Jewish Agency for Palestine, representing the mass of Palestinian Jewry, denounced the violence. But it worked... For, as the British Jewish historian Martin Gilbert writes, “the British will to rule had gone: Jewish terror and heightened national aspirations, and Arab determination not to allow a Jewish State to emerge, created a situation where the British Army could no longer maintain control. A severe economic crisis in Britain added to the determination of the government in London not to be saddled with a growing burden, involving extra troops, mounting expenditure, and the anger of the British public that the terrorists and the agitators were not being crushed or even curbed. If India and Burma could be given up, where Britain had been responsible for far greater numbers of people over a much longer period of time, and had been faced with problems on a much larger scale, then so could Palestine be given up. Attlee and his Cabinet decided to hand the problem to the United Nations.

“The British government in London had reached the end of its tether. Throughout [1947] there had been killings everywhere in Palestine which shocked both British and Jews... No more than 12,000 of the half million Jews in Palestine were believed to be members of the two terrorist organizations. But 100,000 British soldiers were employed searching for them. The Jewish Agency’s own defence organization, the Hagana, also found itself in a series of

⁴⁵³ Roberts, *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples from 1900*, London: Penguin, 2014, pp. 179-180.

confrontations with the British. For their part, British soldiers were frequently called upon to help Jews who were being attacked by Arabs...”

“In the end,” writes Anita Shapira, “[British Foreign Secretary] Bevin despaired of finding a solution to the Palestine problem, and the British cabinet decided to return its Mandate to the United Nations (which had replaced the League of Nations). This change was announced in February 1947, and the UN set up a Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) to reexamine the question of Palestine. The committee visited Palestine in the summer of 1947 and witnessed some dramatic events, including the arrival of the illegal immigrant ship *Exodus* - whose passengers were deported back to Germany by the British... - and terror attacks by Jewish underground groups. UNSCOP recommended the partition of Palestine into Jewish and Arab states, but the Arabs flatly rejected this recommendation and demanded the establishment of a majority state in Palestine.

“The UNSCOP recommendations were brought before the UN General Assembly at Lake Success, New York, where a two-thirds majority was needed for ratification.”⁴⁵⁴

The Zionists then put into motion “Operation Partition”. Enormous pressure - not excluding bribes and threats - were put on UN member nations to vote “the right way”. On November 29, after many delegates had been persuaded to change their votes, thirty-three nations, including the United States and the Soviet Union and the entire Soviet bloc, voted in favour of the plan. Thirteen nations were against, including all the Arab states and Greece, while Britain was among ten states that abstained...

The antisemitic Stalin’s acceptance of the plan was surprising. His reason, writes Paul Johnson, “seems to have been that the creation of Israel, which he was advised would be a socialist state, would accelerate the decline of British influence in the Middle East... Thereafter the Soviet and American delegations worked closely together on the timetable of British withdrawal. Nor was this all. When Israel declared its independence on 14 May 1948 and President Truman [propelled by his large Jewish constituency] immediately accorded it *de facto* recognition, Stalin went one better and, less than three days later, gave it recognition *de jure*. Perhaps most significant of all was the decision of the Czech government, on Stalin’s instructions, to sell the new state arms. An entire airfield was assigned to the task of air-lifting weapons to Tel Aviv.”⁴⁵⁵

In order to understand Stalin’s decision, we should also remember the “dialectical” relationship between the two horns of the Jewish Antichrist, Israel and the Soviet Union, since their virtually simultaneous birth in November, 1917. The Bolshevik revolution was created mainly by atheist Jews who cared nothing for Jewish national aspirations. However, Zionist Jews came largely

⁴⁵⁴ Shapira, *Israel. A History*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2014, p. 92.

⁴⁵⁵ Johnson, *History of the Jews*, London: Phoenix, 1987, pp. 525, 526.

from the Soviet Union and shared its socialist ideals. Not that these East European Jews necessarily loved the Soviet Union – Begin was a survivor of the Gulag and the NKVD's torture chambers.⁴⁵⁶ But the spirit of hatred and revenge, which can exist with equal virulence in a nationalist or internationalist culture, was passed from the Pale of Settlement in the west to the Soviet Union in the north to the State of Israel in the south...

Although the vote at the UN had been passed in the Zionists' favour, the battle was not over. The Arabs indicated that they would invade the land immediately the Jewish state was proclaimed. Nor did Jewish terrorism stop. Thus in April, 1948 a joint Irgun-Stern operation massacred as many as 250 inhabitants of the Arab village of Deir Yassin. Begin crowed: "God, God, Thou hast chosen us for conquest."

Realizing that partition was unworkable, and would lead to war, as well as having many other consequences incompatible with the interests of the United States (the hostility of the oil-rich sheikhs, the intervention of the Soviet Union in the region), President Truman changed tack and spoke in favour of a temporary UN trusteeship in Palestine, while insisting that he was in favour of partition in the longer term. However, extreme pressure from Chaim Weizmann and the Zionist lobby, combined with worries that he could lose the Jewish vote at the November election, persuaded Truman to change tack again and recognize the Jewish state already on May 14. There was consternation at the United Nations, which was still working out the conditions for the internationalization of Jerusalem, and in the American foreign-policy establishment...

The injustice perpetrated by the partition is made clear in a few statistics. At the time of the Balfour Declaration in 1917 there had been 600,000 Arabs living in Palestine next to 80,000 Jews.⁴⁵⁷ Thirty years later, the proportional gap had narrowed but was still large: 1.3 million Arabs facing 650,000 Jews. As regards land, Israel received over 50% of Palestine under the partition as opposed to the 20% proposed by the Peel Commission in 1937. After the war of 1948, they would control 80% of Palestine. "Under the partition plan," writes Lilienthal, "56.4 percent of Palestine was given for a Zionist state to people who constituted 33 percent of the population and owned about 5.67 percent of the land... This is the 'original sin' which underlies the entire Palestinian conflict..."⁴⁵⁸

The Arabs invaded Israel immediately after her declaration of independence in May, 1948. Nine bloody months later, the Jews emerged victorious. "A truce, supervised by the United Nations, followed (during which a Zionist terrorist murdered the United Nations mediator). In 1949 the Israeli government moved to Jerusalem, a Jewish national capital again for the first time since the days of

⁴⁵⁶ Johnson, op. cit., p. 522.

⁴⁵⁷ J.M. Roberts, *History of the World*, Oxford: Helicon, 1992, p. 791.

⁴⁵⁸ Lilienthal, op. cit., p. 97.

imperial Rome. Half of the city [the old part] was still occupied by Jordanian forces, but this was almost the least of the problems left to the future. With American and Russian diplomatic support and American private money, Jewish energy and initiative had successfully established a new national state where no basis for one had existed twenty-five years before. Yet the cost was to prove enormous. The disappointment and humiliation of the Arab states assured their continuing hostility to it and therefore opportunities for great power intervention in the future. Moreover, the action of Zionist extremists and the far from conciliatory behavior of Israeli forces in 1948-9 led to an exodus of Arab refugees. Soon there were 750,000 of them in camps in Egypt and Jordan, a huge social and economic problem, a burden on the world's conscience, and a potential military and diplomatic weapon for Arab nationalists...."⁴⁵⁹

There has been much controversy over these events. "Drawing on documents from newly opened Israeli archives, Benny Morris, Tom Segev, Avi Schlaim and others contested the version of tiny, vulnerable Israel creeping gingerly into existence in the wake of the Nazi catastrophe only to face multiple invasions by Arab armies followed by regular assault from terrorists, blockades, and full-scale military attack. Woven into this narrative was the claim that the Arab population of Israel in 1948 fled as a result of incitement by Arab powers or the consequence of fighting that it brought on itself by hostile actions. According to this established narrative, Israel was not responsible for the festering Arab 'refugee question', and could justifiably treat the remaining Israeli Arabs with caution.

"The 'new historians' demonstrated that although there was no coherent, top-down strategy to expel Arabs from the territory designated for the State of Israel by the UN partition plan in 1947, there was a consensus that it would be better for the new state of Israel if it had fewer Arab. Morris uncovered a plethora of local military actions that resulted in massacres or violent dispossession..."⁴⁶⁰

In retaliation for the expulsion of Arabs from Israel, many Jewish refugees were driven out from other Arab lands: between May, 1948 and the end of 1967 about 567,000 of them fled to Israel.

"Between February and July 1949," writes Peter Mansfield, "the new UN mediator, the American Ralph Bunche, succeeded in securing separate armistice agreements between Israel and Egypt and the Arab states (except Iraq, which nevertheless withdrew its troops). It was broadly agreed to fix a temporary frontier where the lines had been at the start of the negotiations, while certain border areas were demilitarized. Jerusalem was divided between the Arab east and Jewish west. The Gaza Strip came under Egyptian administration.

⁴⁵⁹ J.M. Roberts, op. cit., p. 793.

⁴⁶⁰ David Caesarani, "Coming to Terms with the Past: Israel", *History Today*, February, 2004, p. 18.

“No peace treaty was signed. In December 1948 the UN General Assembly appointed a three-member conciliation commission to promote a final settlement and to arrange an international regime for Jerusalem, but all its efforts were frustrated. The Arab states refused to consider a peace treaty unless the Israeli government agreed to accept all Arab refugees wishing to return to Israel. Resolutions demanding that the refugees should be given the option of return or compensation for their property were constantly reaffirmed by the UN General Assembly, and it was on this basis that Israel was admitted to the UN on 11 May 1949. But Israel maintained that the future of the refugees could be discussed only as part of a general settlement. Moreover, Talmudic law prohibited any surrender of land to non-Jews. Thus Israel Shahak expresses the opinion that many Israeli-Palestinian negotiations have failed simply because ‘displaying the flag of a ‘non-Jewish state’ within the Land of Israel contradicts the sacred principle which states that all this land ‘belongs’ to the Jews’.⁴⁶¹

The impasse was complete. Half of the Palestinian Arabs had become refugees. Neither the new state of Israel nor its Arab neighbours could expect even a minimum of security and stability...⁴⁶²

*

What kind of state was the new Zionist Israel? Formally speaking, it was, and is, a democracy, which in its Declaration of Independence states that “the state of Israel will devote itself to the development of the country for the benefit of all its people; It will be founded on the principles of freedom, justice and peace, guided by the visions of the prophets of Israel; It will grant full equal, social and political rights to all its citizens regardless of differences of religious faith, race or sex; It will ensure freedom of religion, conscience, language, education and culture.” Moreover, the government undertook “to pursue peace and good relations with all neighbouring states and peoples”.

