

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jtvi-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php)

JOURNAL OF  
THE TRANSACTIONS  
OF  
The Victoria Institute  
OR  
Philosophical Society of Great Britain

---

VOL. LXXVII  
1945



LONDON:

---

PUBLISHED BY  
THE INSTITUTE, 12, QUEEN ANNE'S GATE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

---

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

War conditions made it impracticable to hold an Ordinary Meeting on March 19th, 1945, the Paper for that date was circulated to subscribers and is here published, together with the written discussion.

---

*ANTI-SEMITISM : ITS CAUSES, PALLIATIVES,  
AND CURE.*

By The REV. CHARLES FISHER, M.A.

**A**NTI-SEMITISM, or more accurately anti-Judaism—for other branches of the Semites have not been involved, only Jews—existed in pre-Christian days, but became more definite and persistent after the Fall of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews from Palestine. In the early centuries of the Christian era, the opposition came chiefly from church councils and the leading clergy ; but things got worse for the Jews after the Roman Empire embraced Christianity in the time of Constantine, for their Christian opponents had behind them the power of the State.

For nearly a thousand years the outbreaks against the Jews were intermittent, due to definite efforts on the part of the clergy, and were in no way popular ; significantly enough, the Popes were frequently their defenders. But with the fanatical enthusiasm and widespread public interest aroused by the Crusades a complete change came about, and Jew-hatred began to stir the masses to wholesale persecution of the Jews. This more sinister development received great impetus from the Lateran Council of 1215, whose wide influence may be judged by the fact that 71 archbishops, 412 bishops, 800 abbots and a host of other church dignitaries were present.

It was at this Council that the distinctive dress (" Yellow badge ") was imposed upon all Jews throughout Christendom, causing them shame and suffering beyond imagination, and reducing them to servility and a life of fear. The Lateran Council also decreed that Jews should be confined in ghettos and should be subjected to many humiliating restrictions.

The Reformation at first brought some improvement in their lot, for the movement was liberalising in its nature. But Martin Luther, who at first was friendly to the Jews, later became their bitter critic and opponent, and his works have been a rich storehouse from which anti-semitic propagandists have drawn ample materials to lampoon the Jews.

The Russian Orthodox Church has also not been behind in supplying its quota of anti-semitism, for the Russian pogroms at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries, led by the clergy, who incited the mobs to plunder and destroy Jewish homes and slaughter their occupants as they tried to escape, outdid all that had gone before in cruelty and violence. Pobiedonostoff, Procurator of the Holy Synod, declared, "When the pressure on the six million Jews in the Russian Empire has had its full effect, one-third will be dead, one-third will have fled the country, and the remaining third will have adopted the Christian religion."

As we survey the sufferings of the Jews from the time of the Crusades to the opening of the twentieth century, we are obliged to admit that the following lurid picture by Péguy is not overdrawn: "I know this people well. There is no portion of its epidermis that is not painful, where there is not some old bruise, some ancient contusion, some secret woe, a scar, a wound, a laceration of the Orient or of the Occident."

Now the world has been stirred by the Nazi attack upon the Jews, which makes all previous persecutions pale into insignificance. Nazi anti-semitic propaganda, which was intended for export, has also exercised a wide influence on the thought of the whole world, coming as it did at a time of great political unrest and economic insecurity. Even this country, which has shown a traditional friendship for the Jews, and the United States, until recently "a second Promised Land," have both begun to develop obvious traces of anti-semitism. Thus the whole world has become Jew-conscious, and is rapidly becoming Jew-hostile.

#### CAUSES OF ANTI-SEMITISM.

There must be many causes to produce such a condition as that briefly summarised above, and there is danger in oversimplification; but the main sources may conveniently be considered under the following headings: (1) Religious, (2) Economic, and (3) Racial, which is the historical order of their development.

1. *Religious*.—From its very beginning, the basis of Israel's national existence has been religious. God called them to act as His instrument for the restoration of the world, and by this divine election they became "a peculiar people," separated from

the rest of the nations. As they were chosen to stand with God they were necessarily placed in opposition to the spirit of the world. This is revealed more clearly in connection with the second divine election of the Church. "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated Me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love its own : but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, Therefore the world hateth you" (John xv, 18, 19). "Thus hatred of the Jews and hatred of Christians spring from the same source, from the same recalcitrance of the world, which desires to be wounded neither with the wounds of Adam nor with the wounds of the Saviour ; neither by the goad of Israel for its movement in time, nor by the cross of Jesus for eternal life" (Maritain, "Anti-semitism," p. 20). As Samuel Rutherford quaintly puts it : "The wind was blowing in the face of Jesus Christ, and anyone who will walk on the same side of the hedge as He did will find that the wind is blowing in his face too" (*cf.* Jeremiah xii, 9). One thing to which the Jews have clung down the ages is the fact that they are God's chosen people, and any attempt to explain anti-semitism will fail unless this peculiar burden that was laid upon them in the divine election is given due consideration.

But the purpose for which they were called demanded high spirituality and sacrificial service, and the tragic history of the Old Testament shows that they were unwilling to accept this rôle. They thus cut themselves off from the divine protection, which alone could have preserved them from their strong enemies on the North and South of the Holy Land.

The law, which was the very core of their national life, made them clearly distinct from other nations by its pure monotheism, the observance of the Sabbath, and all the regulations concerning food and daily life. But the law was obviously given for the land of Palestine, and for a homogeneous people ; its precepts could not be observed by a minority in a foreign land without untold difficulty and friction. The nation's refusal to follow God's revealed purpose for them led to their chastisement by banishment to Babylon. There we find instances of difficulties arising from their religion (*cf.* Daniel i, 8, iii, 12, and vi, 10), and full-fledged anti-semitism is seen in Haman's accusation of the Jews in Esther iii, 8.

But while the sore discipline of captivity did succeed in eliminating their proneness to idolatry, the heart of the nation

was not brought back into fellowship with God. God's blessing was still withheld from the restored remnant, as the post-captivity prophets show, and finally the voice of prophecy ceased amongst "this stiffnecked and rebellious people" four hundred years before the coming of Christ.

In order to try to restore their former national glories, certain religious leaders concentrated during this period on observance of the letter of the law, and developed a rigid legalism which crushed the true spirit of worship out of their religion and exalted to absurd importance the observation of minute rules and regulations, which actually "made the word of God of none effect." "Ye tithe mint, and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law" (Matt. xxiii, 23). But see the whole chapter, with Christ's eight-fold "woes" against the Scribes and Pharisees, ending with the official rejection of the nation (vv. 34-39).

