

Common Sense

: **CONTENTS** :

Common Sense	
by <i>C. H. S. Runge</i>	3
'n Tragiese Vraagstuk	
deur <i>Prof. A. van Selms</i>	4
Libel of Groups	
<i>Holland and France</i>	5
The Problem of Minorities	
by <i>G. Saron</i>	6
Jews and Communism	
<i>Some Facts</i>	8
A Campaign for Goodwill	
<i>Some Notes on an Organisation in U.S.A.</i>	10
Human — but without Passports	
by <i>Dr. H. Sonnabend</i>	11
Notes on Books.....	12
Reports.....	12

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

VOL. I NO. 1

JULY 1939

PRICE 4d.

Common Sense

Editorial Board:

C. J. CLAASSEN	C. H. S. RUNGE
A. W. EATON	G. SARON
R. F. A. HOERNLÉ	H. SONNABEND

"Common Sense" is published monthly by the
Society of Jews and Christians, Johannesburg.

Subscription:

The subscription to *Common Sense* is 3/- per annum to members (or 3d. per copy); and 4/- per annum to non-members (or 4d. per copy). Post free.

Copies may be ordered from the Secretaries, P.O. Box 7791, Johannesburg, as well as from the Secretaries of Affiliated Societies in other centres of the Union.

THE SOCIETY OF JEWS AND CHRISTIANS.

PRESIDENT:

The Rev. Fr. C. H. S. Runge, C.R.

VICE-PRESIDENTS:

The Rt. Rev. G. H. Clayton (Bishop of Johannesburg).	*Adv. M. Franks, K.C.
The Rev. A. S. Clegg.	Sir Robert Kotze.
	Chief Rabbi Dr. J. L. Landau.

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL:

The Rev. N. Bennet.	Mr. Cecil Lyons.
Mr. Leslie Blackwell, K.C., M.P.	Prof. I. D. MacCrone.
Mr. H. Britten.	The Rev. B. J. Marais.
*Adv. C. J. Claassen.	Mrs. S. G. Millin.
*The Rev. A. W. Eaton.	*Mrs. A. Pratt Nickels.
Prof. S. H. Frankel.	The Rt. Rev. W. Parker (Bishop of Pretoria).
*The Rev. Dr. J. Bruce Gardiner.	Mr. S. Raphaely.
Dr. H. Gluckman, M.P.	*The Rev. Fr. C. H. S. Runge, C.R.
*Prof. J. L. Gray.	*Mr. G. Saron.
Sen. the Hon. G. Hartog.	*The Rev. Dr. A. T. Shrock.
Rabbi W. Hirsch.	Dr. H. O. Simon.
*Prof. R. F. A. Hoernlé.	*Adv. Bertha Solomon, M.P.
Mr. A. S. Holland.	*Dr. H. Sonnabend.
*Adv. G. F. de Vos Hugo.	*The Rev. Dr. J. Dexter Taylor.
Sen. the Hon. J. D. Rheinallt Jones.	*Mr. J. Ramsay Thomson.
*Mr. M. Kentridge, M.P.	Adv. H. J. B. Vieyra.
*Mrs. N. Levine.	*Mr. W. J. de Vries.
	*Rabbi M. C. Weiler.

* THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

The Executive Committee consists of all those against whose names an asterisk has been placed.

Membership:

Membership subscription to the Society of Jews and Christians is 2/6 per annum.

Full particulars and membership forms may be obtained from the Secretaries of the Johannesburg Society or Affiliated Societies.

Membership of the Society of Jews and Christians is open to all persons, whatever their religious or political affiliations, who are in sympathy with its objects.

Publications:

The following publications have been issued by the Society:—

PAMPHLETS:

- No. 1 — *Jews and Christians*, by Dr. Maude Royden.
- No. 2 — *Some Facts about the Society*, with an address by the Hon. J. H. Hofmeyr, M.P.
- No. 3 — *The Problem of Race*, by Prof. R.F.A. Hoernlé.
- No. 4 — *A Jewish Rabbi Appeals to the Christian Conscience*, by Rabbi W. Hirsch.
- No. 5 — *The Jew in the Economic Life of South Africa*, by Prof. J. L. Gray.

All these publications are issued in both English and Afrikaans and may be obtained on application to the Honorary Secretaries, P.O. Box 7791, Johannesburg.

TO OUR READERS

COMMON SENSE is a new venture, and we are conscious that its first issue has many shortcomings. We believe, however, that a monthly of this character can serve a very useful function in the South African scene, and have been encouraged to launch it in the hope that there are many men and women of goodwill who will welcome its appearance and be glad to co-operate as contributors or readers.

We shall gladly welcome articles or comments from

the readers of *COMMON SENSE*, and are especially interested in obtaining information on what is being done in all parts of South Africa to combat prejudice and racialism and to further common sense and goodwill. All correspondence should be addressed to the Editors, P.O. Box 7791, Johannesburg.

May we ask all our readers who are interested in *COMMON SENSE* to send in their subscriptions without delay and to show the journal to their friends?

THE EDITORS.

Common Sense

● By C. H. S. RUNGE

President, Society of
Jews and Christians.

IN the sense in which it is used by countless writers and speakers and by our newspapers to-day, the word "ideology" is unknown to the Oxford Dictionary. In the meaning nearest to its current one, it appears to owe its origin to Napoleon I, who characterised with contempt all crazy and unpractical theorising as mere "ideology." We should perhaps do well to remember the ancestry of the word when we follow current usage and so describe the competing "ideologies" of our day. For, indeed, we are in danger of being ruled by words, phrases, names and "slogans," and of losing the will and the power to examine dispassionately the views and projects that are advanced on this side and on that. Our emotional reactions to words — Nazism, Communism, Democracy, and, indeed, Jew, Christian, Segregation, British Empire, League of Nations — are no doubt a factor in the creation of social and political problems, but they ought not to inhibit all attempts to think dispassionately about them.

To attempt to combat irrational prejudice in one sphere is the purpose for which, two years ago, there was founded in Johannesburg the Society of Jews and Christians. The Society has a good deal of work to its credit. Discussions, public and private, have been held, members have addressed many meetings of other societies, pamphlets have been published, similar societies have been formed in the principal centres of the Union. The Executive of the Society in Johannesburg has now decided to sponsor a periodical, of which this is the first number.

We have ventured to call it *Common Sense*, in the belief that there is such a thing as a natural endowment of intelligence common to human beings as human, by which they can examine and judge all "ideologies." Common Sense transcends

all distinctions of nationality, race, colour, class: it unites instead of dividing.

To attempt to find common ground in reason, to agree, even if sometimes it may be to agree to differ, to seek to harmonise purposes which appear at first sight to be diametrically opposed, may seem in these days a fantastic project. It requires a fundamental faith in human reason and human reasonableness which is sadly to seek in most of the discussions of current problems. That there *are* problems no one would be so foolish as to deny. The Society of Jews and Christians enshrines in its Constitution due recognition that there are factors which lead to friction between Jews and non-Jews. It is vain to pretend that age-long and obstinate conflicts can be resolved by goodwill alone. They need to be analysed, understood, explained. Reason must be brought to bear upon them before any solution is possible. But, we claim, there is a natural common sense of mankind to which sound reasoning appeals, and if that can be brought to bear upon our problems their solution will at least be brought a stage nearer.

The spirit, then, of this publication is the same as that of our Society, but its purpose is wider. Uneasy relations between Jews and non-Jews form only one of the problems of our time and of our country. There are others equally urgent, racial, political, economic. All tend to be confused and obscured by unthinking prejudice and by fastening labels of strong emotional colour to those with whom we disagree. Is it an empty dream that we can contribute something towards mitigating the stresses and distresses of this warlike but war-weary generation by trying to bring to bear upon them the light of that which distinguishes man from the brute creation — common reason, Common Sense?

