

The Jews' "Defenders" Make a Poor Showing

They Fail in Frankness; Billy Sunday an Example; the Hearst-Bernstein Botch; the Gravity of a Jewish-Negro Alliance

THE Jews are most unfortunate in their "defenders." Perhaps the initial misfortune is that the Jewish mind has reverted with automatic directness to the idea of "defense," and not to frank self-criticism and correction. The bankruptcy of Jewish leadership has never been so apparent as in this situation which only calls for an examination and a repudiation of that which brings shame upon the Jewish name. But had such examination and repudiation been made by the leaders, it would have involved confession of the inadequacy and incompetency of their leadership, and in the present state of affairs, when their power is already swaying perilously, they dare not make this confession.

It is now nearly a year since THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT, desirous of bringing into wholesome and sanitary public discussion a question which was festering in silence and suspicion, began a series of studies of the Jewish Question. The question of the motive which inspired these studies has received various treatment. It is a striking note in all the Jewish attempts at explanation, that these studies are in retaliation for some wrong or injury committed by a Jew. It must be rather humiliating to be compelled to postulate wrongdoing on the part of one's race to account for a study of that race. However, THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT is able to defend the Jewish name in this particular and to say most plainly that the present series of studies are not in retaliation for the misdeed of any Jew, and to add, if need be, that they have not in view the injury of any Jew, great or small, but solely the prevention of further injury to the world through the vast misuse by Jewish leaders of the power that rests in their hands.

In all that year of discussion, Jewish leaders have been making a "defense" which even the Jewish people have felt was far beside the point. Rabbis, publicists, political and racial leaders have all arisen and shouted and called names, but have carefully avoided the questions at issue. There have been "challenges," all of which have been strategic attempts to stop the discussion and bury it in the smoke of "investigations" which could easily be controlled. Personal abusiveness has been resorted to, not to mention lurid and ludicrous falsehoods—but never a focus on a fact, never the choice of a concrete situation, and a candid examination of that.

Jews Disgusted With Sham Defense

ALL these activities have had two purposes in mind, as those who understand Jewish modes of procedure have long since seen; first, to befog the issue with irrelevant matter; second, to divert the studies from the main-line to some side line which runs off into a morass. There will be plenty of time to explore the side lines, but the wiser element of the Jews will meet the question on the main line. The refusal of the astronomer to debate the proposition that the moon is made of green cheese, would hardly be received as proof of his fear to meet the facts of his science.

The first real Jewish "defense" was a counsel to violence, for boycott is of the essence of violence—a commercial "pogrom," to use a word the safe and comfortable Jews of America like to employ. This counsel of violence came from the leaders, of course, and was stimulated by secret meetings where every effort was made to rouse the passions of the Jews to unlawful activity. We stress the word *unlawful*, because the Jewish leaders counseled a course which they claim in the courts to be unlawful when used against themselves. How, when and where this was done does not matter in this connection. The point is that in following this desperate line the Jewish leaders confessed their utter incompetency and un-Americanism. Had they been plain men of common sense they would not only have seen the lawlessness of their course but its impossibility as well. But why expect blind leaders to be wise? Who can say that this frenzy of incompetence may not be one of the influences that shall open the eyes of the Jewish masses to the folly of their leadership?

The extent to which this idea of violence "caught on" among the Jewish people can be gathered from a study of several thousands of communities throughout the United States. There is no doubt that the Jewish attitude of "Beware!" toward the non-Jews is still strong in a few quarters, but there is also no doubt that it is rapidly disappearing. The Jewish individual is not a fool, and he is not misled by the folly of his so-called leaders nor by the antics of those "Gentile fronts" who find the Jewish "defense" rather profitable in one way or another. Indeed, some of the most refreshing expressions that have come to THE DEAR-

BORN INDEPENDENT are from Jews who shrewdly estimate the qualities of the Jewish "defense." These sound-headed Jews clearly see that the best defense is to take the situation as it actually is, analyze it, act frankly upon their findings, and seek to remove those mistaken policies and qualities which are always turning up to plague the Jewish people.

In their non-Jewish "defenders" the Jews have had a precious handful. As friends of the Jews they may be just as desirable as any other friends, but as "defenders" their main service is to divert attention for a moment. Then the general situation of the Question closes over them and they are forgotten. Jewish humor must have had numerous occasions to observe how well justified is the Protocols' estimate of non-Jewish ability in the light of the intellectual character of non-Jews' "defense" of the Jews.

Billy Sunday and His "Jew Sermon"

BILLY SUNDAY, for example, is one of these Jewish "defenders." He is not at all clear what he is defending them from, but he is defending them just the same. In the sermon list which Mr. Sunday dispenses during each evangelistic engagement there is what is known as "the Jew Sermon." Men who have been connected with the promotion of his campaigns say that this "Jew Sermon" is depended on to enlist a portion of the financial support which might not otherwise be obtainable in defraying the necessarily heavy expenses of a Billy Sunday campaign. Jewish contributors are more easily approached through the introduction of "the Jew Sermon." It is a familiar compilation of complimentary statements, all of which have been made in this series, such as the fact that Jews sailed with Christopher Columbus to discover America, Jews are never seen in the poorhouses, and so on.