*Corruptio optimi pessima est.* The failure to respond rightly to the privileges of the divine election meant that this nation, which had qualities which fitted it for its high calling, missed its way and became intensely hostile to the full development of that revelation in the Gospel. The Pharisees were the bitterest opponents of Jesus Christ all through His ministry, and their opposition led to His death. It was this same party which strove at all costs to preserve the nation after the Resurrection and the rapid growth of the Church after Pentecost, by bitter opposition to the Gospel everywhere, both in Palestine and throughout Asia Minor and Greece, as is so plainly seen in Paul's missionary journeys and his epistles.

After the destruction of Jerusalem and dispersion of the Jews, the Pharisees maintained their spiritual leadership of the nation, intensifying their legalism, and at the same time their fanatical opposition to the name of Jesus of Nazareth and the new Faith. Though both Jews and Christians suffered considerably in the Roman Empire, both being termed "atheists" because they refused to acknowledge the Roman deities, the bitterness of Judaism against Christianity was maintained as the hard core of the spirit of national survival in dispersion. But when the Empire became "Christian" in the days of Constantine, Christians had now the backing of the State in their controversies with the Jews. As Judaism could no longer exact physical vengeance against its enemies, it carried on the struggle in another way. It retaliated in writing, and the Talmud and

other Jewish writings have ample proofs of this hostility. The spurious Jewish life of Jesus, *Sepher Toldoth Jeshu*, has succeeded from the earliest centuries of the Christian era until now in fanning the flame of bitterness against Christianity. Klausner says of it: "The inventions and legends, compact of hatred and sometimes of penetrating and stinging ridicule against Christianity and its Founder, went on increasing. . . . Nothing in the Gospels was denied; it was only perverted into a source of ridicule and blame. . . . This is the spirit which runs through the Toldoth Jeshu and which was certainly the spirit which prevailed among all Jews during the early Middle Ages" ("Jesus of Nazareth," p. 53).

It is necessary to know this feature of Judaism's religious development to understand its rigid intransigence and continued opposition to the Gospel. When this attitude is set over against the record of the Western Church, the Eastern Church and Protestantism (as briefly noted earlier), it is easy to understand the bitterness of the controversies between church and synagogue during an age when religion played a much greater part in human life than it does now.

The Crusades were the turning-point for the Jews in Christendom. Wherever the crusaders found Jews as they made their way across Europe, they attacked and butchered them. They were going to rescue the tomb of the Lord from the infidel's power, and here were infidels in their midst, "deicides" who had killed the Son of God, on whom they could practise destruction by way of rehearsal! A reign of terror fell upon the Jews in the Rhineland, where many thousands were brutally slain; others made their way eastward into Poland, establishing the Jewish community there, which has been the cultural and religious centre of Judaism ever since.

Through the decrees of the Lateran Council of 1215, embodying the Jew-hatred born of the Crusades, the lot of the Jews became unspeakably bad, and for the next five hundred years their existence was a perpetual nightmare. They were expelled from nearly every European country (from some several times), suffering severe losses. This absence of security forced them to adopt business methods which brought them into conflict with the citizens of the countries where they settled, and thus tended to increase their insecurity! This brings us to the Economic cause of anti-semitism.

2. *Economic*.—In the Roman Empire, Jews were allowed the

rights of citizenship, but when the Empire collapsed they could only live where they were granted permits, and it frequently happened that they became the property of the governing prince, who allowed them to live in his city. For centuries Jews were almost restricted to the business of money-lending and dealing in old clothes. (In the Middle Ages they were not allowed to become members of the trade guilds.) They were used by the princes to squeeze money out of their subjects, and the odium of this nefarious business fell upon the heads of the Jews. One of the most potent causes of "instinctive" anti-semitism is the evil reputation attached to the Jews through their money-lending, and yet they were forced into this occupation by the Gentile princes, who gave them sanctuary and a means of existence.

Later, particularly in Poland and Eastern Europe, great landowners often farmed out their lands to Jews, because thereby they could get the best returns for them ; but the Jews gained a notorious reputation for exploiting the poor peasants, and thereby developed anti-semitism. But while the charges were doubtless often true, the fault was in the system rather than in the Jews, who acted only as most Gentiles would have done under similar circumstances. The same applies to the permission to distil and sell alcohol, granted by the king to the nobles, and in turn passed on by them for a consideration to Jews. This was one cause of intense Jew-hatred, resulting in massacres ; but again it was the system, rather than the individual Jew, which deserved the chief censure.

Jews have been charged with being guilty of unfair business competition, and with introducing doubtful and wrong business methods. The very nature of their existence during the Middle Ages made them quick to seize any opportunity of earning money and, being naturally quick-witted, they often did forestall their Gentile competitors. But such charges came chiefly from Poland, which is a desperately poor country, where there was not sufficient trade for all. When peasants were driven to try to seek better conditions in towns, especially with the coming of the industrial age, no wonder that the Jews who were almost entirely town-dwellers had an advantage over them. The only solution of this aspect of the trouble is by increasing economic well-being all round, not by venting hatred on the Jew, who cannot be blamed for trying to live ! Seeing that they were not granted the privilege of citizenship and were restricted to certain occupa-

tions, it could not have been otherwise than that friction should come between them and their neighbours, especially with the religious background, which helped to poison their relations.

But the greatest incidence of economic anti-semitism arose out of a combination of religious and racial aspects. The pogroms in Russia (which then included much of present Poland) from 1881 onwards drove hundreds of thousands of Eastern Jews into Germany, England and America. Nearly all of these were extremely poor, and of low cultural standing. They were a menace to the standards of economic life in the countries where they settled, for they were ready to work for long hours at low rates of pay, and thus challenged the Trade Union standards which had been built up over many years. But America was then experiencing a very rapid industrial expansion, and was able to absorb almost unlimited immigrant labour. Between one and two million Jews crossed to the United States at this time from Eastern Europe.

But the industrial and economic crisis which developed after the Great War, causing widespread unemployment, almost completely closed the doors against further Jewish immigration into England and America. This damming up of the flood, which alone had relieved Central and Eastern Europe of a most pressing problem—what to do with its unwanted Jews—created a tension which was becoming almost intolerable when the World War came in 1939.