'n Tragiese Vraagstuk

● Uit 'n Lesing deur PROF. A. VAN SELMS

„DIT is slegs naïwiteit om te dink dat daar vir iedere vraagstuk in die wêreld 'n oplossing is. Daar is onoplosbare vraagstukke en dit is juis wat ons die tragiese in die wêreld noem. Die Jodedom is 'n tragiese figuur en ek kan geen onmiddellike oplossing daarvoor kry nie,” het dr. A. van Selms, van die Teologiese Fakulteit van die Universiteit Pretoria, verklaar in 'n boeiende lesing oor die Jode-vraagstuk voor die Teologiese Vereniging Van der Hoff aan die Universiteit.

Op 'n vraag van prof. dr. B. Gemser het dr. van Selms saamgestem dat die enigste oplossing lê in die sending onder die Jode. Deur die Jood terug te bring tot sy God en hom Christen te maak, sal die probleem vanself verdwyn. Hy het die verdrukking en vervolging van die Jood egter as 'n noodlottige stap wat vir die Christen onaanvaarbaar is, beskryf en die vervolging van Jode in Rusland, Duitsland en op ander plekke veroordeel. Die verskriklikste van al die maatreëls wat vandag in Duitsland teen die Jode geneem word, is om hulle te belet om ooit Christene te word, en die gees wat daar heers moet noodwendig gevare meebring.

„Ek is oortuig daarvan dat die atmosfeer van haat en genadeloosheid waaronder die Duitse jeug vandag opgroeï tot een van die grootste probleme van die volgende jare sal ontwikkel,” het hy gesê.

GEEN GODSDIENSTIGE VRAAGSTUK

Die Joodse vraagstuk is geen godsdienstige vraagstuk nie. As teenswoordig oor Jode en Christene gepraat word, beteken „Christen” nie 'n beleider van Christus nie, maar iemand wat nie 'n Jood is nie, terwyl omgekeer tot die Jode ook mense gereken word wat geen deel aan die geestelike lewe van Israel neem nie.

'n Rasseprobleem is dit ook nie. In die eerste plaas bestaan daar geen semitiese ras nie; daar is wel 'n semitiese taalgroep maar rasgrense en taalgrense verskil. Verder is die Jode van die vroegste tye af geen raseenheid nie soos duidelik in die ou Testament gesê word, in tekste soos Eksodus 12, vers 38, Eseg. 16, vers 3, ens. Later vermeng hulle nog meer deur die sterke toevloed van proseliete in die Romeinse Keisertyd, die opname

van Germaanse slawe in Joodse huisgesinne terwyl die emansipasie van Jode in die afgelope twee eeue ook 'n groot aantal gemengde huwelike veroorsaak het. Nóg in oorsprong, nóg in ontwikkeling kan ons dus praat van 'n Joodse ras as eenheid. In die verlede kon dit miskien 'n Godsdienstige of biologiese probleem gewees het, maar vandag is dit nie.

'N SOSIOLOGIESE SAAK

Die huidige Joodse vraagstuk is 'n sosiologiese saak. Dit is sekere maatskaplike toestande wat die Jode gemaak het tot wat hulle is. Die oorsprong lê in die Godsdienspolitiek van die Persiese Koning soos belig deur Esra 7. Dit gee die Jode 'n afsonderlike Godsdienstige en nasionale status en daarna word dit deur die diadoge en Romeine voortgesit. In die Ariaanse stryd as die Christelike kerk worstel om die siel van die instromende Germaanse volke, word die Jode verbied om slawe te hou en later ook om land te besit, en die beperkings wat op hulle gelê word, word nog sterker in die tyd van die kruistogte. Die handel en industrie word monopolië van gildes wat op Christelike grondslag staan en dis ontoeganklik vir Jode. Vir hulle bly daar niks anders as enkele intellektuele beroepe soos die geneeskunde en die geldhandel. Die Jood word 'n swerwer wat telkens verjaag word. Dit is in hierdie tydperk van onderdrukking wat tot sowat 1750 geduur het dat die Jood sy tipiese karaktereienskappe ontwikkel: 'n Minderwaardigheidskompleks met sy kompensasies wat dit meebring. Maar wie die Jode daarvan verwyrt, moet sy eie voorouers aankla.

Prof. Van Selms het hierdie stelling bewys eerstens deur aan te haal dat Jode wat in kort verdrukking verduur het soos die Portugese Jode wat in Nederland veiligheid gevind het daardie eienskappe byna glad nie vertoon nie. Hulle is van die beste burgers van Nederland. Die ander bewys is die bestaan van nie-Joodse groepe met 'n soortgelyke geskiedenis soos die Armeniërs en die Assiriërs wat in Turkye en Irak dieselfde posisie ingeneem het as die Jode in Wes-Europa en dieselfde eienskappe toon.

Daar is twee radikale oplossings: Die een is om die Jode 'n magposisie in die wêreld te gee

sodat hulle hulle minderwaardigheidsgevoel kan verloor — 2iets wat geen nasie sal gedoog nie — en die ander om hulle uit te roei soos Hamman volgens die boek Esther probeer doen het en soos ander dit vandag probeer — iets wat vir die Christen onaanvaarbaar is. Daar is gedeeltelike oplossings soos die Sionisme en assimilasië. Laasgenoemde is 'n proses wat nog geen twee eeue aan die gang is nie, en nou totaal belemmer word, enersyds deur vervolging en andersyds deur die gedrag van Jode wat losgeraak het van hulle godsdiens en baie toeganklik is vir rewolusionêre neigings. Alle oplossings wat dusver aangebied is, val onder hierdie vier kategorieë en alger is onuitvoerbaar of gebrekkig.

Die vraagstuk is 'n kruis wat ons opgelê word en die nie-Jood sal by die erkenning van die tragiese situasie van die Jodedom, die skuld van sy voorouers op hom moet neem; daar is 'n sekere immanente regverdigheid in die wêreldgeskiedenis waardeur die bloed van duisende vermoorde Jode besoek word aan die nageslag van hulle moordenaar.

Hierdie feit wil egter nie sê dat 'n regering ook die oorheersing ekonomies en kultureel van sy volk deur 'n Joodse groep sonder meer moet aansien nie.

'n Regering moet vasstel of binnekant sy gebied die versadigingspunt ten aansien van Joodse invloed bereik is. 'n Ideale reëling sou wees dat 'n land wat hy homself die bereiking van die versadigingspunt konstateer, op dieselfde oomblik hom verplig tot geldelike steun aan ander lande wat bereid is om Jode te neem.

Wat die Jode-probleem van Suid-Afrika betref, het dr. van Selms die mening uitgespreek dat die versadigingspunt reeds bereik is. Dit is hier laag omdat die Afrikaner ekonomies en kultureel swak is en dus nie te veel Joodse invloed kan weerstaan nie. Mens kry ook die indruk dat die Jode wat hier gevestig is, taamlik los is van hulle ou Godsdiens. Daar lê 'n gevaar in, en dis dus wenslik dat enige Jood met kommunistiese neigings of wat die sedelikheid ondermyn, verwyder moet word — iets wat ook geld in 'n nie-Jood wat daardie neigings besit. Dr. Van Selms het die mening uitgespreek dat die Jode wat hier gevestig is, maklik met die Engelse bevolkingsdeel sal assimileer, en hier bestaan geen rede om hulle uit te dryf nie.

(Herdruk van die Vaderland, Mei 12, 1939, met toestemming van die spreker en die Redakteur van die Vaderland.)

Libel of Groups . . . Holland and France

A SIGNIFICANT departure in modern legislation is the fact that a number of countries have in recent years made punishable the publication of libels against groups of persons who belong to a single race or religious creed. It is especially noteworthy that both Holland and France, which have always been jealous of their democratic traditions and freedom of speech, should recently have enacted legislation along these lines.

In Holland the Criminal Law was amended as far back as 1934 to make punishable the act of anyone who intentionally utters public insults against a group of the population, or who disseminates or displays matter of a similarly offensive character. Last month, however, the Minister of Justice introduced a bill extending the law by making amenable to the Criminal Law a person who makes "public allegations of a factual nature against a group of persons who belong to the population if he knows, or must reasonably be

presumed to know, that the allegations are untrue."