In essence, however, Israel was – and is today – an apartheid nationalist mini-empire that treats its Arab citizens as second-class citizens, an “ethnocracy” with international tentacles and underpinned by the Talmudic Jewish faith...

That the Talmudic Law should be such a seemingly ineradicable part of Jewish identity is a result of its two-thousand-year history without a homeland or a state, but with a law. As Sir Lewis Namier writes: “To every man, as to Brutus, the native land is his life-giving Mother, and the State raised upon the land his law-giving Father; and the days cannot be long of a nation which fails to honour either. Only one nation has survived for two thousand years, though

⁴⁶¹ Shahak, “Jewish History, Jewish Religion, Political Consequences”, <http://www.ptimes.com/current/articles.html>. (V.M.)

⁴⁶² Mansfield, *A History of the Middle East*, London: Penguin, 2003, pp. 237-238.

an orphan – my own people, the Jews. But then in the God-given Law we have enshrined the authority of a State, and in the God-promised Land the idea of a Mother-country; through the centuries from Mount Sinai we have faced Eretz Israel, our land. Take away either, and we cease to be a nation; let both live again, and we shall be ourselves once more."⁴⁶³

Being founded on the anti-Christian Talmud, Israel could not fail to be strongly anti-Christian. Jews who become Christians often have to hide their faith, while the numbers of Orthodox Christian Palestinians has dropped sharply. This is in accordance with the anti-Christian position taken by the Jews in many Gentile lands. As Bishop Nikolai Velimirovič (+1956) wrote: "In the course of centuries those who crucified the Messiah, the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, have turned Europe into the main battlefield against God, for the devil. Europe is presently the main battlefield of the Jew and his father, the devil, against the Heavenly Father and His Only-Begotten Son, Born of the Virgin, and against the Holy Ghost.

"[The Jews'] first need to become legally equal with Christians in order to repress Christianity next, turn Christians faithless, and step on their necks. All modern European slogans have been made up by Jews, the crucifiers of Christ: democracy, strikes, socialism, atheism, tolerance of all religions, pacifism, universal revolution, capitalism, and communism. These are all inventions made by Jews, namely, by their father, the devil. All this has been done with the intention to humiliate Christ, to obliterate Him, and to place their Jewish Messiah on the Christ's throne, without being aware even today that he is Satan himself, their father, who has reined them in with his reins, and who whips them with his whip."⁴⁶⁴

This is not to deny the reality of anti-Semitism, only to point out that much of what is called "anti-semitism" is in fact the reaction of Christians – not least in Israel itself – to the "anti-Gentilism" of the Jews and the hostility of the Israeli state to Christianity.

"It bears remarking," writes the Israeli musician Daniel Barenboim, "that the Zionist idea that gave birth to the state of Israel arrived, paradoxically, at a similar analysis of the Jewish problem in Europe as that of the anti-Semitic movement: namely, that the Jews had always been a foreign body and would remain so unless they abandoned their Jewishness. Assimilation had failed and integration was unacceptable in both parties. Wagner wrote in his pamphlet *Das Judentum in der Musik* (Jewry in Music), that the Jews were incapable of writing German music but nevertheless had such a significant cultural influence as to be damaging to the development of true German music. His conclusion – namely, that the Jews must disappear, either by emigration or by complete assimilation into German culture – is not far from the conclusion reached by the early Zionists. For they saw the situation of the Jews in Europe

⁴⁶³ Namier, *England in the Age of the American Revolution*, London: Macmillan, 1930, 1963, p. 18.

⁴⁶⁴ Velimirovič, *Addresses to the Serbian People – Through the Prison Window*, chapter LXXVII.

not only as a social or religious problem, but as a political one as well, and dedicated themselves to finding a political solution. If one extrapolates the dialectic thought process between the anti-Semites and the Zionists, one arrives at the creation of the state of Israel."⁴⁶⁵

It is this tragic irony of the common Fascist essence of Zionism, as well as of anti-Semitism, that is the real cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Paul Johnson has distinguished between four kinds of Jews: observant, assimilationist, Zionist and Non-Jewish Jews (non-nationalist atheists, socialists and Bolsheviks like Trotsky).⁴⁶⁶ We can leave aside the assimilationists and Non-Jewish Jews, for whom their Jewishness was a matter of indifference, or even, sometimes, shame. The real question was: in what way did observant, religious Jewry differ from Zionist Jewry?

The leaders of Zionism were almost without exception East European Jews who had imbibed the socialist ideas of the Russian revolutionaries. However, they mostly came from religious families, and their Zionism required the familiar Biblical narrative of the chosenness, exile and return of the Jewish people as a justification for their violent acquisition of the land and refusal to share it on an equal footing with its Arab inhabitants. Whether they really believed in the stories of Abraham, Moses and Joshua is irrelevant (their attitude to them was often imbued with modernist scepticism common to most contemporary Europeans): the fact is that they needed to proclaim them for purely political reasons, and were prepared to make considerable concessions to the rabbis, the leaders of religious Jewry, for that purpose.

We see this especially in the Law of Citizenship, in the determination, as Shlomo Sand writes, of "who would be included among the authorized proprietors of the Jewish state that was being 're-established' after two thousand years in 'Israel's exclusive land'? Would it be anyone who saw himself or herself as a Jew? Or any person who became a Jewish citizen? This complex issue would become one of the main pivots on which identity politics in Israel would revolve.

"To understand this development, we must go back to the eve of the Proclamation of Independence. In 1947 it had already been decided that Jews would not be able to marry non-Jews in the new state. The official reason for this civil segregation – in a society that was predominantly secular – was the unwillingness to create a secular-religious split. In the famous 'status quo' letter that David Ben-Gurion, as head of the Jewish Agency, co-signed with leaders of the religious bloc, he undertook, *inter alia*, to leave the laws of personal status in the new state in the hands of the rabbinate. For reasons of his own, he

⁴⁶⁵ Barenboim, *Everything is Connected: The Power of Music*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2008, pp. 105-106.

⁴⁶⁶ Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 455.

also supported the religious camp's firm opposition to a written constitution. Ben-Gurion was an experienced politician, skilled at getting what he wanted.

"In 1953 the political promise to bar civil marriage in Israel was given a legal basis. The law defining the legal status of the rabbinical courts determined that they would have exclusive jurisdiction over marriage and divorce of Jews in Israel. By this means, the dominant socialist Zionism harnessed the principles of the traditional rabbinate as an alibi for its fearful imaginary that was terrified of assimilation and 'mixed marriage'.

"This was the first demonstration of the state's cynical exploitation of the Jewish religion to accomplish the aims of Zionism. Many scholars who have studied the relations between religion and state in Israel have described them as Jewish nationalism submitting helplessly to the pressures applied by a powerful rabbinical camp and its burdensome theocratic tradition. It is true there were tensions, misunderstandings and clashes between secular and religious sectors in the Zionist movement and later in the State of Israel. But a close examination reveals that nationalism needed the religious pressure, and often invited it in order to carry out its agenda. The late Professor Yeshayahu Leibowitz was more perceptive than most when he described Israel as a secular state in religious cohabitation. Given the great difficulty of defining a secular Jewish identity, and the highly uncertain boundaries of this impossible entity, it had no choice but to submit to the rabbinical tradition...

"Just as Israel was unable to decide on its territorial borders, it did not manage to draw the boundaries of its national identity. From the start it hesitated to define the membership of the Jewish *ethnos*. To begin with, the state appeared to accept an open definition that a Jew was any person who saw himself or herself as a Jew. In the first census, held on November 8, 1948, residents were asked to fill out a questionnaire in which they stated their nationality and religion, and these were what served as the basis for civil registration. In this way the young state managed quietly to Judaize many spouses who were not Jews. In 1950, newborn children were registered on a separate page without reference to nationality and religion - but there were two such forms, one in Hebrew and one in Arabic, and whoever filled out a Hebrew form was assumed to be a Jew.

"Also in 1950, Israel's parliament - the Knesset - passed the Law of Return. This was the first basic law that gave legal force to what the Proclamation of Independence had declared. This law declared: 'Every Jew has the right to come to this country as an *oleh* (immigrant)' unless he '(1) is engaged in an activity directed against the Jewish people; or (2) is likely to endanger public health or the authority of the State.' Then in 1952 came the law that granted automatic citizenship on the basis of the Law of Return.

"Beginning in the late 1940s, the world rightly viewed Israel as a refuge for the persecuted and the displaced. The systematic massacre of the Jews of Europe and the total destruction of the Yiddish-speaking people drew

widespread public sympathy for the creation of a state that would be a safe haven for the remnant. In the 1950s, provoked by the Israeli-Arab conflict but also by the rise of authoritarian Arab nationalism, semireligious and not especially tolerant, hundreds of thousands of Arab Jews were driven from their homelands. Not all were able to reach Europe or Canada; some went to Israel, whether or not they wished to go there. The state was gratified and even sought to attract them (though it viewed with unease and contempt the diverse Arab cultures they brought with their scanty belongings). The law that granted the right of immigration to every Jewish refugee who was subject to persecution on account of faith or origin was quite legitimate in these circumstances. Even today such a law would not conflict with basic principles in any liberal democracy, when many of the citizens feel kinship and a common historical destiny with people close to them who suffer discrimination in other countries.