3. *Racial*.—While it is difficult to attach any exact meaning to the word “race,” which is used very loosely, and usually in a non-scientific way, it can positively be stated that there is no scientific basis for the Nazi race-theories of Nordic blood giving racial superiority to the Germans, or of the Jews belonging to an inferior type. Gobineau, who propounded the race-theory which Germany has developed with such tragic results to herself, the Jews and the whole world, frankly confessed that “he evolved it in order to support his political views of autocracy!”

Gobineau's famous book, *An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races* (1855), set forth the claim that the Aryans were obviously the master-race, holding that the French aristocracy were the truest expression of it! This theory was taken up and largely reproduced in Germany by Wilhelm Marr to establish the racial supremacy of the German people and the disintegrating qualities of the Jews. Houston S. Chamberlain carried this forward to the extreme limit in his *Foundations of the Nineteenth*

*Century*, which was the bible of Germany after the Great War. Hitler was a friend of Chamberlain long before he wrote *Mein Kampf*, in which one of the author's obsessions is the rottenness and racial inferiority of the Jews, whom Chamberlain had described as a "bastard race," whose "existence is a crime against the holy laws of life."

Another chief ingredient in Hitler's anti-Jewish complex was *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, an egregious forgery which he accepted at its face value. This pernicious book also exercised a very strong influence upon the Czar of Russia, and led to the outbreak of the Russian pogroms in 1881, which flooded Western Europe with a host of poor and backward Jews, who showed many traces of inferiority! But those traits were no proof of racial inferiority, but were the outcome of their historical development under unjust living conditions and repressions of all kinds, extending over hundreds of years.

The writings of Gobineau, Marr and Chamberlain were used to support the movement of national expansion in Germany after the victories over Austria in 1866 and France in 1871. It was wishful thinking on Germany's part that led her to adopt these theories of Aryan race supremacy, and to find that in her own "pure Nordic" blood. The defeat of Germany in 1918 nearly pricked the bubble, but the legend of their having been stabbed in the back by the Jews, thus never having been defeated at all, was the main plank of the Nazi programme which swept Hitler into power, and prepared the way for his most shameful attack upon the Jews and threat to exterminate them.

Economic and Racial anti-semitism flourishes most readily when economic conditions are bad. The tragic condition of Eastern Jewry after the Russian pogroms from 1881 onwards, and the plight of the Jews in devastated Poland after the Great War, both helped to develop local anti-semitism, and to fan the flames of racial anti-semitism in Germany and the West. But worse even than this was the almost complete industrial breakdown in post-war Germany. The Germans were in despair because of their seven millions of unemployed workers and closed world markets. Thus it was that Hitler's bitter attacks upon the Jews in *Mein Kampf*, and in his campaign speeches, gained a hearing and made their lot absolutely impossible.

These three causes of anti-semitism—Religious, Economic and Racial—have combined with others to provide a problem which

bids fair to become a cancer in the life of the Western nations, and must be solved if civilisation, as we know it, is to survive.

### PALLIATIVES.

The trouble is so widespread, and appears in such different forms in the different countries, that no universal solution is possible. The problem was acute before the world war broke out, because of the pressure of economic difficulties. It seems likely that it will have been increased immensely by the destructiveness and impoverishment of the nations due to total war, though in one tragic way the problem may have been eased, for many of the Jews in Europe have perished ! It is impossible to forecast with accuracy what the post-war economic state of Europe will be, though the slight glimpses afforded by the internal conditions of Italy, France, Greece and Poland provide no grounds for optimism. As the Jews have no territory of their own, it may be that their problem will have to wait till the other nations have been settled and rehabilitated. In the meantime, there are certain ways of improving the situation which may be considered.

The only practical scheme which has a wide Jewish backing is Zionism, of which more will be said in a moment. Anything that tends to promote better industrial and economic conditions, locally or world-wide, will help very materially.

1. An effort must be made to secure full minority rights for Jews, wherever they exist in considerable numbers, for the basis of their existence demands the right to order their own modes of life. It may be that the very need for labour for re-building industries shattered by war, and for the rehabilitation of national life in the various countries of the Continent, will make Jews an asset wherever they are.

2. Repeated efforts should also be made to provide that individual Jews should be treated with fairness and justice. There are good Jews and bad, just as there are good and bad nationals in every country. Let the bad Jew be punished for his crimes, as he deserves to be ; but let us avoid blaming the whole Jewish people (in our minds, if not openly) for the sins of individuals, which the majority repudiate as much as do their Gentile neighbours.

3. Let it be recognised that the leaders of Jewry have no

means of control over the Jew who has broken loose from the synagogue and has not developed any sense of responsibility towards the community where he lives. He is a problem and a trial to all, as was the gangster in America, and much patience will be needed to solve the problem of the Jew "wandering between two worlds."

4. Here in our own land much more could be done to get combined committees of Jews and Gentiles to consider together the things that cause irritation between them, and to suggest ways of overcoming or avoiding them. All the faults are not on one side, but those who have many contacts with Jews recognise their over-sensitiveness, and all know how their inferiority complex, due to centuries of unjust treatment, frequently makes them aggressive. As has been well pointed out, ability to put up with the awkwardnesses of the Jews is a proof of national health! The Germans broke down under the test and strove to get rid of the Jews, when actually most of the blame was due to their own sense of frustration owing to defeat in the Great War.

5. There is need for a wider understanding of the tragedy of Jewish life during the Middle Ages, and of all the forces that have combined to make the Jewish case the most tragic blot on human history. "To know all is to forgive all" may not be literally true, but a true perspective gained by a better understanding of where the Jewish shoe pinches would create sympathy where there is now indifference, if not hostility.

As the remarks in the former part of this paper show, much of the trouble has been due to human folly and blindness to the elementary principles of justice and fair play. But now Europe is the legatee of all the past centuries of repression and persecution of Jews and of all the anti-semitic propaganda that has poisoned the body politic for nearly a hundred years, and has to try to solve this problem, intensified many times over by the upheavals resulting from total war. It may be that the Jews will get full consideration in post-war planning, and one of the best ways to mitigate anti-semitism in the coming days will be to stress the need for this now. But, as Dr. James Parkes says, "There is no going back to the past. If human nature becomes to-morrow all that the idealists desire, there would still remain in the Jew question cultural, political and economic difficulties which would take the best intelligence to resolve. With the best will in the world, the progress is going to be slow" (*The Jew and His Neighbour*, Introduction, p. 8).