In France, too, the French Government enacted several decrees towards the end of April. The first decree makes actionable "defamation committed . . . against a group of persons belonging by origin to a definite race or religion . . . if it has as its object the incitement of hatred amongst citizens or inhabitants."

The second decree declares collaboration with foreign propaganda sources or the receiving of funds from abroad for anti-national propaganda to be illegal. The French Government also dissolved three anti-semitic organisations in Alsace.

It is interesting to note that in France these decrees are justified on the ground that group defamation tends to create divisions within the people and to militate against national unity. In Holland the Minister of Justice stated that the bill was aimed against "systematic criticism not in good but in bad faith."

"The Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries might be described as the era of giving to majorities the power that inherently belongs to them. The Twentieth Century appears to be faced with the next problem in sequence, that of majorities learning to give minorities and individuals the rights that are inherently theirs. A democratic society alone can assure those rights . . ."

THESE suggestive lines do not tell the whole story. But they reflect the view of many thinking persons to-day, who, as they consider the oppression to which minorities — of religion, of race, of political belief — are being subjected in many countries, see in the treatment of minorities the very touchstone of progress, the very crux of liberty and democracy. The quotation comes from Raymond Gram Swing, distinguished American student of international affairs, and is taken from his introduction to a striking collection of essays by American writers on the theme of the "Challenge of Democracy to the U.S.A." (in the February number of *Survey Graphic*). After surveying the position in Europe, where minorities are so often either submerged or expelled, these writers turn their attention to the American scene, and consider how that great conglomerate of racial and religious groups can be safeguarded against a similar fate. Their views are of importance to all who are concerned about the fundamental problems of modern society. In the variety of answers which they give there is one dominant note: that the defence of the democracies lies in their becoming more truly democratic, and that the quality of a democracy must be judged by its treatment of minorities.

The democracies are indeed confronted to-day with a threat and a challenge. In the first place, the very existence of the totalitarian states in a Europe of established civilisation is evidence that democracy is failing to live up to its fullest potentialities. It is probably true that democracy was not given a fair chance in those countries; nevertheless, its overthrow as inadequate cannot fail to affect the remaining democracies. But the threat is a more direct one. "We or they," was, in the first instance, Mussolini's own phrase to symbolise the conflict of ideas, the fight between two opposing systems of thought. And there has been a revolution in the technique of the warfare. "Fascism has opened up a new age of aggrandisement, but not of frank aggression. Fascism grows

The Problem of Minorities and the Challenge to the Democracies

— By G. SARON —

great by assimilating, not by destroying, what it seeks to devour." Because the totalitarian intrusion is not by direct approach, but by subterfuge, it is the more sinister and the more difficult to combat. Swing summarises the position:

"The totalitarian war is a new kind of war. Even the aeroplane is old fashioned in combating it. It is a war of ideas, of mendacity against truth, of a play on unfamiliar conceptions of blood and race . . . of appeals to the most intense prejudices of which mortals are capable . . . In the conflict of ideas only one superiority will stem the totalitarian advance, and that is a still stronger idea properly understood and clearly discernible to the rest of the world. Granted, the idea of democracy is not suited to propaganda. Unlike Fascism, it cannot gain its ends by intrigue . . . Democracy can only fight for itself by being. Its health is its only propaganda. It becomes a missionary only in devotion to its mission of giving freedom to its own people."

WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?

If it is true that democracy will survive only through its self-perfection, then self-criticism becomes an urgent and pressing undertaking. It is a time for the clarification of definitions and objectives, and one cannot fail to be struck by the similarity in the approach of writers of the most divergent interests and training. "Democracy is not Utopia. It is a process, not an achievement; an attitude, not a solution. It is a way of life, a social conception, a faith that in the end one person cannot have his fullest liberty unless every other person has his. It is a higher selfishness which serves it self by giving." Thus one writer. Says another: "Democracy is not a system of government, an establishment of reticulated institutions, but a state of mind. Only those in that state of mind can establish or maintain it, or are fit for it . . . it means a social and political system, and *most of all a spirit infusing it*, under which any human being, on the same terms as any of his fellows, may aspire as of right to any opportunity or status open in a free society, on the basis of his personal merits."

What is at stake, indeed, in the modern conflict is not merely rival political systems, but something much more important — fundamental values of our civilised life. And it is not surprising that Christian thinkers, in rallying to the defence of "democracy," do so on the ground that the truly democratic ideal enshrines some of the great religious values. Thus George N. Shuster, a Catholic scholar and a journalist of note, points out that Christianity, in its traditional theology, teaches that endowment of human rights is the essence of democracy. He declares that the *Christian Church*, as such, irrespective of its divisions, can with a single voice make its contribution to the present crisis.

"The normal function of the Church is to teach what is conserved in its own illustrious spiritual heritage," he writes. "And I am convinced that no part of this heritage is more alive or more important than are the following age-old derivatives from its creed that human personality is in its deepest essence inviolably free; that every man is endowed with certain basic rights founded in the very nature of things; and that there is a code of justice — of wrongdoing and rightdoing — not subject to statutory change. These truths, which classic Christian theology fully endorses, are really what we have in mind when we speak rather loosely of 'democracy.' We sense the strange fact that behind the constitutions of the great surviving democracies of the world — England, France and these United States — there lies a declaration of principle, a profession of social faith, in which these inalienable rights and liberties are enshrined."

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

But modern experience has shown that these "rights and liberties" may be attacked and even vanquished (though faith in their validity assures us that the defeat can only be temporary). Hence the general realisation that if they are to be maintained it will not be by lip service, but by energetic action and continual effort. Nor, on a true interpretation, is it merely a question of preserving certain outward constitutional forms. Political

democracy may mean little without economic democracy; the right to vote may be of little value if it goes together with economic degradation. That, indeed, is one of the urgent phases of democracy's crisis. The growing concentration of economic power seems to be making more remote the quality of economic opportunity. "Industrialism and concentrated finance have shifted the power to the relatively few, and political power has not been able to restore to the individual his full economic initiative." There is a danger that that economic evolution which resulted in Europe in the decline of individual liberty may have similar results elsewhere. If democracy is, therefore, to survive, new mechanisms must be designed, suited to deal with new problems. Raymond Swing (quoted earlier) states the problem very pithily. "Modern industry and finance have little resemblance to anything our forefathers conceived of as democracy. In our efforts to change them we have resorted to strong government action. Yet government action, if strong enough, puts individual liberty in jeopardy. That is, perhaps, the great dilemma of the Twentieth Century."

"MILITANT DEMOCRACY"

These are some of the considerations which have called for the persistent demand for a "militant democracy," a democracy active and energetic in its own defence. "What, a new war to save democracy?" asks Edgar Mowrer. "Why not, if necessary? How else will you save it? But a war waged not once every generation in some foreign field . . . but one really sought by all of us every day on the home front and, if really required, elsewhere as well . . . Liberal democracy must become militant or perish."

If the analysis made above is correct, then it is on the economic front that the battle will be fiercest and most decisive for the future. Is there need to outline the application to conditions in our own South Africa, with its hundreds of thousands of underfed "poor whites," a ready prey for the demagogue; its struggling Asiatic and coloured population; its impoverished native majority?

There are, of course, also purely political issues. One of the most controversial is the question whether the democracies should grant freedom to organised movements in their midst whose aim it is to destroy freedom. Should they allow partisans of dictatorship free scope to plot the overthrow of democracy? The answer of the

(Continued on page 9.)

Jews and Communism

SOME FACTS

The following article does not attempt to pass judgment on Communism, but merely to give the facts concerning the extent of Jewish participation in the movement.

"The very enormity of a lie contributes to its success . . . The masses of the people easily succumb to it, as they cannot believe it possible that anyone should have the shameless audacity to invent such things . . . Even if the clearest proof of its falsehood is forthcoming, something of the lie will nevertheless stick." ("Mein Kampf.")

PROPAGANDA based on this philosophy has been continuously employed by the "Shirt" movements in South Africa and elsewhere in order to popularise the belief that Jews and the Jewish religion are ultimately connected with the theory and practice of Communism. Latterly this allegation has been used for wider political objectives in the Union in attempts to disrupt the existing trade unions and to discredit activities of various kinds for the preservation of democracy.