“Yet the Law of Return was not a statute designed to make Israel a safe have for those who were persecuted in the past, present or future because people hated them as Jews. Had the framers of this law wished to do so, they could have placed it on a platform of humanist principle, linking the privilege of asylum to the existence and threat of anti-Semitism. But the Law of Return and the associated Law of Citizenship were direct products of an ethnic nationalist worldview, designed to provide a legal basis for the concept that the State of Israel belongs to the Jews of the world. As Ben-Gurion declared at the start of the parliamentary debate on the Law of Return: ‘This is not a Jewish state only because most of its inhabitants are Jews. It is a state for the Jews wherever they be, and for any Jew who wishes to be here.

“Anyone who was included in ‘the Jewish people’... was a potential citizen of the Jewish state, and their right to settle there was guaranteed by the Law of Return. A members of the ‘Jewish nation’ might be a full citizen with equal rights in some liberal national democracy, might even be the holder of an elected position in it, but Zionist principle held that such a person was destined, or even obliged, to migrate to Israel and become its citizen. Moreover, immigrants could leave Israel immediately after arrival, yet keep their Israeli citizenship for the rest of their lives...”⁴⁶⁷

This extraordinary inclusivity in definition was combined with an extraordinary exclusivity that excluded any Jew who embraced any other faith than Talmudism. Thus “in 1970, under pressure from the religious camp, the Law of Return was amended to include, finally, a full and exact definition of who is an authentic member of the people of Israel: ‘A Jew is one who was born to a Jewish mother, or converted to Judaism and does not belong to another religion.’ After twenty-two years of hesitation and questioning, the instrumental link between the rabbinical religion and the essentialist nationalism was now well and truly welded...”⁴⁶⁸

⁴⁶⁷ Sand, *The Invention of the Jewish People*, London: Verso, 2010, pp. 283-284, 286-287, 288.

⁴⁶⁸ Sand, *op. cit.*, pp. 289-90.

The State of Israel does not appear to fit into any usual categorization of statehood. It is neither autocratic, nor despotic nor democratic in the ordinary senses of these words. It is both secular and religious at the same time, both potentially inclusive of all Jews throughout the world yet perversely exclusive of those who have the greatest right to live on its territory. It is nationalist, and yet its nationalism is not defined by territory or blood (much as many Jews would like to define it thus), but by religion. The only remotely similar states, paradoxically, are its fiercest enemies, Wahhabist Saudi Arabia and Shiite Iran. And yet neither the Arab nor the Iranian states have any Law of Return, any truly comparable myth of exile and return and redemption...

For fuller understanding, therefore, it will be worth examining what this single apparent exception to the main development of human history can mean, from the only point of view that would seem capable of comprehending it - the religious-eschatological. A clue to our search may be found in *the Abrahamic Covenant*, in the relationship revealed at the very beginning of Jewish history between God and the sons of Abraham, Isaac and Ishmael. Isaac was the ancestor of the spiritual Israel, the Church of Christ, and Ishmael the ancestor of the carnal Israel, the people that fights God. Although the spiritual Israel is blessed, while the carnal Israel is accursed, still an important promise is given to the carnal Israel: that it will *live* in accordance with Abraham's petition: "Let this Ishmael *live* before Thee" (Genesis 17.18). This life cannot be spiritual, because that is promised only to the spiritual Israel. So it must be carnal - physical survival and worldly power. At the same time, St. Ambrose admits, Abraham's powerful petition could win spiritual life for some of the Jews - but only, of course, if they cease to belong to the carnal Israel and join the spiritual Israel through faith in Christ. For "it is the attribute of the righteous man [Abraham] to intercede even for sinners; therefore, let the Jews believe this too, because Abraham stands surety even for them, provided they will believe..."⁴⁶⁹

The promise of physical life has certainly been fulfilled in the extraordinary tenacity of the Jews, their survival in the face of huge obstacles to the present day, and - since their gradual emancipation from the ghetto in the nineteenth century, - their domination of world politics, business, art and science in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Moreover, since the carnal Israel is promised physical life and power, it is no wonder that since the Balfour Declaration of 1917, and especially since the foundation of the State of Israel in 1948, it has regained power over the land of Israel, driving out most of the Christians in the process, and may well recapture all the land from the Nile to the Euphrates, as was seemingly promised in the Abrahamic Covenant. But it is important to understand that such a re-conquest, if it takes place, will not be by virtue of the Jews being the *chosen* people, as they and their Evangelical allies believe, but by virtue of the exact opposite: of their being the *accursed* people -

⁴⁶⁹ St. Ambrose, *On Abraham*, 88.

Ishmael rather than Isaac.⁴⁷⁰ For of the two covenant peoples the people that is carnal is given physical gifts that are appropriate to its carnal desires.

For the truth may be, as an anonymous Russian writer has suggested, “that the very preservation up until now of the Jewish people is a result not of their being ‘chosen’, but as a result of their apostasy”. For, having renounced their birth-right, the Kingdom of God, they have received a “mess of pottage” instead – the promise of physical survival and worldly power. “If the Jews, having repented of the crime committed on Golgotha, would have become Christian, then they would have made up the foundation of a new spiritual nation, the nation of Christians. Would they have begun to strive in this case to preserve their nationality and government? Would they not have dispersed among other nations as the missionaries of Christianity just as the Apostles? Would they not have been strangers in a foreign land, not having a fatherland, like unto Abraham, but in this case with a higher spiritual meaning? All this happened with the Jews, that is, they became wanderers, not in a positive spiritual sense, but due to a curse, that is, not of their own will, but due to the will of chastising Providence since they did not fulfil that which God intended for them. Would they not have been exterminated *en masse* during persecutions as the main preachers of Christianity? Would they not have been assimilated among other peoples, so that the very name ‘Jew’, ‘Hebrew’, as a national name, would have disappeared and would have only remained in the remembrance of grateful nations as the glorious name of their enlighteners? Yes, and the very Promised Land and Jerusalem were given to the Hebrews not as a worldly fatherland, for which they are now striving, but as a prefiguration of the Heavenly Kingdom and the Heavenly Jerusalem, as a token of which Abraham and through him all the Hebrew nation coming out of Haran, renounced their earthly fatherland. For this reason the very significance of Jerusalem and the idea as a prefigurement would have passed away for the Jews, as soon as the Kingdom of God and the Heavenly Jerusalem would have become obtainable for them and would have become for them, as they are now for us, Christian holy places.”⁴⁷¹

⁴⁷⁰ So great have been the worldly successes of the Jews that many Evangelical Protestants have been tempted to ascribe them, not to God’s promise to *Ishmael*, but to his promise to *Isaac*. Reversing the interpretation of the Apostle Paul, they have made of the carnal Israel “the chosen people”, “the blessed seed” - and this in spite of the fact that this “chosen people” has been the foremost enemy of those who believe in Christ for the last two thousand years! By elevating the carnal Israel into the spiritual Israel, the Protestants fill up a major spiritual and emotional gap in their world-view; for, having rejected both the *concept* of the Church, and the *reality* of it in Orthodoxy, they have to find a substitute for it somewhere else. And so we have the paradoxical sight of the State of Israel, one of the main persecutors of Christianity in the contemporary world, which forbids conversions of Jews to Christianity and has driven out the majority of the Orthodox Christian population, being ardently supported by the Evangelical Protestants of the Anglo-Saxon countries. There have even been several attempts by Evangelicals to blow up the mosque of the Dome of the Rock, in order to make it possible for the Jews to build their Temple again – the Temple of the Antichrist!

⁴⁷¹ “How to understand the Jews as being a chosen people”, *Orthodox Life*, vol. 41, no. 4, July-August, 1991, pp. 38-41.

Tragically, however, it was not to be: the Jews remain unconverted to this day. Even many Orthodox Jews believe that the foundation of the Zionist State of Israel was a grave sin. Religious parties such as Mizrahi and Agudah, were routinely accused of treachery when they entered into relations with the Zionist state.

“The Agudah viewpoint was set out as follows (10 October 1952): ‘The world was created for the sake of Israel. It is the duty and merit of Israel to maintain and fulfil the Torah. The place where Israel is destined to live and, therefore, to maintain the Torah is Israel. This means that the *raison d’être* of the world is the establishment of the regime of the Torah in the land of Israel. The foundation of this ideal has been laid. There are now Jews living in the homeland and fulfilling the Torah. But completion has not yet been achieved, for all Israel does not yet live in its land and (not even) all Israel is yet fulfilling the Torah.’ In short, Agudah pledged itself to us Zionism to complete the ingathering and transform the result into a theocracy.

“Just as Mizrahi’s compromises produced Agudah’s, to Agudah’s in turn produced a rigorist group which called itself the Guardians of the City (‘Neturei Karta’). This broke away from Agudah in 1935, opposed the foundation of the state root-and-branch, boycotted elections and all other state activities, and declared that it would rather Jerusalem were internationalized than run by Jewish apostates. The group was comparatively small and to the secular mind extreme. But the whole history of the Jews suggests that rigorous minorities tend to become triumphant majorities. Like Judaism itself, moreover, its members exhibited (granted their initial premise) strong logical consistency. The Jews were ‘a people whose life is regulated by a supernatural divine order... not dependent on normal political, economic and material successes or failures.’ The Jews were not ‘a nation like any other nation’, subject to the factors ‘which cause all other nations to rise and fall’. Hence the creation of the Zionist state was not a Jewish re-entry into history, a Third Commonwealth, but the start of a new and far more dangerous Exile, since ‘full licence has now been given to tempt through the success of the wicked’. They frequently quoted the statement of a group of Hungarian rabbis who, on their arrival at Auschwitz, acknowledged the justice of their punishment from God for their too feeble opposition to Zionism. The Zionist masqueraders, pretending to represent the people of Israel, were incinerating Jewish souls, whereas Hitler’s ovens only burned their bodies and released their souls for eternal life. They deplored alike the Sinai and the Six Day Wars as calculated, by their glamorous success, to lure Jews to Zionism and so to eternal destruction. Moreover, such victories, being the work of Satan, would merely culminate in colossal defeat. The Guardians rejected the ‘deliverance and protection’ of Zionism, together with its wars and conquests. ‘We do not approve or any hatred or hostility, and above all any fighting or war in any form against any people, nation or tongue, but the reverse. If, through our many sins, we are apparently joined in the destiny of these rebels [against God] Heaven forbid! All we can do is pray to the Holy One, blessed be He, that He may release us from their destiny and deliver us.’ The Guardians saw

themselves as a 'remnant' who 'refused to bow the knee to Baal' as in 'the time of Elijah', or to 'dine at Jezabel's table'. Zionism was 'a rebellion against the King of kings' and it was implied in their theology that the Jewish state would end in a catastrophe worse than the Holocaust."⁴⁷²

So must we conclude that the foundation of the State of Israel be necessarily evil – and its crowning glory the enthronement of the Antichrist?...