## ZIONISM.

The revelation of the deep-seated anti-semitism even in liberal France which was made by the "Dreyfus affair" (1895) convinced a typical assimilationist Jew from Vienna, Theodor Herzl, who was a journalist in Paris, that there was no possible solution of the Jewish problem apart from the provision of a national home. That was not the beginning of Zionism, but he undoubtedly made it begin to make history. At first Herzl was not committed to Palestine as the National Home for the Jews, but experience of trying to forward his scheme convinced him that only by making the Holy Land the objective could he rouse the enthusiasm which was necessary to make the proposition a matter of practical politics.

Zionism made an immediate appeal to the masses of impoverished Jews in Russia and Eastern Europe, whose economic and social conditions were unspeakably bad; but liberal Jews in Britain and America, and the large number of assimilationist Jews in Germany and elsewhere on the Continent, did not welcome it, and often definitely opposed it, as did also the Rabbis of Poland because of its political emphasis. The whole movement received a great help forward by the Balfour Declaration of 1917, promising the support of the Allied Nations in the reconstitution of the Jewish National Home in Palestine. In 1922 the Mandate for Palestine was granted to Britain, but at that time the subsequent happenings in Europe could not possibly be foreseen. Instead of a normal flow of Jews back to the Holy Land, which might have been carried through without undue opposition from the Arabs—though from its very inception they viewed the whole scheme with sullen disfavour—the fury of the Nazi attack upon the Jews sent tens of thousands of refugees fleeing from Germany, with Palestine as the first objective for many of them.

In 1933 there were 30,000 Jewish immigrants into Palestine, over 42,000 in 1934, and nearly 62,000 in 1935, with the result that the Arabs refused point-blank to try to make the plan of the Mandate work. In spite of a Royal Commission and two other Commissions sent to Palestine, and a Palestine Conference of Jews and Arabs held in London in February, 1939 (at which the Arabs refused to meet the Jews), no agreed solution could be found, and the Mandatory power had to impose its own settlement, which it did by the White Paper in May, 1939, knowing

that it would not be acceptable to either party. The last quota of 10,000 Jews to be admitted under the terms of the White Paper, *after which no more Jews are to enter without first securing the consent of the Arabs*, was completed in May, 1944, and there the *impasse* stands.

Thus the working of the Mandate has proved impossible without the consent of the Arabs. To have imposed it by force would have been contrary to the terms of the Mandate, but the outbreak of war in 1939 suspended all further consideration of the question for the present. But neither Arabs nor Jews have suspended judgment in the matter, and Arab intransigence and opposition have assumed a much graver significance through the calling of the Pan-Arab Conference in Cairo (1944). It seems that any attempt to re-open the question of the Jewish National Home in Palestine will be met by a solid Pan-Arabic resistance. If so, there seems little likelihood that the Mandatory power—certainly not Great Britain, with all her Mohammedan subjects throughout the Empire—would undertake to incur an Arab war by forcing the return of the Jews upon them. At a time when the need is far greater than it was in 1917, because of all that has happened in Europe, the only way out for the Jews is blocked by a solid stone wall! The recent Jewish attempt to stampede the issue by terrorism, in the assassination of Lord Moyne, the British Resident Minister in the Near East, has done untold harm to the cause of Zionism, though it has been repudiated on all hands by responsible leaders of Jewish thought.

If the Arabs agreed to a considerable measure of Jewish immigration into Palestine, that would not solve the problem of anti-semitism, though the surprising success of the Zionist effort there has had the much-needed effect of giving those Jews sharing in it, and in some measure world-wide Jewry, a new psychological attitude of hope and sense of freedom from frustration. What the re-action will be if Arab opposition is adamant when the war is over it is impossible to say. But even if the whole land of Palestine were put at their disposal, it might intensify Jew-hatred, especially in countries where there is an unduly large Jew population, for Palestine could only absorb some two or three millions at the most, and that over a period of several years. All the unwanted Jews of Europe, who couldn't be accommodated in Palestine, might find themselves in a worse plight than ever before.

Reference may be made to Biro-Bidjan, the recently-estab-

lished autonomous Jewish Republic in the Far East of Siberia, though actually this has no connection with anti-semitism. Under the Czarist régime, Jewish life had become impossibly narrow. After the Revolution it was recognised that the Jews were a separate people, and an attempt was made to establish Jewish agricultural settlements, some 6,000 Jewish families being settled in the Crimea and 40,000 in the Ukraine.

In 1928 the policy was changed, and Biro-Bidjan was set apart for further colonies. This new venture may have had a two-fold objective: (1) to counteract the illegal, but strong, Zionist propaganda amongst the Jews in European Russia, and (2) to develop the potentially rich country of Biro-Bidjan, and thus provide a valuable frontier guard in a thinly-populated area in case of war with Japan.

When Lord Marley visited the settlement in 1933, the total population was between 40,000 and 50,000, but only 10,000 of these were Jews. In that year a thousand new settlers arrived from America, Belgium, Latvia, Palestine and elsewhere, but 60 per cent. of these were disillusioned by the appalling difficulties, and returned westwards (cf. *Biro-Bidjan: An Eye-Witness Account of the New Home for the Jews*, Lord Marley).

In 1937 the population is reported to have risen to 60,000, 21,000 of whom were Jews, and of these about 14,000 were living in the one town of Biro-Bidjan. It must be borne in mind that the U.S.S.R. has always maintained that Biro-Bidjan is a purely Russian concern. As a result they were reluctant to grant visas to German or Polish Jews to settle there. They finally did grant an official immigration quota, but it is probable that only a mere handful of foreign Jews were able to get there before 1939. For this reason, Jews abroad are uninterested in it. Eugen Lyons (*Assignment in Utopia*) states that during the Trotsky purges (1935), the leaders of the Jewish autonomous region perished.

#### THE CURE.

There is only one real cure for anti-semitism, the Scriptural one. "A thing is never settled till it's settled right." "They gat not the land in possession by their own sword." It was given them by God, as the Scriptures plainly teach. But it was that they might serve His purposes, otherwise they would lose their tenure (cf. Deut. xxviii, 64; xxx, 18, etc.). The prophets repeatedly warned them of their departure from God, but all in

vain. Finally the day of reckoning came, as foretold by our Lord (*see* Luke xxi, 20, 24), and Israel was scattered to the ends of the earth.

But God is a covenant-keeping God (Mal. iii, 6). Paul asks the question, "Hath God cast off His people whom He foreknew?" and answers with the emphatic word, "Perish the thought" (Rom. xi, 1, 2). God's honour and sovereignty are involved in the carrying out of His covenant promises to Israel, and yet His character demands that His "chosen people" should also be a choice people. They thought their divine election guaranteed their security and supremacy among the nations; this led to racial pride and spiritual declension. As a substitute for spiritual fellowship with God they developed their own intense legalism, which made them a problem to themselves and an offence to the nations (Mal. ii, 8, 9).