An overwhelming amount of authoritative material exploding the myth that Communism is Jewish has been published in recent years. From this mass of material for reasons of space, only such evidence will be dealt with as is relevant to the main arguments usually employed in substantiating the allegation that Communism is Jewish.

The Progenitors of the Revolution

First, there is the argument that Karl Marx, the "father" of Communism, was a Jew, and hence Communism is Jewish. This involves the fallacy of arguing from the particular to the general; moreover, Marx was a Jew only in the sense that he was born of Jewish parents. At the age of six he was baptised a Lutheran and the rest of his life had no connection with Judaism. On the contrary, he was an advocate of complete Jewish assimilation and launched a bitter attack on the Jews in his well-known essay on the Jewish problem. Further, we are reminded by the distinguished Catholic historian, Father Joseph N. Moody, Professor of European History at Cathedral College, St. Louis (in a booklet entitled *Why Are the Jews Persecuted?*, issued under the imprimatur of the Archbishop of St. Louis), that while Marx was a Jew by birth, the intellectual progenitors of the founder of Communism were not. Such men as Hegel, Feuerbach, Owen, Saint-Simon, Proudhon, Blanc and Fourier were not Jews. The same is true of the spiritual fathers of Bolshevism. In the long list of men who prepared the Russian mind for the acceptance of the present order we look in vain for a member of this particular oppressed group.

Jews and the Russian Revolution

The position of the Jews in Soviet Russia is often misrepresented. While the Jews had every reason to

desire the overthrow of the Czarist regime, the majority of them were members of liberal or conservative rather than of the revolutionary parties. The Socialist Party in Russia before the revolution included only 60,000 of the five million Jews, while the number of Jews in the Bolshevist group was negligible. Alexander Kerensky, who was premier of the first Government established after the overthrow of the Czar in March, 1917, declared in the course of an interview with the *New York Times*, 29th November, 1938, that

" . . . far from being a Jewish movement or a movement fomented and financed by Jews, the revolution of March, 1917, was a revolt of the whole Russian people against the Czarist camarilla headed by Rasputin, which sought to betray Russia and the Allies into a separate peace with Germany. The revolt was supported by all parties. . . There was not a single Jew in the Government established immediately after the revolution and headed by Prince Lvoff."

While the revolution of March, 1917, which overthrew the despotism of the Czar was welcomed by the Russian Jews (as well as by the Allied Governments, which floated huge loans to assist Kerensky's Government), most of them resisted the Bolshevist attack in November against the provisional government. This point is stressed by Professor Hugo Valentin, Professor of History at Upsala University, in Sweden, in his book *Anti-Semitism, Historically and Critically Examined*. Professor Valentin says (page 257):

" . . . Even in 1922, that is, after several years of intensive Bolshevising, the Jewish element only amounted to 19,526 members, or 5.2 per cent. of the party, in spite of the fact that the Jews, in contrast to the rest of the Russian population, were very largely composed of town-dwellers, who were able to read and were thus more accessible to propaganda. All three Jewish workers' organisations, the Serp, the Zionist Poale-Zion and the greatest of them, the General League of Jewish Workers, founded in 1897 and usually known simply as the Bund, declared against Bolshevism."

" . . . The Bolshevist revolution of November 7th, 1917, (October 25th) aroused dismay and indignation. And, in fact, the Bund vigorously opposed the Bolshevist defeatism which led to the peace of Brest-Litovsk. The Commissariat for the administration of Jewish Affairs, appointed by Lenin's Government, issued a manifesto on March 15, 1918, attacking the Jewish workers for their anti-Bolshevist attitude. The Jewish bourgeoisie, the majority of whom followed trades and professions which must inevitably be ruined in a Communist Russia, were still more enraged against Bolshevism. In the Ukraine in 1918 the Jewish workers, with arms in their hands, made common cause with the Jewish bourgeois against Bolshevism—which did not prevent Petlyura and other White generals during the civil war of 1919 from labelling Bolshevism as Jewish."

From *Documents of Russian History, 1914-1917*, by Professor Frank Alfred Golder (Century Co., New York,

1927) a standard work on the subject, it appears that of the first Government of the Peoples' Commissars in 1917, consisting of 16 persons, only one, Leon Trotsky, was a Jew (page 619). The *Statesman's Year Book* for 1938 indicates that in that year the politbureau of the Communist Party, the highest authority of the Soviet Union, had 13 members, of which only one, L. M. Kaganovitch, was a Jew. The Council of the Peoples' Commissars, the official executive and administrative organ, consisted of 28 members, of whom five were of Jewish origin.

Russian Jewry's Sufferings Under Bolshevism

The Russian Jews have suffered severely under Bolshevism. To quote again from Dr. Moody:

"If anything they have suffered more than the rest of the population from Soviet tyranny. Most of the Jews in Russia were engaged in private trade, and thus belonged to a class which bore the brunt of the Soviet discriminatory legislation, especially since the revocation of the NEP in 1923. The Jewish religion has been proscribed with the same fervour as was the Christian and the Mohammedan. Synagogues have been confiscated and turned into 'cultural' centres. The Hebrew language is strictly forbidden, and no Jewish child may be taught the rudiments of his faith."

The Jewish community organisations were officially liquidated by the order of April, 1919, countersigned by Joseph Stalin, then Commissar of Nationalities. Jewish religious schools, including the Yeshivahs, were forced to close. By 1922 the *Emess* (Communist daily), November, 1922, was able to report triumphantly that in the province of Zhitomir all Jewish religious schools had been closed. Practice of the rite of circumcision was punished. (*The Religious Persecution in Russia*, Permanent Bureau of the International Entente Against the Third International, Geneva, 1930, p. 25.)

The Position in Germany

Since the Nazis have been the originators of the "Jewish-Communist" allegation, it is important to recall the position in Germany itself. Before the Nazis came into power, the Communist voting strength in Germany was six million. In the whole of Germany there were only some 300,000 Jews who had the right to vote. Even if these 300,000 Jews had all voted Communist (a completely untenable assumption in itself), what would they have amounted to among six million? The small part actually played by Jewish Communists in Germany is borne out by an official Nazi publication, *Kuerschner's Vollshandbuch Deutscher Reichstag*, 1933, which shows that, in the Reichstag of 1930, out of 70 Communist deputies, there was only one Jew. In the Reichstag of 1933 (dissolved by the Hitler Government), out of 81 Communist deputies, there was *not a single Jew*.

Jews Oppose Communism

Opposition by Jews to Communism has not been confined to Russia. In 1930 the Chief Rabbi of England issued a statement in which he said:

"Conscience, religious liberty and all that is divine in the human spirit are to-day trampled under foot in Russia. . . . The Rabbis and even priests of all confessions, are subject to all kinds of outrages, under the pretext that they are counter-revolutionaries . . . what is more fatal to

the cause of religion is the prohibition of religious teaching of the young."

Many Jewish organisations have gone on record as opposing Communism. Thus, the Bnai Brith, a national fraternal organisation with over 75,000 members, at a national convention at Washington, D.C., in 1938, adopted a resolution condemning Communism as a danger to both Judaism and Christianity. Similarly, the Jewish war veterans of the United States went on record in 1936 as "uncompromisingly opposed to Communism, Nazism and Fascism." A survey made by the magazine *Fortune*, in its issue of February, 1936, revealed that of about four million, five hundred thousand Jews in the United States, only about three thousand were members of the Communist Party. The Jewish Labour Committee, an organisation, representing several hundred thousand Jewish workers, on 6th March, 1938, adopted a resolution to bar Communists from membership, pledging themselves "to inalienable adherence to the principles of democracy and freedom and rejecting co operation with any organisation that upholds a dictatorship of any sort." (*New York Times*, March 7, 1938).

A final word:

Like any other people, the Jews have their rich and their poor, their orthodox and their atheists, their radicals and their conservatives. If anything, the Jewish religion has tended to act as a conservative influence even on that section of its people who because of their economic position would appear most likely to be open to the influence of Communist propaganda. The "Jew-Communist" identification is sheer myth.