Before jumping to this conclusion, let us recall Alain Dieckhoff's interpretation of the thought of the nineteenth-century "Forerunners of Zion": "In Jewish tradition there was only one true remedy for sin: repentance (teshuva), i.e. explicit renunciation of evil and adoption of behaviour in accordance with the Law. The idea of inner repentance was so essential that it was supposed to have coexisted with the Law before the proclamation on Mount Sinai, and even to have existed before the creation of the world. This was above all of an individual nature in Talmudic literature, but took on a collective dimension from the sixteenth century, under the impetus of the Kabbala of Isaac Luria. After that the return to a life of holiness ensured not only the salvation of the individual soul, but also restored the original fullness of the world. Teshuva was no longer limited solely to the existential level, within the narrow confines of the individual; it also concerned the historic level of the national group, and beyond that the cosmic level of mankind. Alkalai went so far as to consider, differing from the classical idea, that collective repentance must necessarily precede individual repentance. There remained the final question: what did this general teshuva involve?

"It involved physical re-establishment of the Jews in the Land of Israel to recreate the national community. Playing on the double meaning of the word teshuva, which strictly means return, Kalischer stated that collective repentance meant a geographical return to Zion and not, at least not directly, a spiritual return. So Jews who returned to Palestine were not breaking the religious Law, since in the first instance their return was a purely material one. It was only later, when they were gathered in Zion, that by the grace of God the truly supernatural redemption would start, bringing with it the individual repentance of every Jew and union with God..."⁴⁷³

In other words, *perhaps the return of the carnal Jews to their carnal homeland is a preparation, in God's plan, a springboard, as it were, for their return to the spiritual Israel, the Church of God, as St. Paul prophesied in Romans 9-11...*

⁴⁷² Johnson, op. cit., pp. 549-550.

⁴⁷³ Dieckhoff, *The Invention of a Nation*, London: Hurst and Company, 2003, pp. 16-19.

47. THE ARAB/ISRAELI WARS

The failure of the Anglo-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt in 1956 led to an increase in Arab power in relation to the West – and Israel. The most forceful Arab leader was President Nasser of Egypt. On 16 May 1967 Cairo radio announced: “This is our chance, Arabs, to deal Israel a mortal blow of annihilation.” On 27 May Nasser said: “Our basic objective will be the destruction of Israel.” Again, President Arel of Iraq said on 31 May: “Our goal is clear: to wipe Israel off the map.” And on 1 June Ahmed Shukary, Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization, declared: “The Jews of Palestine will have to leave. Any of the old Jewish Palestine population who survive may stay, but it is my impression that none of them will survive.”⁴⁷⁴

An important new player in the region was the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). Created in 1960, it “was designed to co-ordinate the release of oil supplies on the open market. The aim was to allow the founder members – Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Venezuela – to combine their interests and boost their income by controlling supply, and therefore controlling prices. It was the logical next step for resource-rich countries which had an eye on wresting power from the western corporations while receiving political and financial backing from western governments.

“OPEC effectively marked a deliberate attempt to curtail the influence of the west, whose interests in providing cheap and plentiful fuel for its domestic markets were distinctly different to those of the countries that were rich in deposits of oil and gas, and who were keen for the revenues they brought in to be as high as possible. Unlikely as it seems, OPEC was the spiritual protégé of an already unlikely cast of characters made up of defiant leaders like Mossadegh, the popular demagogue Nasser, the hardliner Qasim and increasingly anti-western figures in Iran typified by the Ayatollah Khomeini. All were linked by their concerted attempts to detach their states from overpowering outside attention. OPEC was not a political movement; but aligning a range of countries and enabling them to act with a single voice was a key step in the process of transforming political power away from Europe and the US to local governments.”⁴⁷⁵

Another of the consequences of the failure of the Anglo-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt, as Burleigh writes, was that “France threw its influence behind Israel, equipping it in 1957 with its Dimona nuclear reactor, which it would use to produce an arsenal of atomic bombs it pretends it does not possess. In Arab eyes Israel would be indelibly identified with Western imperialism – a latter-day crusader state – and Nasser’s mere survival was construed as a victory, which became a wider impediment to political realism in the Middle East.”⁴⁷⁶

⁴⁷⁴ Johnson, *Modern Times*, p. 666.

⁴⁷⁵ Peter Frankopan, *The Silk Roads*, London: Bloomsbury, 2015, pp. 435-436.

⁴⁷⁶ Burleigh, op. cit., p. 311.

Realism returned to the Arab world only after the Six-Day War between the Israeli Defence Force, on the one hand, and the armies of four Arab nations – Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Iraq and Kuwait, supported by Algeria and Libya, - on the other. This was one of the most spectacular triumphs in the history of warfare. It started when Israel, alarmed by the annihilatory threats and by “the concentration on her border of armies outnumbering her own by three to one, heavily armed with modern Soviet material, launched a preventive war on 4 June, beginning with strikes against Egyptian sea power. It lasted six days and was wholly successful. The Egyptian, Jordanian and Syrian forces were routed, and in Egypt’s case humiliated. Sinai and the West Bank were occupied. The Syrian Golan Heights, which made possible the bombardment of the Israeli settlements in Upper Galilee, were stormed. Above all, Old Jerusalem, including the Wailing Wall and the Holy Places, the great prize which had eluded Israel in 1948, was now brought into the new state.”⁴⁷⁷

The Middle East now became one of the battlefields of the Cold War. For the Americans became the patrons of the Israelis, while Nasser turned to the Soviets for help, as did the Syrians...

As Alexander Shulman writes: “Nasser often approached the leadership of the USSR requesting that they send Soviet armies to save his country. In December, 1969 Nasser made a secret visit to Moscow for a personal meeting with L. Brezhnev.

“Nasser besought Brezhnev to send to Egypt regular Soviet forces with for air defence and aviation. At a session of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the USSR together with the commanders of the Armed Forces it was decided to satisfy his request...

“The operation to create a group of Soviet armies for Egypt composed of 32,000 military personnel received the name ‘Kavkaz’. It was led by Marshal P.F. Batitsky. In the first days of March, 1970 the armies with their military hardware set off from the port of Nikolaev in an atmosphere of complete secrecy. The men were dressed in civil clothing and had no documents of any kind. A very strict command was given to shoot without hesitation anyone who ‘tried to jump overboard’.

“In July, 1970 the Israeli Armed Forces engaged in battle with Soviet airmen over Suez. In the course of the battle five Soviet MIGs were downed... Undismayed, the Soviets became even more committed to helping their Arab allies...”⁴⁷⁸

⁴⁷⁷ Johnson, op. cit., p. 666.

⁴⁷⁸ Shulman, “Boj nad Suetsem” (Battle over Suez), *Russkaia Planeta* (Russian Planet), June 14, 2013.

It was the threat of Soviet control of the Middle East oil-fields that brought the Americans into the conflict. The threat was not so much to the Americans themselves, who had their own oil reserves, as to their allies in Western Europe and Japan, who were totally dependent on Middle East oil and would collapse if they were deprived of it.⁴⁷⁹ It followed that the Americans' only real ally in the region, Israel, had to be defended at all costs.

Consequently, the states of the Middle East played off the superpowers against each other, trying to make themselves independent of both.

“Oil was the fuel behind much of this movement to escape from the overbearing influence of outside powers, setting off a chain reaction that had profound long-term implications. The catalyst for a new round of change was a coup led by an ambitious young Libyan army officer who had been described as ‘cheerful, hard-working and conscientious’ by the British army course instructor who supervised his training in the UK. Mu‘ammar Gaddafi was certainly resourceful. At the start of 1970, shortly after seizing power, he demanded a dramatic rise in the revenues of Libyan oil – which at that time was responsible for 30 per cent of Europe’s total supply. ‘Brothers,’ he had proclaimed to his countrymen, ‘the revolution cannot let the Libyan people be poor while they own colossal oil wealth. ‘There are people living in huts and tents while the foreigner lives in palaces. Other countries put men on the moon, Gaddafi went on: the Libyans are exploited to the extent that they have no electricity or water.

“The oil companies screamed with outrage at the new regime’s insistence on being paid a fair price for the oil; but they soon complied after it had been made clear that nationalization was not an option – but that it might be. The fact that the Libyan leader could force a renegotiation was not lost on others: within weeks, OPEC was pushing to raise the contribution made to its members by western oil companies, threatening to reduce production to force agreement. It was, in the words of one Shell executive, the moment when the ‘avalanche’ began.

“The results were spectacular. The price of oil quadrupled over the course of three years, putting immense strain on the economies of Europe and the US, where demand and consumption levels galloped ever onwards. In the meantime, the oil-producing countries were flooded by unprecedented flows of cash. The countries in the centre of Asia and the Persian Gulf had seen their returns steadily improve almost as soon as the Knox D’Arcy concession [in Persia] struck oil as agreements were slowly but surely renegotiated in the decades that followed with better and better terms. But what happened in the 1970s was a shift of seismic proportions. In 1972-3 alone, Iran’s oil revenues rose thirty-fold. In neighbouring Iraq, the rise was no less spectacular, going up fifty times between 1972 and 1980 from \$175 million to \$26 million.