As God is a moral being He will not use force to compel Israel's obedience. Also, having thrust them out for their sins, He cannot consistently reinstate them till they are adjusted to His will. Israel's original calling was to restore the world to God by providing a Saviour; their existence, therefore, is bound up with the problem of sin. But they needed the Saviour just as the rest of mankind, even though they were God's chosen people. It is this unwillingness "to submit themselves to the righteousness of God" that has characterised the Jewish nation from its inception until to-day, in which respect they are exactly like the rest of mankind (*cf.* Rom. iii, 9, 22, 23). But the Jews, by their divine election, were set forth as an example before the nations, hence their failure receives special attention from God. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities" (Amos iii, 2, 3).

But Israel will yet be brought to the place of obedience, in the same way as individuals are brought, by repentance and regeneration (*cf.* Zech. xii, 11-14, and Isaiah lxvi, 6-8). Just as Jacob became Israel at Peniel, when he met God face to face, so the Jews will become "Israelites indeed" at the revelation of the Lord from heaven. It is the Jacob nature that has caused "the controversy of Zion," God's long striving with Israel (Hebrew, *God striveth*), and has also made the Jews so hated by the nations. But when she is redeemed and restored to the divine favour, which involves her return to the Promised Land, those undesirable traits will vanish, and the nations will turn to her saying, "We will go with you, for we have

heard that God is with you" (Zech. viii, 23). Thus will anti-semitism fade away in mutual recognition and sympathy, as the Gentile nations accord to Israel her true place in God's wondrous plan for the redemption of mankind.

#### COMMUNICATIONS.

Sir WYNDHAM DEEDES, C.M.G., D.S.O., wrote thanking the Council for their courtesy in sending the paper on "Anti-semitism," and for inviting his comments.

Under the heading "Religion" the implication is "The Jews began it," and the part played by the Church, the Inquisition, etc., is passed over very lightly. The Jews treated early Christians as Christian Churches came to treat their own heretical sects. But on balance and over 2,000 years, and as between Judaism and Christianity, the latter, in my opinion, is more "sinning than sinned against." But not according to this article. Page 43, "the recent Jewish attempt to stampede the issue by terrorism . . ." Pray! state this otherwise—the Jewish community in Palestine and Jews the world over were as horrified at the crime as were Gentiles.

It was committed by two fanatical youths who belong to a relatively small group. As written in the article it looks as though the Jews, as a whole, had wittingly had recourse to this method. "Zionism" (page 42). This paragraph does not, of course, represent views which I myself hold. To me the treatment of the subject is quite inadequate and shows insufficient acquaintance with the *imponderabilia* of Zionism. As to "the cure" I agree that it is to be found in that sphere—of the spirit. But I should have stated it otherwise myself.

Dr. NORMAN BENTWICH, O.B.E., M.C., LL.D., wrote: I do not think that the cure proposed is very helpful, though the diagnosis of the disease is fair enough.

The statement about the religious cause of anti-semitism is one-sided. The writer would do well, I think, to study Dr. Parkes's big work on the Church and the Synagogue, which brings out that it was the persecution of the Church after Christianity became the religion of the Roman Empire that caused the hatred. What is

said on page 35 suggests that it was the Jews who first fostered hatred of Christianity.

Some statements on page 38 about the Jews from Russia are startlingly inaccurate; that they were backward and that they showed many traces of inferiority. Nor were there pogroms in Russia in 1881. The cause of the Jews' exodus was the enactment of restrictive laws.

On the historical side, the author might read Roth's history of the Jews.

The statements about Zionism are also often inaccurate. The Arab opposition to the Palestine Mandate was not the result of the large immigration after 1933. The serious outbreak of 1929 had little to do with immigration. It is not a fact that the last quota of 10,000 Jews to be admitted under the White Paper of 1939 was completed in May, 1944. The Government of Palestine has in fact granted two quotas since then and there is still a balance. It is mistaken to speak of a Jewish attempt to assassinate Lord Moyne. It was an attempt of two Jewish youths.

Mr. LESLIE I. MOSES wrote : The Rev. Charles Fisher in his paper takes no account of the curse that the Jewish leaders laid on their people. "His blood be on us and on our children."

This curse will not be lifted until that day when "they shall look unto Him whom they pierced."

Mr. E. H. BETTS, B.Sc., wrote : I should like to thank Mr. Fisher for his exceptionally fair-minded and well-balanced statement which has provided a sound basis for further thought and a stimulus to watchfulness. While recognising that there is no complete solution, Mr. Fisher points out to us certain palliatives, attention to which is surely a grave and solemn Christian responsibility. That our observance of these duties can only mitigate and not abolish the evil must be obvious if we reflect that it is largely the outcome of God's retributive ways and the fulfilment, whatever the human instruments and however evil the human passions deployed, of repeated solemn warnings (See, *e.g.*, Deut. xxviii, 15-68 and Matt. xvii, 25). Further, prophecies which are as yet unfulfilled and must

remain unfulfilled until the "time of the end" indicate very clearly that anti-semitism will not only continue its course but will work up to a great and terrible climax, when final deliverance will come in the person of Christ the Messiah. (See Dan. ix, 27; xii, 1-13; Zech, xiv, 2-3; Rev. xii.)

Dr. PAUL LEVERTOFF, D.D., Ph.D., wrote: There is one comment that I should wish to make to Mr. Fisher's paper. Christians who are suffering for their Christian faith cannot be anti-Jewish. They see the members of this people enduring shame and torture, often for wrong reasons—on trumped-up charges and vulgar accusations. They know that if the Jewish people were to accept Christ to-day, it would still be suffering: it would be suffering for the very things that Christians are prepared to suffer for. A Jewish writer, Maurice Samuel, rightly says that we shall never understand the maniacal world-wide seizure of anti-semitism unless we transpose the terms. It is of Christ that the Nazi-Fascists are afraid, it is in His omnipotence that they believe, it is Him that they are determined madly to obliterate. But the names of Christ and Christianity are too overwhelming, and the habit of submission to them too deeply ingrained after centuries and centuries of teaching. Therefore they must make their assault on those who were responsible for the birth and spread of Christianity. They must spit on the Jews as the "Christ killers" because they long to spit on the Jews as the "Christ-givers."