THE PROBLEM OF MINORITIES

(Concluded from page 7.)

older theorists of liberty was in the affirmative; but there is a growing body of opinion which believes that the limits of tolerance are reached when it is faced by *intolerant* action, and that it may be necessary to resort even to force for the protection of liberty.

Principally, however, the battle for liberty and democracy must be fought on the "minorities" front. For here most of the other issues are involved—the freedom of the individual as an individual, culturally, economically, politically. The temptation is indeed great to sacrifice the minorities to the will of the majorities. For thus not only is their vanity flattered and their greed satisfied, but they are also provided with a scapegoat and a diversion from the real issues. At the same time, however, the essence of democratic liberty is sacrificed and the way paved for the suppression of *all* liberty. These things must be pondered by democrats the world over, and not least in South Africa, where minorities of race, religion, colour and language, produce problems of so complicated a nature.

A Campaign for Goodwill

● Some Notes on an Organisation in the U.S.A.

THE National Conference of Christians and Jews in the United States of America has recently announced that they will distribute ten million Badge of Tolerance buttons throughout the country. This button, it is explained, is to be worn on the lapel and "symbolises the unity of the American Protestants, Catholics and Jews for democracy, freedom and tolerance."

Behind this announcement is the story of a great constructive effort to combat group antagonisms and promote inter-faith relationships.

The National Conference of Jews and Christians was created about eleven years ago. Four years before that a Committee on Goodwill between Jews and Christians, fathered by the Federal Council of the Churches and the Jewish organisation B'nai B'rith, had existed in a small way. In 1928 the time seemed ripe for a permanent, independent Conference for bringing Protestants, Catholics and Jews together in united effort. Its object was summarised as "Justice, Amity, Understanding and Co-operation" among these religious groups. The aim was not to merge the religious bodies or to modify their distinctive beliefs, but to "analyse, moderate and finally eliminate inter-group prejudices, which disfigure and distort business, social and political relations, with a view to the establishment of a social order in which the religious ideals of Brotherhood and Justice shall become the standards of human relationships."

GROWTH OF THE MOVEMENT

The story of the growth of this organisation, of its penetration into the universities, schools, seminaries, churches and friendly societies is a significant and an encouraging one. Today, it has enlisted the support of many of the foremost political and intellectual leaders in America, and last year President Roosevelt consented to serve as Honorary Chairman of the National Committee for furthering the movement.

The Executive Secretary, Dr. Everett R. Clinchy, recently wrote an interesting account of its progress and plans. At first there was a certain amount of "sweet sentimentality" in the relations between the groups. Soon the leaders saw the need for scientific analysis and educational procedures. Sociologists, psychologists and educators as well as religious leaders were called in. By means of seminars and similar methods the religious groups were enabled to become informed of each others' principles and practices. At that stage emphasis was placed upon better inter-group relations as a religious problem.

Later, more attention was given to the origin of certain types of prejudice in "external forces." It was realised how closely prejudice is related to economic

injustice, to war, to dictatorship. Thus a scientific formula for better human relations was tentatively achieved. Dr. Clinchy puts it this way:—

"First, reduce the 'social distance,' the isolation between the various religious and racial groups, so that democratic communication may be kept active. Second, discover the economic and sociological forces which make for prejudices and deal with the several factors individually. Hold the guiding stars in the sky of men's aspiration, political democracy above totalitarianism; industrial democracy above economic injustice; freedom of the human spirit above tyranny; peace above war; essential justice for all groups above privilege for any one."

METHODS

How does the Conference set about achieving its objects? In the first place, it sponsors numerous seminars and conferences, which are held at universities and other centres of learning, and are occasions for the exchange of ideas and experiences, and not for debates and the passing of resolutions. Conferences have been held under the leadership of outstanding personalities, like Nicholas Murray, President of Columbia University. In the next place, teams, consisting of a Protestant Minister, a Catholic Priest and a Jewish Rabbi, undertake lecture tours, speaking to schools, colleges, clubs and general societies. In 1937 twenty-five such travelling teams covered a total distance of 38,000 miles. Again, Brotherhood Day, which is held annually in the week of George Washington's birthday, serves as a rallying point for community leaders and is observed in a large number of cities.

More recently attention has been directed to the creation of permanent "Round Tables" (equivalent in our prosaic language to standing committees) in many cities. By the beginning of last year over 100 such "Round Tables" were functioning. These standing committees, in which the three groups participate, study together matters of common concern, promote public meetings, plan radio programmes and take joint action in times of tension and crisis. The Conference gives special attention to teachers and schools, for whom it holds lectures and discussions. It aims at applying the Round Table methods to as many university colleges as possible. Lastly, one should mention the news service which it issues under the name of "Religious News Service" throughout the country.

Conditions in the U.S.A. differ very much from those in South Africa. There things must be done on a grand scale and in a highly organised way. But have not we, too, something to learn from this example of an organised national activity to foster good relations and eliminate prejudices?

Human—but without Passports

● By Dr. H. Sonnabend

"HUMAN beings consist of three elements — body, soul and passport," proclaimed a saying of Tzarist Russia. Since 1918 not less than twenty million "voluntary" and involuntary emigrants have crossed the frontiers of their native lands, and many of them have been hounded from country to country like homeless ghosts, because they have not been able to produce that precious document.

Outside the Consulates of many European capitals long queues of men wait for a visa. Alas, only seldom does one emerge from the luxurious building clutching in his hands a passport with the fateful open sesame stamp. Why this barring of doors by countries which only recently boasted of the noble tradition of offering a haven to the exile? The little book by Sir Norman Angell and Dorothy Frances Buxton *You and the Refugee** contains a careful, painstaking, objective analysis of the arguments used by those who are advocating the closed door policy.

Sir Norman Angell, though a distinguished economist, never belonged to those who see in Economics the "dismal science" dealing only with that lifeless monster the *homo economicus*. He and Mrs. Buxton do not hesitate to include the word *morals* in the sub-title of their book, which in fact reads "The Morals and Economics of the Problem."

Morals have indeed some bearing on the subject. Apart from general humanitarian considerations, there are additional obligations in the case of the political refugees from Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia: Were they not indeed encouraged and admonished by public opinion in England and France to make a stand against the spread of undemocratic doctrines? Have they not, therefore, a moral claim to be sheltered in this, their hour of defeat and distress? I do not allude to the few hundred "leaders," who, in the moment of danger, have their planes ready to take them to a place of safety. No, I am much more concerned with those un-named millions who have been encouraged by the democracies to march under the banners of peace and freedom and now find themselves trapped.

In so far as Britain is concerned, the authors rightly emphasise the moral obligation of an Empire which stretches over a quarter of the globe

and which is the trustee of the great empty spaces. Are not Britain and France the correct addresses for people in need of shelter?

In the economic field the book discusses the "murderous fallacy" that immigration intensifies unemployment. Investigations carried out in England, Holland and even South Africa have revealed that recent immigrants have created employment for many thousands. Looking back at the history of mass migration, the authors find that cyclical movements of immigration coincided with cyclical movements of prosperity. The United States of America had no unemployment problem in the days of mass immigration. Poor and hopeless Greece admitted after the war not less than 1,400,000 refugees and as a result blossomed forth into a period of prosperity. The admission of immigrants has often been the stimulus to a stagnant economy, for the immigrant is not only a producer, but also a consumer of goods. Moreover, many industries such as building, furnishing, etc., prosper only in periods of expanding population.

I am afraid that the most compelling advocacy on behalf of the refugees will not convince the average voter and will not move those who indulge in the noble sport of vote-catching. In each country there are small groups of people who may suffer *individually* from the influx of immigrants, and they are beating the big drum. The fact that the country as a whole may benefit from the admission of new immigrants will not deter those vociferous groups from exploiting the xenophobia of the masses. Who is going to conduct a vigorous counter-agitation? The opinion of the minority is in this case bound to prevail, no matter how short-sighted these agitators may be and how evanescent and trivial the nature of their interests.