⁴⁷⁹ However, because of the low price of oil, American imports of it increased from 10 per cent in 1960 to 28 per cent in 1968 to 36 per cent in 1973 (Johnson, op cit., p. 665).

“It was all very well complaining about the ‘extent of dependence by western industrial countries upon oil as a source of energy’, as one senior American official did in a report prepared for the State Department in 1973. But there was an inevitability about the transfer of power – and money – to the countries straddling the spine of Asia; and there was an inevitability too about the strengthening of sinews of the Islamic world that followed as ambitions were magnified.

“The most dramatic expression of this came with a renewed effort to dislodge the totemic symbol of outside influence in the Middle East as a whole: Israel. In October 1973, Syrian and Egyptian forces launched Operation Badr, named after the battle that had opened the way to securing control of the holy city of Mecca in the time of the Prophet Muhammed. The assault caught not only Israeli defences by surprise, but the superpowers as well...

“The impact of the conflict shook the globe. In the US, the military alert level was raised to DEFCON 3, indicating that the risk of a nuclear launch was considered to be imminent – and higher than at any point since the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. In the Soviet Union, the focus was on containing the situation. Pressure was put on Egypt’s President Sadat behind the scenes to agree a ceasefire, while the Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko – a consummate political survivor – personally pressed President Nixon and his newly appointed Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, to act jointly to prevent a ‘real conflagration’ that might easily lead to war spreading.

“The real significance of the Yom Kippur War, so named because the attack began on the Jewish holy day, lay not in the attempts by Washington and Moscow to work together, nor even in the spectacular results which saw one of the great military reversals in history as Israel went from being within hours of extinction to shattering the invading forces and advancing on Damascus and Cairo. In fact, what was remarkable was the way the Arabic-speaking world acted together – as a caliphate in all but name. The ringleaders were the Saudis, the masters of Mecca, who not only talked openly about using oil as a weapon but actually did so. Production was cut back, which, combined with political uncertainty, led to price rises: costs per barrel tripled almost overnight...”⁴⁸⁰

As Niall Ferguson writes, “there did not need to be a specifically *Soviet* control of Middle Eastern oil for both the United States and its allies to suffer acute economic pain. Arab control might suffice.. Up until 1972 the United States had succeeded in squaring the circle of its support for Israel and its support for the Saudi king, who loathed Zionism as deeply as he loathed communism. In 1973, however, the Saudis backed the Egyptian assault on Israel not with soldiers but with a 70 percent increase in oil prices and a rolling embargo that cut supplies of oil to supporters of Israel by 5 percent per month.

⁴⁸⁰ Frankopan, op. cit., pp. 442-444.

When the Americans more than doubled their aid to Israel, the Saudis imposed a total embargo on exports to the United States."⁴⁸¹

*

After the Yom Kippur War of 1973, the Israelis returned Sinai to Egypt, and in 2005 they withdrew from Gaza. But Arab/Israeli hostility has remained to the present day, when there are some 800,000 Israeli settlers living illegally in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, and permanent peace seems further away than ever. In spite of repeated defeats on the battlefield, the Arabs remain as implacably hostile as ever.

In the long run, however, in view of this unremitting hostility and the rapid growth in the population of the Arabs both within and outside Israel, Israel's military victories may yet be seen as Pyrrhic in the extreme...⁴⁸²

Two historical events continue to poison the relationship between the Arabs and the Jews: the Holocaust in the early 1940s and the expulsion of the Palestinians from their homeland in the late 1940s. The Israeli pianist Daniel Barenboim points out: "During the time following Israel's foundation as a state, the Holocaust was hardly present in public discourse; on the individual level it was understandably avoided by the survivors because of the pain it brought back, while the new generation wanted to dissociate itself at all costs from the image of the Jew as a victim. Therefore, both those who had experienced the Holocaust and those who fortunately only knew about it considered a discussion of the subject uncomfortable. The majority of young Israelis in the 1950s were concerned with creating an ideal society in which Zionism walked hand in hand with Socialism (the kibbutz being a clear example)..."

"The capture of Adolf Eichmann in Argentina in 1961 and the trial that followed in Jerusalem were not simply the process of bringing a criminal to justice - and what a criminal at that, having been one of the primary advocates and perpetrators of the 'final solution' - it was also a necessary educational experience for the young generation in Israel precisely because the Holocaust had not been a topic of great urgency for many years. It was the first time that the young population of Israel had been confronted with the full horror of the Holocaust. While it renewed the pain and suffering of the survivors, it also enabled them to open their hearts to the next generation... The terrible and constant presence of the trial made it impossible to continue to circumvent the subject..."⁴⁸³

However, a necessary educational experience has turned into a pseudo-justification of continued injustice against the Arabs both within and outside

⁴⁸¹ Ferguson, *Colossus*, London: Allen Lane, 2004, p. 116.

⁴⁸² "The Six-Day War", *The Week*, May 20, 2017, p. 11.

⁴⁸³ Barenboim, *Everything is Connected: The Power of Music*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2008, pp. 124-125.

Israel. Thus to the terrible Palestinian refugee problem created by the Israeli victory in 1948 was added the Israeli annexation of the Arab territories conquered in the Six-Day War of 1967. If the Israelis, learning the true lessons of the Holocaust, had shown generosity and strategic foresight in 1967 by returning the conquered territories of the West Bank and Gaza, some reciprocal movement on the part of the Arabs could have been elicited. Instead, the Arab position hardened; they knew that their higher birth-rates meant that, however many battles the Israelis won, they could never win the war. And so they refused to admit Israel's legitimate security concerns and resorted to terrorist tactics, the killing of innocent civilians.

"With the passage of time," writes Barenboim, "the hardening of the Palestinian position on cultural, social and political issues makes their demands more difficult for Israel to accept. What would have been an act of generosity soon after the Six Day War in 1967, such as the return of occupied territories, will today, now that the necessity of doing so is internationally recognized, inevitably be construed as an unavoidable act of weakness on Israel's part. The fact that the whole Arab world was not willing to negotiate from a position of weakness should have inspired Israel to develop creative propositions rather than to solidify its unyielding attitude. I believe, however, that Israel has not yet been able to understand rationally its strength or weakness in the conflict and has consequently vacillated from one extreme to the other. The residue of having been persecuted and victimized throughout history may be an element that keeps it from objectively measuring its strength as a state."⁴⁸⁴

In spite of his admirable determination to be fair to both Arabs and Israelis (demonstrated practically in his foundation of the East-Western Divan orchestra, composed of both Jewish and Arab musicians), Barenboim's Jewishness here shows through in an ignorance of Jewish history. For Jews have by no means "been persecuted and victimized throughout history" - or at any rate, not without reasons. As we have seen in previous volumes, they have persecuted Christians whenever they have been in a position of power to do so, which has been part of the reason why they themselves have been feared and persecuted when the balance of power has shifted...

This excuses neither Christian nor Muslim anti-Semitism; but it shows that the roots of the Jewish problem go back much further in history than is commonly recognized. Although it is no longer politically correct to assert this, they go back right back to the day when, in front of the Roman procurator Pontius Pilate and the semi-Arab usurper Herod, the Jews called for the crucifixion of their true King, Jesus Christ, crying: "We have no king but Caesar... His blood be on us and on our children"...

⁴⁸⁴ Barenboim, op. cit., p. 107.

CONCLUSION: THE RESURRECTION OF ISRAEL

In this book, we have traced the spiritual fall of Israel from its Old Testament glory as the people of God, through the long centuries of its exile and humiliation among the Gentile peoples, to the beginnings of its resurrection as an independent state and arbiter of the destinies of the same Gentile peoples that once dominated it. The century or so since the Balfour declaration and the Russian revolution have been to the highest degree eventful and stormy for the Jews both inside and outside their reconquered homeland. However, it is beyond the scope of this book to cover the most recent, half-century or so of Jewish history. Instead, we shall conclude with some thoughts on the destiny of the Jews that arise in conjunction with that history and the still-unfulfilled prophecies of the destiny of the Jews that are contained in Holy Scripture. As a framework for our discussion we shall take the intriguing article by an anonymous author entitled "How to Understand the Jews as Being a Chosen People".⁴⁸⁵

The central thought of the author, an Orthodox Christian, is that whereas "Christians are the chosen nation of God, holy, redeemed by the Lord", and although the Jews, as a nation, have fallen away from their spiritual calling, nevertheless "the covenant concluded with them carnally, that is by descent from Abraham, could not be annulled even in the face of spiritual apostasy". That covenant consists essentially in the promise of *survival*. Since in Christ "there is neither Jew nor Greek" (Galatians 3.28), the Jews would not have survived as a separate nation if they had believed in Christ and joined the chosen nation of God, which is the Church. However, "the covenant with the Jewish people made to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, is never revoked, and therefore, in remaining a 'special, different' people, since they did not accept Christianity, they repudiated their being the chosen people of God". But at the same time they guaranteed their survival as a nation. "Thus, it may be that the very preservation until now of the Jewish people is a result not of their being 'chosen', but as a result of their apostasy..." For the covenant was not only with Abraham's son through Sarah, Isaac, but also with his son through Hagar, Ishmael. To Isaac and his Seed - by which, as St. Paul explains in Galatians, is meant Christ and the Christian, is promised *salvation*. But to Ishmael and his seed is promised *survival*. And spiritually speaking, the Jews who reject Christ are of the seed of Abraham *through Ishmael*, not Isaac.

The Lord said on the eve of His Passion: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Unless a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit" (John 12.24). These words are applicable, first of all, to Christ, Who died in order to rise again, and to individual Christians, who must die to their egoism in order to live spiritually. But it also applies to nations...

The Jews killed Christ because they saw in Him a threat to their national

⁴⁸⁵ *Orthodox Life*, vol. 41, no. 4, July-August, 1991, pp. 36-41.

survival. As the chief priests said: "If we let Him thus alone, all men will believe on Him, and the Romans will come and take away both our place and nation" (John 12.48). For they had plans to rebel against Rome, whereas Christ rejected such mistaken zealotry. He recognized the authority of Rome over Israel politically, insisting that His Kingdom was universalist, not nationalist in essence, and even "not of this world". Knowing this, and knowing that the people were ready to follow Him if given the chance, Caiaphas insisted: "It is expedient for us that one man [Christ] should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not" (John 12.50).