Mr. DOUGLAS DEWAR, B.A., wrote: Mr. Fisher has given us a most interesting paper, but it contains two statements which seem to be open to question. The first is his description of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* as "an egregious forgery." What evidence has he of this? By whom were these long-winded documents forged? When and where? What court has pronounced them to be a forgery? These questions are most important, in view of the influence these Protocols have exercised on the conduct of many people. Some years ago, two young men were prosecuted in a police court at Berne for selling a book embodying these Protocols on the ground that these were forgeries. The defence put in a list of twenty-five witnesses to prove the authenticity of these documents. The

court, however, refused to hear all except one. It then found that the defence had not proved the authenticity of the documents and therefore they must be forgeries, and one of the accused was fined 50 francs and the other 20. They appealed to the Chief Court at Berne and this court quashed the proceedings of the magistrate, acquitted the accused and held that the magistrate was not empowered to pronounce on the authenticity of the documents. Have there been any later proceedings which have not come to my notice ?

The second statement which I venture to think is quite wrong is that their inferiority complex frequently makes the Jews aggressive. The truth is that any aggressiveness shown by the Jews is due to a superiority complex. The Talmud, again and again, tells the Jews that they are immensely superior to all other peoples. Here are some examples. In *Sanhedrin* 58b we read : " He who strikes an Israelite acts as if he had boxed the ears of the Holy One (God)." This is based on Prov. xx, 25. In *Berakoth* 25b and *Sabbath* 150a we are told that the flesh of non-Israelites is as the flesh of asses and in consequence the command not to work on the sabbath does not apply to them. The statement that the Gentiles are as asses is based on Ezekiel xxiii, 20.

Seeing the views such as the above are expressed in their religious books it would be very strange if the less tactful Jews did not often behave in such a way as to rouse anti-Jewish feelings among those with whom they come into contact.

Mr. STANLEY B. JAMES wrote : The instructive paper by the Rev. Charles Fisher on anti-semitism does not, in my opinion, go far enough. Opposition to anti-semitism is merely that of one negative to another. We must be more positive. There is need for something which might be called pro-semitism. Such a movement would take two forms.

1. In our Christianity we must show ourselves more Jewish than the Jews. The Primitive Church regarded itself as the true Israel. In Christ it saw the flowering of the Hebrew tradition, the fulfilment of Jewish hopes. Even after Pentecost, Christians continued to worship in the Temple. Severance from the synagogue was a much slower process than has been supposed. Though at Pisidian Antioch

St. Paul declared that henceforth he would turn to the Gentiles, it is on record that subsequently to this, at Iconium, Thessalonica, Corinth and Ephesus, he continued his habit of going first to the synagogue. It is even said explicitly (Acts, xvii, 2) that this was his custom. He regarded his Gentile converts as grafted into the stock of Israel.

Later, this close connection waned. The influence of the West increased and that of the Orient declined. This lessening of the Hebraic influence in Christianity led to a loss of dynamism. The ethical emphasis was partly obscured. How serious had been the loss thus suffered was seen at the time of the Renaissance. Contemporary Christianity must recover its Hebraic heritage, as that heritage is revealed in the New Testament. The challenge of the Nordic Myth, repudiating Christianity's Jewish origin, must be taken up.

2. We must realise that the Jew, so far from being cast off, has reserved for him a place in the Church of his Messiah corresponding to the promises made to his forefathers. When, through the grace of God and an experience of suffering without parallel in the history of the world, he accepts the Pauline Gospel, it will be found that his natural gifts and the deepening of his spirituality effected by that experience have qualified him for leadership. The truth that "the first shall be last and the last first," which, in its earlier application, relegated him to the tail of the procession, will, in the days to come, justify his priority.

There would seem to be some close connection between the return of Israel and the ushering in of Christianity's last, triumphant phase. Bossuet declared that we have the right to believe that "it will not be with the end of the world, but rather with the most astonishing splendour of the world that the conversion of the Jews will coincide." That scarcely goes beyond what the words of St. Paul himself (Romans xi, 12) suggest.

Acceptance of this unpalatable view may not be easy. But the workings of Divine Providence are always an affront to human and racial pride. One thing is certain: if we are compelled to accept this forecast of Jewish destiny, we must not only abandon all anti-semitism but we must give the Jew a leading place in the drama of human redemption.

Sir EDWARD SPEARS, K.B.E., C.B., M.C., M.P., wrote: The historical outline is valuable. I have felt for a long time that anti-semitism has been fanned by Zionism. In fact political Zionism as it is manifested in Palestine to-day preaches very much the same doctrines as Hitler. It raises the question, most painful to Jews themselves, of whether Judaism is a religion or a race. This at once establishes a difference between assimilated and non-assimilated Jews. The assimilated Jew feels himself a member of the country of his adoption. The un-assimilated Jew, immigrant or the son of an immigrant, driven out by persecution, sees salvation in a separate Jewish State. It seems to me, therefore, that the question of Zionism, which stimulates anti-semitism, must be solved by the Jews themselves. Either they are a religion and should aim at being assimilated by the countries of their adoption or they are a separate race in search of a country. In the latter case Palestine cannot solve their problem since it could not absorb all the Jews in the world and the Jews who did not settle in Palestine would be permanent aliens in the countries of their adoption. They would be bound to be looked upon as a separate class of citizen and sooner or later the demand for their expulsion would be overwhelming, *e.g.*, in times of economic crisis, during wars and threats of wars, etc. As for Zionism itself it is either a religious question or a political one. If it is a political one, it is a question of deciding whether it is expedient to create a Jewish nation. It is hardly possible to justify Zionism on both political and religious grounds at one and the same time.

If a Jewish Palestine is claimed on religious grounds several difficult questions arise.

I understand that many learned divines hold that according to the Scriptures themselves the Jews forfeited their claim to Palestine and this seems to be the implication of your paper.

If nations can claim land on religious rather than political grounds this implies a completely new political structure. If the Jewish claim to Palestine is upheld by some, those who do so must be prepared to confine the claim of the Jews to the land they originally held. It is a historical fact that the Philistines, Canaanites and others were established in Palestine long before the Jews, remained there during the time the Jews occupied the highlands of the country

and long afterwards, and that the Arabs of Palestine to-day are the descendants of those early inhabitants who have adopted the Arabic language and the Moslem or Christian religions. It is interesting to note that the Jews in fact only occupied the coastal province and the plain of Esdraelon for seventy-two years, and that during the whole of the rest of the time that the Jews were in Palestine before the dispersal, these provinces remained in the occupation of the indigenous inhabitants.