The authors have broken a lance in favour of mass infiltration, and have done this with great gallantry and remarkable skill. It is not their fault that human folly prevails over reason and determines the immigration policy of most countries. The era of mass infiltration is definitely closed — what remains is a mere trickle. Perhaps close mass settlement, on the lines of the Palestine experiment is more likely to obtain the active support of the great colonial powers?

* *You and the Refugee*, by Norman Angell and Dorothy Frances Buxton. A Penguin Special. 6d.

RECENT ACTIVITIES OF THE SOCIETY

THE publication of *Common Sense* offers a much-needed opportunity of submitting to members and friends of our movement a regular monthly report of activities. We feel that this will not only help to establish closer contact between the Johannesburg Executive and the Societies in other centres, but will also enable each group to profit from the experience of other branches.

Since its last annual meeting speakers from the Johannesburg Society have addressed a number of informal and public meetings. On 15th February, Mr. J. M. Rich spoke at a meeting of the Norwood Wesleyan group. On March 10th, the Rev. A. W. Eaton and Dr. H. Sonnabend addressed a gathering in Randfontein. The inaugural meeting of the Society in the last-named town was addressed by Prof. Gray and Adv. Claassen on the 19th April. On 1st June, Dr. Sonnabend spoke to a Presbyterian group in Pretoria. On 10th June, Rabbi M. C. Weiler addressed the Young Fellowship of the Presbyterian Church, Johannesburg.

On 18th February a meeting of members and invited guests was addressed in Johannesburg by Lord Marley on the "Refugee Problem." An address was delivered by Dr. Stein-Lessing on "Jewish Art," on Monday, 24th April. Preparations are now in hand for the showing of a film depicting Jewish life in Palestine. This function is to take place on 26th June, at the Coronation Hall, Johannesburg.

The Society of Jews and Christians in Capetown has shown considerable activity. A number of public and informal functions have been arranged and were well attended. Particular mention should be made of a Symposium on 4th May, which was presided over by the Bishop, the Right Rev. S. W. Lavis, on "The Relationship between Jews and Christians." Papers were read by the Rev. W. Constable and Messrs. M. S. Comay, H. M. Bloch and V. A. Smart (Secretary of the Society).

The Capetown Society has ventured further afield by arranging a meeting at Piquetberg on the 7th May. Addresses were delivered by Bishop Lavis, Mr. Clouts and Mr. Smart. The Society also provides speakers for Jewish and non-Jewish organisations.

The Bloemfontein Society held a very successful function on the 2nd June. It took the form of a lecture-concert devoted to the works of Jewish composers. The Bishop of Bloemfontein, the Right Rev. A. H. Howe-Brown, was in the Chair. Mr. Charles Hamer gave illuminating sketches of the lives and work of Offenbach, Mendelssohn and Rubenstein.

In Pretoria, Rabbi W Hirsch addressed a meeting of the Methodist Church Guild. Further functions took place in Brakpan and Benoni.

Secretaries of affiliated Societies are requested to send regular reports of their functions and other activities for insertion in Common Sense. These should reach us not later than the 15th of each month.

NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS

KNOW THIS OF RACE

by *Cedric Dover*. SECKER & WARBURG. 110 p. 2/6.

In this little volume the facts that everyone should know about the race problem are presented with passion, gusto and pungency. The author (himself a half-caste) knows his subject intimately, both from the scientific and social viewpoints. (He will be remembered for his brilliant survey of race and race-prejudice in *Half-Caste*.) He explodes the myths about blood, race and racial characteristics; reveals the how and why of racialism.

THE SHORTEST WAY WITH THE JEWS

by *Peter Harlow*. ALLAN & UNWIN. 6/-.

This book is divided into three parts: "The Myth about the Jews," "Anti-Semitism Dissected," "Is there a Solution." The argumentation is sound, if not very novel, and the author covers many of the current allegations against the Jews on racial, economic and social grounds. He believes that Jewish troubles will disappear only if Jews become "assimilated" and lose their identity as a separate people. "Nothing is easier," he writes, "than to bring about the solution of the Jewish problem. All that is required is to leave the Jews in peace long enough for their absorption to take place. Tolerance would lead to their rapid assimilation and final disappearance. From the purely Jewish point of view that can hardly be called a solution."

JEWISH RIGHTS AND JEWISH WRONGS.

by *Neville Laski, K.C.* SONCINO PRESS, London, 7/6.

This latest edition of the Soncino Press consists of essays by the President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews. He discusses such varied topics as the Jewish contribution to European civilisation, the plight of the Jews in Poland, the refugee problem and anti-defamation work in England. The essays do not profess to be comprehensive studies of their respective subjects, but the book itself will serve a useful purpose.

ISRAEL'S MISSION TO THE WORLD

by *H.H. Rowley*. STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT PRESS. 3/6.

This volume consists of four lectures by Dr. Rowley, Professor of Semitic Languages at University College, Bangor. The author sets forth his views upon the mission of Israel in a spirit of sympathetic understanding and frankness. From his study of the Old Testament he is convinced of the full value of the contribution by Judaism to the religious conceptions and moral stability of the world; although he speaks of Christianity having taken over Israel's mission, he emphasises the contribution of Judaism to religion.

IF YOU ARE INTERESTED IN "COMMON SENSE"

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

MEMBERS

of the Society of Jews and Christians, whether in Johannesburg or elsewhere, are invited to send their annual subscription of **3/-** (three shillings); and

NON-MEMBERS

are invited to send their annual subscription of **4/-** (four shillings)

to

COMMON SENSE,

P.O. Box 7791,

Johannesburg.

Common Sense

: CONTENTS :

The Working Faith of a Liberal by <i>R. F. Alfred Hoernlé</i>	3
Notes on Recent Books.....	4
The Curse of Prejudice by <i>Dr. J. L. Landau</i>	5
Die Oxfordgroep en Rassehaat deur <i>C. J. Claassen</i>	6
Experiment in Vivisection by <i>Dr. H. Sonnabend</i>	7
The Problem of Education by <i>C. H. S. Runge</i>	8
The Dilemma of our Generation by <i>J. L. Gray</i>	10
The Rising Tide by <i>A. W. Eaton</i>	11
The Myth of "International Jewry" by <i>G. Chagy</i>	13
"In Polish Woods" by <i>H. Jenkins</i>	15
Activities.....	16

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

VOL. 1. NO. 2.

AUGUST 1939

PRICE 4d.

Common Sense

"Common Sense" is published monthly by the Society of Jews and Christians, Johannesburg.

Editorial Board:

C. J. CLAASSEN	C. H. S. RUNGE
A. W. EATON	G. SARON
R. F. A. HOERNLÉ	H. SONNABEND

THE SOCIETY OF JEWS AND CHRISTIANS

Membership:

Membership subscription to the Society of Jews and Christians is 2/6 per annum.

Full particulars and membership forms may be obtained from the Secretaries of the Johannesburg Society or Affiliated Societies.

Membership of the Society of Jews and Christians is open to all persons, whatever their religious or political affiliations, who are in sympathy with its objects.

Publications:

The following publications have been issued by the Society:—

PAMPHLETS:

- No. 1 — *Jews and Christians*, by Dr. Maude Royden.
- No. 2 — *Some Facts about the Society*, with an address by the Hon. J. H. Hofmeyr, M.P.
- No. 3 — *The Problem of Race*, by Prof. R.F.A. Hoernlé.
- No. 4 — *A Jewish Rabbi Appeals to the Christian Conscience*, by Rabbi W. Hirsch.
- No. 5 — *The Jew in the Economic Life of South Africa*, by Prof. J. L. Gray.

All these publications are issued in both English and Afrikaans and may be obtained on application to the Honorary Secretaries, P.O. Box 7791, Johannesburg.

The cordial reception that has greeted Common Sense has justified our belief that a monthly of this character can serve a very useful function and that there are many men and women of goodwill who welcome its appearance.