And indeed, as the Evangelist John points out, Christ did die for the nation. He died so that the chosen nation of God, the Christians, "the new Israel" (Galatians 6.16), should not die spiritually, but live eternally. That nation would include both Jews and Gentiles, but it would not consist of nations in the ordinary, worldly sense of the word, being a "peculiar" nation of a quite different kind.

But Caiaphas was right even in his own terms. For if the Jews were to survive as a distinct nation in the worldly sense, they had to be united around a nationalist creed that put the nation above every other value, even loyalty to the God of Israel. Christ with His universalist vision was an obstacle on that path, and so He had to be killed.

So, having killed Christ, the Jews have miraculously survived as a nation in spite of the most terrible catastrophes that would have destroyed any other nation. In spite of the destruction of Jerusalem in the first century. In spite of being exiled from Babylonia in the eleventh century, and England in the thirteenth century, and Spain in the fifteenth century. In spite of the Nazi holocaust in the first half of the twentieth century. In spite of the uncompromising hostility and overwhelming numerical superiority of the Arabs in the second half of the twentieth century. They have survived, and not only survived, but even prospered – and prospered mightily. The Rothschild century has turned into the Rockefeller century, and now in the twenty-first century they rule the world as never before

Since the two peoples of the covenant come from the same father, there is a family likeness between them, their destinies in history are intertwined, and the transition of individuals and groups from one people to the other is easier than to any third category or people outside the covenant (pagans or atheists). Thus the conversion of the Arabs, the original physical Ishmaelites, to Orthodox Christianity in the early Christian centuries (before Mohammed) is an example of transition from the spiritual category of unbelieving Ishmael to the spiritual category of believing Israel. Again, while the Jews have never converted en masse to Christianity, there have been individual conversions throughout the centuries, from St. Epiphanius of Cyprus to New Martyr Alexander Jacobson.

More common, alas, has been the reverse movement, the falling away of

Christians into various forms of Judaizing heresy. We see this already in the Early Church – St. Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians is essentially a tract against Christian Judaizers. And explicitly or implicitly Judaizing movements in Christianity have appeared many times since then. Islam, for example, contains many Judaizing elements. In fact, when Christians fall away from the True Faith, if they do not become complete pagans or atheists, they usually acquire traits of Judaism; for, as the anonymous Russian Christian writes, “Christianity without Christ reverts to Judaism”.

We see this, for example, in Roman Catholicism: at the time of the falling away of the Roman Church in the eleventh century, the Romans adopted wafers – that is, unleavened bread (azymes) – in the liturgy instead of the leavened bread of the Orthodox – a relapse from the New Testament to the Old. Thus St. Nicetas Stethatos, a monk of the Studite monastery in Constantinople, wrote to the Latins: “Those who still participate in the feast of unleavened bread are under the shadow of the law and consume the feast of the Jews, not the spiritual and living food of God... How can you enter into communion with Christ, the living God, while eating the dead unleavened dough of the shadow of the law and not the yeast of the new covenant...?”

The same Judaizing process is still more evident in Protestantism. Thus the Protestants adopted as their Old Testament Bible, not the Septuagint until then in use throughout the whole of Christendom, but the Massoretic text of the Jewish rabbis. Again, the Protestants’ chapel worship is similar to the Jews’ synagogue worship: in both we find the exaltation of Scripture reading and study above liturgical worship (although this is more principled in Protestantism – in Judaism it is necessitated by the destruction of the Temple in which alone, according to the Law, liturgical worship can take place).

Again, the relationship between Church and State in many Calvinist communities was modelled on the Old Testament Israel in the period of Moses and the Judges. Thus A.P. Lopukhin writes: "On examining the structure of the Mosaic State, one is involuntarily struck by its similarity to the organisation of the state structure in the United States of Northern America." "The tribes in their administrative independence correspond exactly to the states, each of which is a democratic republic." The Senate and Congress "correspond exactly to the two higher groups of representatives in the Mosaic State - the 12 and 70 elders." "After settling in Palestine, the Israelites first (in the time of the Judges) established a union republic, in which the independence of the separate tribes was carried through to the extent of independent states."⁴⁸⁶

Indeed, for the Pilgrim Fathers, their colonisation of America was like Joshua’s conquest of the Promised Land. Just as the Canaanites had to be

⁴⁸⁶ Lopukhin, *Zakonodatel'stvo Moisea* (The Legislation of Moses). Saint Petersburg, 1888, p. 233; quoted in Alexeyev, N.N. “Khristianstvo i Idea Monarkhii” (“Christianity and the Idea of the Monarchy”), *Put'* (The Way), N 6, January, 1927, p. 557.

driven out from the Promised Land, so did the Red Indians from America. And just as Church and State were organically one in Joshua's Israel, so it was in the Pilgrim Fathers' America.

Protestantism, especially in America, also acquired the distinctly Judaistic trait of the deification of materialism, the pursuit of material prosperity, not simply for its own sake, but as a proof that God is with you.

"This Jewish materialistic approach," writes the anonymous Russian Christian, "openly or more subtly, under the appearance of various social theories and philosophical systems, encroaches upon the consciousness of Christians, breaking down the Christian nations. In particular the penetration into the Christian consciousness of this Judaistic idea explains many heresies, the rise of Islam, the substitution of Christianity with humanism, altruism, Marxism and separatist nationalism. Nationalism, which at times takes on an anti-Semitic character, at other times ends up in union with Judaism; in any event it is the reverse side of Jewish philosophy. A nation is truly attractive only in that part of it which is Christian. On the other hand, separatist nationalism, that is the extolling of a nation because it is a particular nation, refers back to the incorrect and prideful Jewish understanding of their chosenness, when they boast, 'We are the children of Abraham'.

"This activity of Judaistic philosophy is responsible for the striving towards the worldly in Christian societies, the wasting of spiritual talents for the worldly, that is, the burying of them, which explains the direction of present-day civilization towards 'progress', the ruining of our planet, modern pagan art, and so on.

"Thus the Jews may obtain supremacy, resulting from the breakdown of the Christian peoples, that is, from an open or subtle falling away from Christianity, which can be viewed as a direct influence of Jewish philosophy. In the end they will bring forth from their midst the Antichrist, their messiah, upon whom they hope..."

In still more recent times, Western Christianity as a whole has adopted another, still more fundamental trait of Judaism: its *adogmatic* character, making it, like Judaism, *a religion, not so much of faith, as of works*.

Thus in his work, *The Religio-Philosophical Foundations of History* (Moscow, 1997), the former revolutionary L.A. Tikhomirov writes: "It is now already for nineteen centuries that we have been hearing from Jewish thinkers that the religious essence of Israel consists not in a concept about God, but in the fulfilment of the Law. Above were cited such witnesses from Judas Galevy. The very authoritative Ilya del Medigo (15th century) in his notable *Test of Faith* says that 'Judaism is founded not on religious dogma, but on religious acts'.

"But religious acts are, in essence, those that are prescribed by the Law. That means: if you want to be moral, carry out the Law. M. Mendelsohn formulates

the idea of Jewry in the same way: 'Judaism is not a revealed religion, but a revealed Law. It does not say 'you must believe', but 'you must act'. In this constitution given by God the State and religion are one. The relationships of man to God and society are merged. It is not lack of faith or heresy that attracts punishment, but the violation of the civil order. Judaism gives not obligatory dogmas and recognizes the freedom of inner conviction.'

"Christianity says: you must believe in such-and-such a truth and on the basis of that you must do such-and-such. New [i.e. Talmudic] Judaism says: you can believe as you like, but you have to do such-and-such. But this is a point of view that annihilates man as a moral personality..."⁴⁸⁷

Of course, the works prescribed by Talmudic Judaism are very different from those prescribed by Christ: the one kind enslaves and debases while the other liberates and exalts. However, in the last resort works without faith, according the Gospel, are useless; for works are only valuable as the expression of faith, faith in *the truth* – it is *the truth* that sets man free (John 8.32). So contemporary Christians' adoption of the Jewish ethic of works, and loss of zeal for dogmatic truth, is a kind of slow but steady spiritual suicide...

The logical conclusion of the apostasy of the Christian world and its reversion to Judaism will be, as St. Paul prophesies, the appearance of "the man of sin", the Antichrist (II Thessalonians 2.3). He will become the king of the Jews, will rebuild the Temple and reintroduce the Mosaic Law and Temple worship, with the worship of himself as Messiah and God as its centre and culminating point. And so Judaism will finally acquire a positive dogma, that the Antichrist is God, to supplement its negative dogma, that Jesus Christ is not God; and the Christian world, the spiritual Israel, will finally dissolve into the carnal Israel – with the exception of a heroic remnant.

The spiritual Israel is blessed, while the carnal Israel is accursed. Nevertheless, a promise is given to the carnal Israel: that it will *live* in accordance with Abraham's petition: "Let this Ishmael *live* before Thee" (Genesis 17.18). This life cannot be spiritual, because that is promised only to the spiritual Israel. So it must be carnal – physical survival and worldly power.

At the same time, St. Ambrose admits the possibility that Abraham's powerful petition could win spiritual life for some of the Jews – but only, of course, if they cease to belong to the carnal Israel and join the spiritual Israel through faith in Christ. For "it is the attribute of the righteous man to intercede even for sinners; therefore, let the Jews believe this too, because Abraham stands surety even for them, provided they will believe..."⁴⁸⁸

The promise of physical life and prosperity has certainly been fulfilled in the extraordinary tenacity of the Jewish race, its survival in the face of huge

⁴⁸⁷ Tikhomirov, *Religiozno-Filosofskie Osnovy Istorii*, Moscow, 1997, pp. 379, 380.