If the claim of the Jews to Palestine is not urged on religious and historical grounds—and indeed I cannot see how a nation can claim to return to the land of its origin after a lapse of two thousand years without establishing a precedent which could disrupt all the countries of the world—then the claim of the Jews must be based on humanitarian grounds. A land must be found for the homeless Jews. If this is the ground on which Zionism is defended, then there is no reason in justice and equity why the Arabs alone should provide a land for the Jews. I think I am right in saying that the mass of emigrant Jews are descendants of early converts in Russia itself. On these grounds, co-operation by Russia might be invited. In this extremely difficult and seemingly insoluble problem there is one glimmer of hope. If order is re-established in Europe, and conditions are not too difficult there, it may be possible that a considerable proportion of the European Jews now in Palestine will seek to return to the lands of their birth. In any case pressure of immigration may be relaxed. This, of course, will not be the case if conditions in central Europe are abominable; but presupposing reasonable conditions in Europe, I suggest that facilities should be given to the Jews in Palestine to establish a kind of Vatican City there, and that an effort should be made on the lines of the valuable suggestion contained in the paper that Jews and Gentiles should look into and eliminate where possible causes of local friction wherever there are Jewish communities. I think also that encouragement should be given to the Jewish Fellowship which looks upon Judaism as a religion and not as a political movement. An effort should be made to draw a line between the assimilated Jews, *i.e.*, people not prepared to give up their adopted nationality under any consideration, and those who definitely refuse to be assimilated. The ideal would be to provide a sufficiently wide region somewhere in

the world where un-assimilated Jews might settle. It is probable that there would be a constant flow from this centre once it was established towards those other centres where assimilated Jews were settled and the latter could absorb into their own community Jews who had been filtered through this half-way house.

The above are merely thoughts that occur on reading the paper, and I do not suggest that they should provide more than a basis for discussion for those who have gone into the subject more deeply than I have. I do not pose as an expert on the subject and am only interested in it in so far as it affects the British position in the Middle East. One thing is quite certain, and that is, that under no circumstances whatever will the Arabs consent to being a numerical minority in Palestine, and that all the Arab States will oppose such a possibility by force if need be.

Dr. H. S. Curr, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D., wrote: Mr. Fisher has placed the Institute under a deep debt of gratitude by his discussion of a problem which seems at times to be almost insoluble. The outline of its history is of great interest, for, although the hand of the past is always on the present in every direction, the principle applies with special force to the Jewish question.

Insufficient attention is paid to the fact that antipathy to the Jewish people is not confined by any manner of means to nations which are professedly Christians. Mr. Fisher refers to the dislike shown towards them by Arabs, for example. That, of course, is largely due to the Zionist policy, as far as Palestine is concerned, but in other parts of the Arab world, a very large and influential section of Semitism, a certain unfriendliness probably exists, although it may not find expression in active opposition. That may be somewhat conjectural, but we are on sure ground when we turn to consider the attitude of the Roman Empire in general towards the seed of Abraham before its emperor professed Christianity.

One of the Roman satirists described the ghetto of the metropolis as hating all, and being hated by all. The expulsion of Jews by Claudius from Rome, mentioned in Acts xviii, 2, is said to have been due to their dissensions, but it may be an index of dislike as well.

In the famous episode in which Gallio figures (Acts xviii, 12-17), the maltreatment of Sosthenes, the ruler of the synagogue, seems definitely to prove that the local community of Jews was decidedly unpopular. "The bystanders, Gentiles, ever ready to take advantage of the despised or hated Jew, took their cue from Gallio's resentment at their over-reaching attempt, and wreaked a sort of wild justice upon their leader Sosthenes, with Gallio's connivance—he feeling that the Jew richly deserved the beating" (J. Vernon Bartlet. *The Acts Century Bible* p. 308).

Such instances of bad feeling require explanation and consideration in the investigation of this perplexing question.

Whatever be its difficulties, the spirit in which that ought to be approached, is described in the classic words of a writer who was proud to describe himself as an Hebrew of the Hebrews. "For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh : who are Israelites ; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises ; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, Who is over all, God blessed for ever.—Amen."

Mr. W. E. LESLIE wrote : The information given concerning special Jewish settlements in the U.S.S.R. is interesting. But the numbers living in them must be but a small minority of the Jews in the whole of the U.S.S.R. territory. Under the old regime these Jews suffered persecution, to-day, as far as one can gather, they do not. Is this due to the change in the economic system, or to the lessened influence of the Greek Orthodox Church ? If anti-semitism has practically disappeared from an area where it was very prevalent it should be possible to draw helpful lessons from the facts.

#### AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I agree with Sir Wyndham Deedes's conclusion that "on balance and over 2,000 years, and as between Judaism and Christianity, the latter in my opinion, is more 'sinning than sinned against.'" Limitation of space may be pleaded for not treating this aspect of

the subject in greater detail, but I certainly did not wish to convey the impression which Sir Wyndham seems to have drawn.

While my remark about "the recent Jewish attempt to stam pede the issue by terrorism" is a rather careless one, it expresses what the man in the street thought of it. "Jews" in the mass are held responsible for the actions of certain Jews. I stated immediately afterwards that the act of terrorism "has been repudiated on all hands by responsible leaders of Jewish thought." Actually, however, Jews were more sympathetic to the terrorism than he allows.

Dr. Bentwich is highly inaccurate in his criticism.

(1) Parkes clearly brings out that the roots of the trouble precede the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the Empire.

(2) While my statement about Russian Jews may not be true from the point of view of strictly Jewish culture, it is idle to deny its truth from the point of view of West European culture.

(3) He says, "Neither were there pogroms in Russia in 1881," and suggests that "On the historical side the author might read Roth's History of the Jews." May I quote from Roth ("A Short History of the Jewish People," p. 384, seq., 1943 edition) ?

"On Wednesday, 27th April, 1881, a dispute about the Blood Accusation in a tavern at Elisavetgrad, in the government of Kherson, served as the pretext for the outbreak of a riot. . . . The example spread like wildfire, being followed on an especially large scale at Kiev (8th to 9th May), and Odessa (15th to 19th May). By the autumn, outbreaks had occurred at no fewer than one hundred and sixty places in South Russia. At Christmas another series began at Warsaw. . . . In May, 1882, there were promulgated the infamous 'May Laws,' by which the Jews were excluded from all villages and rural centres even in the Pale of Settlement, outside Poland proper."