We shall be glad to receive articles or comments from the readers of Common Sense, and are especially interested in obtaining information on what is being

"WHO'S WHO" AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS

G. Chagy, B.A. (Hons.).

Adv. C. J. Claassen is a member of the Johannesburg Bar and is prominently associated with the Oxford Group.

The Rev. A. W. ("Tubby") Eaton, L.Th., Anglican Clergyman, Rector of the St. Patrick's Church, Malvern, and Editor of the Diocesan Magazine, *The Watchman*.

Prof. J. L. Gray, M.A., Head of the Department of Social Studies of the Witwatersrand University.

Prof. R. F. A. Hoernlé, M.A., B.Sc., Professor of Philosophy at the Witwatersrand University, Chairman of the South African Institute of Race Relations. His Phelps-Stokes lectures on "Race Relations" will be published under the auspices of the University of Cape Town before the end of the year.

H. Jenkins, M.A., Lecturer in English at the Witwatersrand University.

Chief Rabbi Prof. Dr. J. L. Landau, M.A., Ph.D., is Chief Rabbi of the Federation of Synagogues of the Witwatersrand.

The Rev. C. H. S. Runge, M.A., D.S.O., M.C., is a prominent Anglican clergyman. He is Provincial of the Community of the Resurrection in South Africa and President of the Society of Jews and Christians, Johannesburg.

Dr. H. Sonnabend, D.Sc., Lecturer in the Department of Social Studies at the Witwatersrand University, author of works on race and population.

Subscription:

The subscription to *Common Sense* is 3/- per annum to members (or 3d. per copy); and 4/- per annum to non-members (or 4d. per copy). Post free.

Copies may be ordered from the Secretaries, P.O. Box 7791, Johannesburg, as well as from the Secretaries of Affiliated Societies in other centres of the Union.

done in all parts of South Africa to combat prejudice and racialism and to further common sense and goodwill. All correspondence should be addressed to the Editors, P.O. Box 7791, Johannesburg.

May we ask all our readers who are interested in Common Sense to send in their subscriptions without delay and to show the journal to their friends?

THE EDITORS.

The Working Faith of a Liberal

● By R. F. ALFRED HOERNLÉ

IN May of this year, I had the honour of delivering, before the University of Cape Town, the Phelps-Stokes Lectures on Race Relations.

The topic of my lectures was "South African Native Policy and the Liberal Spirit." This topic compelled me to take stock of what liberty and the liberal spirit mean to me. I had to ask myself by what ideals I am guided in my efforts for better relations among all sections of the population of South Africa. Thus, I came to set down the following credo:—

The core, the essence, of the liberal spirit, is "concern for the quality of human lives." No doubt, this includes the quality of one's own life, but the orientation of the liberal spirit is not upon self, but away from self, beyond self: it is outward-looking; it is inclusive. The lives actually lived by human beings vary widely in satisfactoriness. All too many are cramped and stunted, both physically and mentally. The conditions which hamper the attainment of greater excellence, the achievement of a life worth living, may be external—viz: repressive social and economic arrangements; or internal—lack of moral character, defective development of the intellectual powers. To free human beings from whatever stands in the way of their realizing the best that their nature is capable of—this is, in general principle, the aim of the liberal spirit.

In detail, this spirit manifests itself in many diverse ways. The varied possible excellencies of human nature must be realized in individual human beings: concern for individuals, respect for personality, respect for human nature and its potentialities in every human being—these are one aspect of the liberal spirit. But, individuals live their lives as members of social groups, and the excellence of their lives is relative, therefore, to the culture (in the widest sense) of their group, the culture to the pattern of which individual lives are moulded, the culture from which they draw the materials, as it were, for a life worth living. The liberal spirit, in this aspect, shows itself as a respect for social groups other than one's own, for cultures other than

one's own, for sentiments and traditions other than one's own.

Again, in those who enjoy advantages and privileges, which they recognise to be essential to the achievement of such excellence and worthwhileness as their lives possess, the liberal spirit appears as an urge to share these advantages and privileges and to communicate them to others; and if education and training are required to use these privileges wisely, then as an urge to help others, by extending educational facilities to them, to fit themselves for the enjoyment of these privileges. In those, on the other hand, who are as yet excluded from these advantages, but who recognize that their possession is necessary for the achievement of better lives for themselves and their fellows, the liberal spirit manifests itself as a demand for "reforms," for the throwing down of barriers to a fuller life, for greater "social justice," for the granting of fundamental human "rights."

Dangers of Paternalism.

The greatest moral danger in the very heart of the liberal spirit itself is that, in the relation of well-meaning superior to stricken inferior, it is so apt to become paternalism and condescension, and to beget in the recipient of its favours a spirit of dependence and irresponsibility. A superiority-complex on the one side makes it impossible to respect the inferior's personality, and the corresponding inferiority-complex on the other side makes it equally impossible for the inferior to develop a personality worth respecting. Here, in South Africa, for instance, we often talk piously of wanting the Natives to show "self-respect" as well as respect for Europeans. But, if our treatment of them merely cultivates an inferiority-complex in them, then they cannot respect themselves, and will fear us without respecting us. From this point

of view, it is part of the liberal spirit to respect the manhood of men; and self-mastery is of the essence of manhood—self-mastery in the double sense of inward self-control or moral character, and outward power to mould one's own life by responsible choices within a social system providing a wide range of choices. From this angle, we can understand why the liberal spirit has sought to create institutions guaranteeing to individual men the exercise of self-determination, whilst seeking also to train them to a wise use of that power.

Moreover, the liberal spirit is concerned, not only with the quality of the lives of individuals in relation to their social group, but also with the power of a social group to maintain and develop its own distinctive group-life and its own culture. It finds itself, therefore, compelled to criticize and challenge all inter-group relations in which one group, in its own interests, disintegrates other groups without offering opportunities for new integration, or imposes rigid limits to the progress and self-development of other groups. In the history of liberalism, liberals have always stood up both for the liberties of oppressed or restricted individuals and for the liberty of oppressed groups, whether economic classes, churches, nations or races.

The Liberal Ideal.

Thus, the liberal spirit, as concern for the quality of human lives, assumes many forms and ranges over a field as wide as human life itself, in its individual and social aspects. If at one end it seeks to improve human lives by arousing the social conscience to the task of preventing diseases and securing health and fitness, at the opposite end it seeks to provide fuller and more easily accessible opportunities for enlightening human minds and freeing them from the bondage of ignorance and superstition. If at one end it protests, in the name of humanity, against the cruelties, oppressions, persecutions, which men inflict upon fellow-men, at the other end it seeks to secure for the oppressed the power to protect themselves.

The free mind is the self-directing mind—the mind which is fit to direct itself because, with open access to the culture-values of humanity, it has perceived something of the nature of human excellence and sets itself, of its own initiative and energy, to realize that vision, in virtue of the power of action socially guaranteed to it. A world of free minds in free societies is the liberal ideal.

NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS

(The Prices stated are Published Prices.)

THE JEWISH PROBLEM

by *Louis Golding*. PENGUIN SERIES, 1938. pp. 213. 8d.

The fact that this book has gone into four editions in three months and the fact that it meets the popular need is an indication of its real worth.

I do not believe this to be a great book, but it is full of information, is easy to read, and very stimulating.

One is tempted to see the hand of Cecil Roth all the way through and to think that he keeps Golding to the path of sane thinking when the zeal for his brethren tends to send him off the rails.

I think the reading of this book will send those really keen on the Jewish problem to the study of the larger books that Louis Golding himself recommends. However, there is no question that this is just the kind of book that many people can understand and appreciate. That is what has made it worth writing and worth publishing.

A.W.E.

FROM U-BOAT TO CONCENTRATION CAMP

by *Martin Niemoeller*. London, WM. HODGE & Co., 1939. pp. 285. 5/-.

July 1st was the beginning of the third year of the imprisonment of Dr. Martin Niemoeller, the fearless and outspoken leader of the German Evangelical Church, which has refused to accept State leadership in internal Church affairs and has refused to allow itself to be "gleichgeschaltet" (co-ordinated) for political purposes. This volume is a translation of Pastor Niemoeller's autobiography, with additional chapters on the Church struggle in Germany by the Dean of Chichester.