⁴⁸⁸ St. Ambrose, *On Abraham*, 88.

obstacles to the present day, and - since its gradual emancipation from the ghetto in the nineteenth century, - its domination of world politics and business in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. However, the successes of the Jews in worldly terms have been so great that many Evangelical Protestants have been tempted to ascribe it, not to God's promise to *Ishmael*, but to his promise to *Isaac*. Reversing the interpretation of the Apostle Paul, they have made of the carnal Israel "the chosen people", "the blessed seed" - and this in spite of the fact that this "chosen people" not only does not believe in Christ, but has been the foremost enemy of those who do believe in Christ for the last two thousand years!

In fact, "it may be," as the anonymous Russian writer has suggested, "that the very preservation up until now of the Jewish people is a result not of their being 'chosen', but as a result of their apostasy". For, having renounced their birthright, the Kingdom of God, they have received a "mess of pottage" instead - the promise of physical survival and worldly power. "If the Jews, having repented of the crime committed on Golgotha, would have become Christian, then they would have made up the foundation of a new spiritual nation, the nation of Christians. Would they have begun to strive in this case to preserve their nationality and government? Would they not have dispersed among other nations as the missionaries of Christianity just as the Apostles? Would they not have been strangers in a foreign land, not having a fatherland, like unto Abraham, but in this case with a higher spiritual meaning? All this happened with the Jews, that is, they became wanderers, not in a positive spiritual sense, but due to a curse, that is, not of their own will, but due to the will of chastising Providence since they did not fulfil that which God intended for them. Would they not have been exterminated en masse during persecutions as the main preachers of Christianity? Would they not have been assimilated among other peoples, so that the very name 'Jew', 'Hebrew', as a national name, would have disappeared and would have only remained in the remembrance of grateful nations as the glorious name of their enlighteners? Yes, and the very Promised Land and Jerusalem were given to the Hebrews not as a worldly fatherland, for which they are now striving, but as a prefiguration of the Heavenly Kingdom and the Heavenly Jerusalem, as a token of which Abraham and through him all the Hebrew nation coming out of Haran, renounced their earthly fatherland. For this reason the very significance of Jerusalem and the idea as a prefigurement would have passed away for the Jews, as soon as the Kingdom of God and the Heavenly Jerusalem would have become obtainable for them and would have become for them, as they are now for us, Christian holy places."

By elevating the carnal Israel into the spiritual Israel, the Protestants fill up a major emotional gap in their world-view; for, having rejected both the *concept* of the Church, and the *reality* of it in Orthodoxy, they have to find a substitute for it somewhere else. And so we have the paradoxical sight of the State of Israel, one of the main persecutors of Christianity in the contemporary world, which forbids conversions of Jews to Christianity and has driven out the majority of the Orthodox Christian population from Israel, being ardently

supported by the Evangelical Protestants of the Anglo-Saxon countries. There have even been several attempts by Evangelicals to blow up the mosque of the Dome of the Rock, in order to make it possible for the Jews to build their Temple again – the Temple of the Antichrist!

However, before dismissing this delusion out of hand, we need to study the arguments that the Evangelicals produce in favour of it. And one of the most important of these is that Israel's success has been prophesied and blessed by God in the Abrahamic Covenant. In particular, they argue that God promised to the descendants of Abraham the whole land of Israel from the Nile to the Euphrates, which promise has been almost fulfilled since the foundation of the State of Israel in 1948, and that this would be their heritage *forever* (Genesis 13.15, 15.18).

In reply to this argument, we may note the following:-

1. God's prophecies are never fulfilled *approximately*, but always *exactly*. The prophecy of the Jews' winning control of the whole area from the Nile to the Euphrates was fulfilled *exactly* in the time of Kings David and Solomon (II Kings 8.3, II Chronicles 9.26). But the modern-day Jews have not emulated this feat: in 1967 they very briefly reached the Suez Canal, but not the Nile, and have never reached the Euphrates.
2. Even if the boundaries of the State of Israel were to extend this far at some point in the future, this would still be an achievement of the *carnal* Israel (unless the State of Israel would have become officially Christian by that time), and therefore would not be something to rejoice in as if it were blessed by God, but rather to be bemoaned as an extension of the kingdom of the Antichrist.
3. According to St. Philaret of Moscow, the Hebrew word translated as *forever* ("I will give it to thee and to thy seed *forever*" (13.15)) can mean no more than an indefinite period of time.⁴⁸⁹ Even if we accept St. John Chrysostom's interpretation, that it means *in perpetuity*, this can only mean until the end of the world.⁴⁹⁰ For it is only "the meek" – that is, the Christians - who "will inherit the earth" in the age to come...

However, this is not the only argument of the Evangelicals. They also point to the many Biblical prophecies that speak of the return of the Jews to the land of Israel and their conversion to Christ. Some Orthodox Christians reject the Evangelical interpretation of some of these passages on the grounds that all the as-yet-unfulfilled Old Testament prophecies concerning Israel in fact refer to the New Testament Israel, the Church. However, it is impossible to allegorize these prophecies to such an extent that *all* references to the race of the Jews and to the physical land of Israel are excluded. In any case, even if, as I shall argue, some of these prophecies *do* refer to the return of the Jews to the Holy Land and their conversion to Holy Orthodoxy, they do not justify the

⁴⁸⁹ St. Philaret, *Zapiski*.

⁴⁹⁰ St. Chrysostom, *Homily 34 on Genesis*, 9.

Evangelicals' positive attitude to the carnal Israel that remains unrepentant and unbelieving.

So let us now examine these prophecies:-

1. Malachi 4.5, 6: "I will send you Elijah the Tishbite, who will restore the heart of the father to the son, lest I come and utterly smite the earth". That this passage indeed refers to the conversion of the Jews through the Prophet Elijah is confirmed by Christ Himself: "Elijah is indeed coming first and restores all things" (Mark 9.12) as one of the two witnesses against the Antichrist (Revelation 11). And St. John Chrysostom explains that the reason for Elijah's coming is that "he may persuade the Jews to believe in Christ, so they may not all utterly perish at His coming... Hence the extreme accuracy of the expression: He did not say 'He will restore the heart of the son to the father', but 'of the father to the son'. For the Jews being father to the apostles, His meaning is that He will restore to the doctrines of their sons, that is, of the apostles, the hearts of the fathers, that is, the Jewish people's mind."

2. Ezekiel 36-39. In chapter 36 the Prophet Ezekiel describes how the Jews will be gathered back into the land of Israel, and there converted and baptized: "For I will take you from the nations, and gather you from all the countries, and bring you into your own land. I will sprinkle clean water upon you [baptism], and you shall be clean from all your uncleanness... And you shall be My people, and I will be your God" (36.24-25, 28). Then comes the famous vision of the dry bones (ch. 37), which is an allegorical description of the resurrection of the Jews to true faith when they appeared to be completely devoid of it. Then comes the invasion of Israel by Gog and Magog (ch. 38), and the description of how the Jews will spend seven months clearing up after the destruction of the invaders (ch. 39). And then the Prophet says: "All the nations shall know that the house of Israel was led captive because of their sins, because they rebelled against Me, and I turned My face from them, and delivered them into the hands of their enemies, and they all fell by the sword. According to their uncleanness and according to their transgressions did I deal with them, and I turned My face from them. Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Now will I turn back captivity in Jacob, and will have mercy on the house of Israel, and will be jealous for the sake of My holy name" (39.23-25).

3. Jeremiah 3.16-18: "It shall come to pass, when you are multiplied and increased in the land in those days, says the Lord, that they will say no more, 'The ark of the covenant of the Lord'. It shall not come to mind, nor shall they remember it, nor shall they visit it, nor shall it be made anymore. At that time Jerusalem shall be called the Throne of the Lord, and all the nations shall be gathered to it, to the name of the Lord, to Jerusalem. Nor more shall they follow the dictates of their evil hearts. In those days the house of Judah shall walk with the house of Israel, and they shall come together out of the land of the north to the land that I have given as an inheritance to your fathers."

4. Zephaniah 3.10-13, 18-20: "From beyond the rivers of Ethiopia My

suppliants, the daughter of My dispersed ones, shall bring Me offering. On that day you shall not be put to shame because of the deeds by which you have rebelled against Me; for then I will remove from your midst your proudly exultant ones, and you shall no longer be haughty in My holy mountain. For I will leave in the midst of you a people humble and lowly. They shall seek refuge in the name of the Lord, those who are left in Israel... I will remove disaster from you, so that you will not bear reproach for it. Behold, at that time I will deal with all your oppressors, and I will save the lame and gather the outcast, and I will change their shame into praise and renown in all the earth. At that time I will bring you home, at the time when I gathered you together; yea, I will make you renowned and praised among all the peoples of the earth, when I restore your fortunes before your eyes, says the Lord."

5. Zechariah 12-14. In chapters 12 and 13 the Prophet Zechariah appears to describe how the Jews come to a profound repentance for their apostasy from Christ: "I will pour out on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem a spirit of grace and compassion; and they shall look on Me Whom they pierced" (i.e. the Crucified Christ), "and they shall mourn for Him, as one mourns over a first-born" (12.10). "In that day a fountain shall be opened for the house of David and for the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness [baptism]" (13.1). In chapter 14 a great disaster overtakes the people, and "half the city shall go into captivity" (14.2). But the Lord will fight for Israel, and finally, after a great war, "it shall come to pass that everyone who is left of all the nations that came against Jerusalem shall go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the Feast of Tabernacles" (14.16). Now the mention of the feast of Tabernacles may lead to the thought that this is a Judaic feast, and so the context is the whole world going up to Jerusalem to pray at the Judaic feast - perhaps even to worship the Antichrist! However, in the context it is much more natural to interpret this as being a true, Christian feast, probably the Christian fulfilment of the feast of Tabernacles.

6. Romans 11.15, 25-27: "For if their [the Jews'] being cast away is the reconciling of the world [the Gentiles' conversion], what will their acceptance be but life from the dead?... For I do not desire, brethren, that you should be ignorant of this mystery, lest you should be wise in your own opinion, that blindness in part has happened to Israel until the fullness of the Gentiles has come in. And so all Israel will be saved."