Dr. Bentwich's statements about Palestine are accurate. The high rate of Jewish immigration increased, but did not cause, Arab opposition. I am glad to be corrected about the further quota arrangements after what was stated to be the Government plan in the White Paper.

Mr. Moser : There is need to distinguish between the judicial blindness of Israel, of which the crucifixion was the culminating

act (so far), and the curse that the Jewish leaders laid on their people. God's righteous judgment visits "the sins of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation" only. Many people, however, hold modern Jews responsible for the death of Jesus Christ, and this idea is still a factor in anti-semitism.

It is their moral blindness, due to continuing opposition to God's will, which will be removed at the return of the Lord Jesus, when "they shall look unto Him whom they pierced."

There is nothing in the way of criticism in Mr. Betts's comments, but I would like to add one word about "the mystery of Israel." It seems that Israel in dispersion is serving a double purpose in the divine moral government of this world. Their dispersion, according to the clear teaching of Scripture, is a judgment upon them for their disobedience to the revealed will of God, and continues as a chastisement to bring them at last to acknowledge their sin. But the presence of "the Chosen People" amongst the nations is a serious and severe test to the Gentile nations, and they have come badly out of that test. The Jewish Question is actually the Problem of Sin in this world, and the moral government of God robs both Jew and Gentile nations of rest "till they find rest in Him."

Space unfortunately makes it quite impossible to deal adequately with Mr. Dewar's statements about *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. I do not know that anyone has ever seriously challenged Philip Graves' proofs that they are for the most part borrowed from Maurice Joly's *Dialogue aux Enfers*. So much so is this the case that one of the anti-semitic experts at the Berne trial (Mr. Dewar's statements here are far from accurate) tried to prove that Maurice Joly was a Jew; and the chief expert, Lieutenant-Colonel Fleischauer said, "Whether the *Protocols* have been copied or not is not at all important (*sic*!); what is important is the history of the last 150 years, and they alone decide upon the question of forgery." But even in Tsarist Russia it was realized that they were a forgery, and the Tsar himself forbade their use in the notorious Bailiss ritual-murder trial on this very ground.

It is strange that he should think it necessary to cast doubt on their inferiority complex, for it is blatantly obvious to all who have closer dealings with them. There is not much point in judging the modern Jew by remarks made between 250 and 800 A.D. It is a

well-known psychological fact that an inferiority complex often shows itself in aggressiveness.

I agree with much that Mr. James says. The fact that Paul was himself a Jew, "a Hebrew of the Hebrews" and a Pharisee, is sufficient to explain his constant return to the synagogue. He had a passionate love for his own nation (*cf.* Rom. ix, 1-5; x, 1-3).

How could Christianity ever have become a universal religion while it was wedded to the Law, as so much of Jewish Christianity was. It was therefore, necessary, for the dominating position of Jerusalem and its identification with the Law to be set aside. Such was the amazing progress of the Gospel amongst Jews after Pentecost, that when the break-up of the nation came, Christianity was able to stand upon its own feet and "go into all the world." Yet the great principles of divine grace which preceded the law, and were enshrined in it, cannot be discarded except at the peril of vital Christianity.

There seems to be no ground for the assumption that the Hebrew Christian is generally a leader. While it is gloriously true that some out of Israel have become mighty in proclaiming the Gospel, it is still a fact, true of Jews as of Gentiles, that "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty . . . are called."

Sir Edward Spears's over-simplification of "either . . . or" (used twice over) does not meet the case. He says that the Jews are *either* a religion *or* a race. The fact is they are both! The very basis of their national existence is a religious one! Again, his distinctions between assimilated and un-assimilated Jews breaks down. In Germany the assimilated Jews suffered just the same as un-assimilated Jews, for Hitler's attack was upon them racially, not religiously. In view of the breakdown of the foremost attempt at assimilation, that in Germany, the Jews are being compelled to re-think their whole position over again.

Further, Sir Edward overlooks the fact that the narrow slip of land called Palestine is by no means the whole of the Promised Land, which stretches from the river of Egypt to the great river, the Euphrates. It is calculated that there is room for a nation of sixty millions in this area. When "the desert shall rejoice and blossom as a rose" much of what is now desert will become rich agricultural land, providing support for the utmost

development numerically that Jewish nationalists can visualise.

While it is true that "many learned divines hold that according to the Scriptures themselves the Jews forfeited their claim to Palestine," it still remains a fact that the Bible is the most misleading book in existence if the future of Israel is not bound up with their return to the Promised Land. The return of the Lord Jesus introduces "the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began" (Acts iii, 19-21), one of which promises is "He that scattered Israel will gather him" (Jer. xxxi, 10).

Sir Edward's concluding remark about Arab intransigence raises an interesting point. When Jacob was returning to Palestine at God's bidding, after he had run away from the anger of his brother, he was full of fear about meeting Esau. But that night Jacob "had an interview with God," and his name was changed from Jacob to Israel, and he became "a prince with God." When Jacob got right with God the trouble over Esau vanished, for Esau packed up his goods and left the whole land to Jacob! May it not be so again, when at long last the Jews become reconciled to God? As David Baron pithily suggests, "The whole nation shall have the whole of the land when God has the whole of their heart." Sir Edward suggests that my paper implies that I agree that the Jews have forfeited their claim to Palestine. I am glad to have the opportunity of making my position clear about this. My paper should have ended thus: "But when she (Israel) is redeemed and restored to the divine favour, which involves her return to the Promised Land, those undesirable traits will vanish," etc. It will be so amplified in the final reproduction.

Mr. Leslie raises a most interesting and valuable point. There are various reasons for the lack of anti-semitism in the U.S.S.R. Here are a few.

(1) As Lenin tried to create a confederation of peoples among whom the Russians would only be the predominant partner, the anti-foreign element dropped away.

(2) The Communists had already got a scape-goat—the capitalist, the fascist—so he did not need the Jew!

(3) The religious motive fell away; if the Jew was persecuted for his religion, the Christian was even more.

(4) The Jew had been economically ruined by the May Laws and the 1914 war, so the economic motive largely vanished.

It is true that where religion plays a lessening part in the life of the community there is a tendency for anti-semitism to become less pronounced, but the religious aspect of the trouble is only one part. It was the development of a virile paganism in Germany which made the clash with the Jews so bitter. But whether the Jews try by assimilation to discard their religious background, or the Gentile nations lapse into religious indifference, whatever alleviation of anti-semitism comes in this way is bought at too high a price! "A thing is never settled, till it is settled right," and behind the problem of anti-semitism is the problem of sin.