It recites the statement of which Jewish writers delight to remind Christians, namely, that Christ was a Jew. The tense is emphasized because Mr. Sunday's utterance is capable of interpretation in the present tense. "If ever you walk the streets of glory, and are kept out of hell, it will be because of your repentance and faith in the shed blood of a Jew." This is questionable theology, to say the least, for it is the faith of the Christian church that Christ was and is the Son of God. Nevertheless, the statement as made by Sunday is quite in harmony with the Jewish view of the case. Few things are more nauseous and reprehensible than this senile acceptance of the statement that "your god is a Jew." "We gave you your god, now we'll give you your government." It is very much as if the American people after execrating the assassin of McKinley should journey to Africa and find that Czolgosz had become the god of the Africans. It would give the American a sense of superiority to think that an outcast of his people had become the god of another race.

Well, that does not matter either. Mr. Sunday speaks about "my friend, Nathan Straus." He says, "You pay tribute to the Jew for the suit you have on and the dress you wear; for they control the tailoring and the custom-made business of the United States. There is not a cabinet in Europe that hasn't had Jews in its membership. Some of the shrewdest financiers in the world are Jews. It was really the banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Company, of New York, that refused to loan Japan the money to prosecute the war, that really hastened peace. Isabella had to hock her jewels to pay for Columbus' voyage, and she hocked them to a Jew. And the Jew is just as distinctively a Jew today as he was 6,000 years ago. All hail, the Jews!"

Mr. Sunday Didn't Know—But

THIS is great "defense." Everyone knows what it is, a rehash of Madison C. Peter's little book. But it doesn't touch the case. Each statement Sunday makes contains the vital essence of criticism, but he doesn't know it.

Mr. Sunday has not read "The International Jew." More than that, he has not even read his textbook, the Bible. Dollars to doughnuts he cannot tell offhand the difference between Judah and Israel, or he would stop confusing them. And it is doubtful if he can tell where the Jewish Christ found his first disciples, among the Jews of Judea, or the non-Jewish Israelites of the north country. Mr. Sunday, excellent and useful as he is in certain fields, is simply not master of his subject, and what is worse, he has not tried to be.

That he speaks without knowledge when he attempts to characterize the studies which have appeared in

THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT is shown by the following telegrams:

"William A. Sunday, Jan. 11, 1921.
"Fairmount, West Virginia.

"We have read your comment as carried by the International News Service, of January 7, on Jewish series now appearing in THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT.

"Will you be so good as to inform us whether you have read any one of the forty or more articles which have appeared, and if so, which one, and if more than one, how many? Thanking you for telegraphic reply at our expense.

"The Dearborn Publishing Company."

Here is Mr. Sunday's reply:

"Dearborn Publishing Co., Jan. 11, 1921.
"Dearborn, Mich.

"Have read frequent excerpts from Jewish series printed in other papers and comments by Metropolitan Press. I had no reason to question the correctness of these reports. The part with which I especially disagreed was the statement that the Jews were aiming at control of the important activities of the country. I have not found the slightest evidence of the existence of such a condition.

"W. A. Sunday."

Mr. Sunday did not read any "excerpts" from these articles in any "other papers" up to January 11. None was printed. Up to that time the newspapers printed Jewish propaganda only, and Jewish propaganda is the only knowledge Mr. Sunday has of the Jewish Question. The part with which Mr. Sunday especially disagreed was, he says, the statement that the Jews are aiming at control of the important activities of the country. It would be difficult if not impossible to arrive at an understanding of how Mr. Sunday could especially disagree with what was not said. If he had known, he would have seen that it was not "aiming at control" which was stated, but *actual control* which was shown. And as for Mr. Sunday's failure to find evidence of such a condition, there is plenty of evidence in his own sermon on the Jews. He possibly does not consider it as evidence because he read it in a newspaper and did not gather it by direct observation, but he considers it good enough for his sermon.

Mr. Bernstein Plus Hearst Type

AS A "defender," Mr. Sunday occupies the position of one who has not studied his case. Whether he would study it or not, we have not asked him. From his own standpoint, his sermon to the Jews is an unfaithful and halting piece of evangelism. Obviously he feared to go sled-length in his effort to convert the Jews—that would be to "insult" them; he therefore remains in the region of half-truths and stereotyped praises and veers from his stated purpose as soon as he has disposed of his bouquets.

Mr. Sunday, by the way, is not the only minister who confessed by telegraph that he spoke without knowing whereof he spoke. However, the great majority of them proceeded at once to look into the Question for themselves, and the result has been confirmatory of most of the statements made in this series. As a matter of fact, the Bible is the best textbook from which to begin the study of the Jewish Question.

The "defense" of the Jews has been exceedingly stupid not only because a part of it has been made in utter ignorance of what the charge was (as if one should defend a man for murder who is only charged with speeding), but also because of the assumption on the part of some of the defenders that the question could be settled by personalities. Thus far this resort to personalities has been taken exclusively by the Jewish side, though not for lack of material on the other. On that line too there would be no hesitancy to try conclusions, but there are a few Jews at least who appreciate the forbearance in that respect which has been shown.

The chief weakness of the "defense" which resorts to personalities is that it settles nothing. If all this were mere say-so, dependent for acceptance upon the credibility of certain witnesses, an attack on personalities might serve to break down the basis of belief. But if the case consists merely in bringing to light certain facts which anybody can see for himself by the mere act of looking, then the matter of personality has