Origen explains this passage well: "Now indeed, until all the Gentiles come to salvation, the riches of God are concentrated in the multitude of [Gentile] believers, but as long as Israel remains in its unbelief it will not be possible to say that the fullness of the Lord's portion has been attained. The people of Israel are still missing from the complete picture. But when the fullness of the Gentiles has come in and Israel comes to salvation at the end of time, then it will be the people which, although it existed long ago, will come at the last and complete the fullness of the Lord's portion and inheritance."

Again, as St. Cyril of Alexandria says, "Although it was rejected, Israel will also be saved eventually... Israel will be saved in its own time and will be called at the end, after the calling of the Gentiles."

What does "all Israel" mean? Blessed Theodoret of Cyr writes: "'All Israel' means all those who believe, whether Jews... or Gentiles." So when "the fullness of the Gentiles" has been gathered into the granary of the Church, and then "the fullness of the Jews", we will be able to say that "all Israel" has been saved – that is, the whole of "the Israel of God" (Galatians 6.16), the Church of Christ.

7. Revelation 3.8: "Behold, says the Lord to the Angel of the Church of Philadelphia, I will make them of the synagogue of Satan, who say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie; behold, I will make them to come and make obeisance before they feet, and to know that I have loved thee."

Holy New Martyr Mark (Novoselov) comments on this: "[St. John] with complete clarity speaks about the conversion of the God-fighting people to the Church of Christ, when she, few in numbers and powerless from an external point of view, but powerful with an inner strength and faithfulness to her Lord (Revelation 3.8) will draw to herself the 'remnant' of the God-fighting tribe.

"Gazing with the eye of faith at that which the Lord has done before our eyes, and applying the ear of our heart and mind to the events of our days, comparing that which is seen and heard with the declarations of the Word of God, I cannot but feel that a great, wonderful and joyous mystery of God's economy is coming towards us: the Judaizing haters and persecutors of the Church of God, who are striving to subdue and annihilate her, by the wise permission of Providence will draw her to purification and strengthening, so as 'to present her [to Christ] as a glorious Church, having no spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but so that she should be holy and blameless' (Ephesians 6.27).

"And in His time, known only to the One Lord of time, this, according to the son of thunder's strict expression 'synagogue of Satan' will bow before the pure Bride of Christ, conquered by her holiness and blamelessness and, perhaps, frightened by the image of the Antichrist. And if the rejection of the Apostle Paul's fellow-countrymen was, in his words, 'the reconciliation of the world [with God], what will be their acceptance if not life from the dead?' (Romans 11.15)."

The famous monarchist writer Lev Tikhomirov agrees with this interpretation: "Is this conversion of the Jews that salvation of 'all Israel' which the Apostle Paul foretold? In the Apocalypse it is said that the saved will come 'of the synagogue of Satan, who say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie'. But not the whole of the 'synagogue' will come, but only 'of the synagogue', that is, a part of it. But even here, where the Apostle Paul says that 'the whole of Israel will be saved', he means only a part: 'for they are not all Israel, which are of Israel... They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children

of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed' (Romans 9.6, 8).

"The opinion is widespread among us that the conversion of the Jews will take place at the very appearance of the Saviour, when they shall cry out: 'Blessed is He That cometh in the name of the Lord'. But this is not evident from the Apocalypse. But if the Philadelphian conversion will bring 'all Israel' that is to be saved to Christ, then this will, of course, be a great event, fully explaining the rejoicing of the Heavens. Israel is a chosen people with whom it will not be possible to find a comparison when he begins to do the work of God. The Jews will, of course, multiply the forces of Christianity for the resistance against the Antichrist. 'If the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world,' says the Apostle Paul, 'what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?' (Romans 11.15)."

7. Revelation 7.4: "And I heard the number of those who were sealed; and there were sealed a hundred and forty and four thousand of all the tribes of the children of Israel." "This sealing," writes Archbishop Averky of Syracuse and Jordanville, "will begin with the Israelites, who before the end of the world will be converted to Christ, as St. Paul predicts (Romans 9.27, 11.26). In each of the twelve tribes there will be twelve thousand sealed, and 144,000 in all. Of these tribes only the tribe of Dan is not mentioned, because from it, according to tradition, will come the Antichrist. In place of the tribe of Dan is mentioned the priestly tribe of Levi which previously had not entered into the twelve tribes. Such a limited number is mentioned, perhaps, in order to show how small is the number of the sons of Israel who are saved in comparison with the uncountable multitude of those who have loved the Lord Jesus Christ from among all the other formerly pagan people of the earth."

So the carnal Israel can and will be saved. But only, it must be emphasized again, by ceasing to be the carnal Israel and becoming part of the spiritual. For the carnal and the spiritual Israels, though related through their common father, and constantly intertwined in history, are mutually incompatible...

We are now in a better position to understand the relationship between the two "great nations" who come from Abraham and who are given promises in the Abrahamic Covenant.

For clarity's sake we shall refer to *two* covenants, or promises, the one referring to the spiritual Israel and the other to the carnal Israel. The two covenants are both complementary and contrary to each other. The spiritual Israel is promised spiritual blessings: *salvation and the Kingdom of Heaven*, while the carnal Israel is promised carnal blessings: *survival and the kingdom of this world*; for this is what the Jews confessed that they belonged to when they declared to the ruler of this world: "We have no other king than Caesar" (John 19, 15). And so it has turned out in history: the children of the spiritual Israel, consisting of people from many nations, both Jews and Gentiles, have been given salvation in Christ, while the children of the carnal Israel, having lost

salvation, have nevertheless survived many centuries of oppression and humiliation, and have achieved worldly power – and power over the spiritual Israel, too, in places like Israel and Soviet Russia. The worldly power of the carnal Israel is destined to reach its peak at the end of the world, in the time of the Jewish Antichrist. At the same time, however, - or perhaps before - the spiritual Israel will achieve *her* greatest victory – the conversion of many, perhaps most of the children of the carnal Israel to Christ.

Since the carnal Israel is promised physical life and power, it is no wonder that since the Balfour Declaration of 1917, and especially since the foundation of the State of Israel in 1948, it has regained power over the land of Israel, driving out most of the Christians in the process, and may well recapture all the land from the Nile to the Euphrates, as was promised in the Abrahamic Covenant. But it is important to understand that such a reconquest, if it takes place, will not be by virtue of the Jews being the *chosen* people, as they and their Evangelical allies believe, but by virtue of the exact opposite: of their being the *accursed* people. For of the two covenant peoples the people that is carnal is given physical gifts that are appropriate to its carnal desires.

As for the spiritual Israel, the meek and the righteous Israel, “the Israel of God” (Galatians 6.16), it is not in this age that it will inherit the earth, as was promised by God. It will be given to it only after this present world has perished in its present form, and has been renewed and transformed into the conditions of the original Paradise. For “we, according to the promise, look for new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells” (II Peter 3.13). *That* is the Promised Land of the Saints. Moreover, since corruptible “flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom” (I Corinthians 15.50), they will receive it, not in corruptible bodies, but in that “earth”, the incorruptible bodies of the resurrection, that they will inherit at the Second Coming...

*

Finally, we may pose the question: after the spiritual resurrection of Israel, is it possible that a Christian Jewish autocracy could also be created, a resurrection of the autocracy of David and Solomon, but now fulfilled in the Church of Christ?

The prophecies give no clear answer to this question. The most relevant and striking of them, Zechariah chapters 12-14, speaks only of the destruction of Israel in a great war, followed by the repentance of the Jews, followed by the destruction also of the enemies of Israel. After that “the Lord shall be King over all the earth. In that day it shall be ‘the Lord is one’, and His name one. The people shall dwell in it; and no longer shall there be utter destruction; but Jerusalem shall be safely inhabited... And it shall come to pass that everyone who is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem shall go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the Feast of Tabernacles. And it shall be that whichever of the families of the earth do not come up to Jerusalem to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, on them there

will be no rain..." (14.9-11, 16-17).

In other words, Jerusalem will become a great *spiritual* centre, to which most of the nations of the world, now converted to Christianity, will come to celebrate the Christianized Feast of Tabernacles; but there is no word of its becoming a great *political* centre again. Jerusalem will be "safely inhabited"; there will be no external threats to her existence (as there are now). But she will not become the capital of an autocracy such as Byzantium or Russia.

And this is appropriate; for the great temptation of Old Testament Israel was the temptation of *political power*. It was for this reason, as we have seen, that the Jews rejected their true Autocrat and King, Jesus Christ. They feared that he would not approve of their nationalist dreams; for He refused to approve of their revolutionary plans and said that His was a spiritual Kingdom that was not of this world - and not at all to the taste of the carnal-minded Scribes and Pharisees.

The final crushing of Israeli political power as described (we believe) in Ezekiel 38-39 and Zechariah 12, after which the Jews will "look upon Him Whom they pierced" and repent of their sins, will finally cure them of their desire for political power and domination over other nations. Then they will be spiritually freed to fulfill the destiny and mission that the Lord assigned to them when He first separated them from all the other nations of the earth as His own chosen people: that they should be priests to, and servants of, the other nations, rather than lords over them.

In any case, is it conceivable that, having recognized Jesus Christ as the true King of the Jews, they could ever accept another Jewish king over them (as opposed to some regent, or "governor of Judah", like Zerubbabel)?!

"But what about the Antichrist?", somebody will immediately object. "Will he not claim to be the King of the Jews?" He will; but he will be no true autocrat in the Orthodox Christian understanding of the word, because he will not only claim to unite in Himself the roles of King and Priest, which all despots from Nimrod to Saul and from Nebuchadnezzar to Herod Agrippa have tried to do, but will even claim to be God "and sit as God in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God" (II Thessalonians 2.4). All true Israelites will then reject him, glorifying the only true God and King of the Jews, Jesus Christ. To Him be the Kingdom, the Power and the Glory, unto the ages of ages.