(Continued on page 5.)

The Curse of Prejudice

● By Dr. J. L. LANDAU

ONE of the greatest and most distressing losses that nature can inflict on a person is the loss of his eyesight; so that he is doomed to spend his life in perpetual darkness and to have to see the beauties and the wonders of nature with another's eyes. His affliction proves an even greater calamity, when the other person, who has to be trusted and relied upon, is misleading and mischievous. A similarly painful and baneful affliction is mental blindness, when one's instincts are unlit by intellect and one must rely on the guidance of others — the more so when they are unscrupulous. Need I point out how infinitely greater this calamity is when it affects a large number of individuals, who are made the victims of the basest motives of political or religious leaders, who abuse the trust placed in them by those mentally blind, who follow them with closed eyes, because they implicitly believe what they are told, unable to see and judge for themselves? The still greater curse that springs from ignorance is the fact that the false and corruptive opinions are transmitted from parents to children and from generation to generation. The accumulated impressions of all those vicious widely-spread and almost generally-accepted views we call prejudice, baseless hatred provoked and spread by fictitious accusations. These lies form a most formidable weapon when brandished by irresponsible, unscrupulous demagogues.

A LESSON FROM MASARYK

Masaryk, the late president of the Czechoslovakian Republic, told the following interesting story. As a young student he was very prejudiced against Jews. He never associated with any, but was afraid of them. In school he studiously avoided his Jewish fellow-students. One day, when the students spent a day out in the country, dancing, singing and drinking, he noticed that a Jewish student suddenly disappeared. He decided to follow him, feeling sure that he was up to some mischief. But to his surprise he found him reading his afternoon prayers with visible devotion. Masaryk was so profoundly impressed that he decided forthwith to study Jewish life and Jewish history, feeling convinced that there was no justification for his prejudice against all the Jews. This vindicates Abraham Lincoln's saying, that one may

be able to deceive part of the people all the time, but one cannot deceive all the people all the time.

Ignorance is undoubtedly the source of great evils. The vicious brutalities which are committed to-day by masses of people against innocent individuals spring from ignorance. John Huss, seeing an old woman piously adding a log of wood to the stake on which he was to be burnt, exclaimed: "Sancta simplicitas!" The simplicity, however, which to-day drives men to murder and similar crimes is not sacred but vicious, crimes to which they are driven by evil spirits; and those evil spirits can only be fought by convincing enlightenment. Most effective is the spoken, impressive and convincing word. But those whom spoken words cannot reach must be approached with the printed word, in the same way as the outrageous and dastardly lies are spread through thousands of pamphlets. It is impossible to believe that all men and all women are wicked. They are merely misled and misinformed, provoked by fictitious stories which are shamelessly offered as proven facts. Those stories, which poison the minds and the feelings of millions of people, can and must be proved to be false. In my opinion, therefore, it is the sacred and imperative duty of those whose task it is to raise the people out of the night of ignorance and out of the mire of crime, to use every effort — from the pulpit, the platform and, where possible, through the press — to destroy the ever more widely-spreading and destructive plague of prejudice and hatred of men against their fellow-men.

(Continued from page 4.)

MY YEARS IN GERMANY

by *Martha Dodd*. London, VICTOR GOLLANCZ, 1939. pp. 319. 10/6.

A vivid account by the daughter of the United States Ambassador to Germany from 1933 to 1937, of her impressions of Nazism, the Nazi leaders and the European diplomatic scene during that period. Miss Dodd's experiences turned her "natural sympathy for the Germans" into active antagonism to "the destructive international Fascist spirit." The book contains striking portraits of Hitler, Goering, Himmler, Goebbels and many other prominent political personalities, German and non-German, whom she met during her stay in Germany.

Die Oxfordgroep en Rassehaat

● Deur C. J. CLAASSEN

DIE Oxford Groep is 'n groeiende bloeiende organisme sonder 'n organisasie konstitusie of regulasies. Daar bestaan geen lidmaatskap nie. Niemand kan aansluit nie en niemand kan bedank nie. Dit is nie 'n nuwe denominasie nie, dit is 'n nuwe determinasie om 'n nuwe kwaliteit van lewe onder die leiding van God te leef.

Hierdie kwaliteit van lewe word prakties wanneer ek my lewe doelbewus oorgee aan die leiding van God en my lewe dan baseer op die vier standaarde van absolute eerlikheid, absolute reinheid, absolute liefde en absolute onselfsugtigheid.

Daar bestaan geen twyfel dat elke persoon hierdie kwaliteite sal aanbeveel en goedkeur nie. Maar waarom is dit dan nie alreeds van wye toepassing in die wêreld nie? Elkeen wil graag hierdie dinge verwesenlik sien in die lewe van die ander persoon, die ander party en in die ander nasie, met die gevolg dat elkeen wag vir die ander een om te begin. Sodra as ek met myself begin word iets gedaan en dan ook meteens het ek 'n doeltreffende boodskap en getuigenis vir die ander man en vir my nasie, want dan is ek die oplossing. Gevolglik is dit nie meer nodig om 'n oplossing te soek nie. Vermenigvuldig dan hierdie oplossing op 'n groot skaal en my persoonlike en volksprobleme verdwyn. Ek glo dat dit die enigste oplossing vir probleme is en dat geen ander bestaan nie.

Hoe het ek begin? Vir jare lank wou ek graag 'n nuwe mens word deur ontslae te raak van sekere geheime penwortel sondes van oneerlikheid en onreinheid waarvan die uiterlike simbole was 'n gemaskerde gesig, onverdraagsaamheid, liefdeloosheid, jaloesie, afguns, vrees, rassehaat, ens.

Dit is goed om vroeg te leer dat hierdie dinge alleen die uiterlike simbole is van die afwesigheid van God in die hart van die mens. Wel al my wilsinspanning om 'n nuwe lewe te lei was ondoeltreffend. Herhaaldelike gebede om verlossing het gefaal omdat ek probeer het om in my gebede met God eerlik te wees maar dieselfde oneerlike gemaskerde gesig aan my medemens van dag tot dag te vertoon. Dit wou nie en kon nie werk nie.

Aanraking met die Groep het vir my verduidelik dat God 'n plan had vir my lewe en dat daardie plan aan my verduidelik kan word as ek

gewillig is om tyd te gee aan stil te luister na God.

Die eerste stap in God se plan vir my lewe het vir my duidelik geword in my eerste stiltyd toe 'n vriend en ek stil geluister het. Die boodskap was maar eenvoudig: wees absoluut eerlik met God en mens. Dit het ook meteens vir my duidelik geword wie die persoon is met wie ek werklik eerlik moes word aangaande myself en my verlede. Dit was pynlik en baie vernederend, maar iets het gebeur. Die eerlikheid met God en mens het die nekslag gegee aan die twee groot struikelblokke wat gestaan het tussen God en my en tussen my en my medemens, naamlik vrees en hoogmoed. Die gevolg hiervan was die ontworteling van my penwortel sondes en oorwinning daarvoor.

Dit was die begin van die nuwe lewe. Absolute eerlikheid het van my geëis om die verkeerde dinge van die verlede reg te maak. Soos byvoorbeeld verskoning vra aan persone van wie ek geskinner het, belasting terugbetaal wat oneerlik teruggehou was, erken aan my Joodse en Engelse vriende dat ek 'n rassehater was en hulle om vergifnis vra.

Sulke restitusie gepaard met 'n oorgawe aan God, en lewe onder Sy leiding bring vryheid, en die essens van vryheid is om vry van self te wees. Dit meen vir my vryheid van my geheime penwortel sondes, dan volg vryheid van al my haat, vooroordeel en onverdraagsaamheid.

Hierdie nuwe vryheid is aansteeklik, want as ek eerlik my hede en verlede met my vriend deel en hy luister ook na God dan vind ook hy die nuwe vryheid.

Rassehaat "is a fruit sin not a root sin." Dit is alleen 'n simbool van 'n innerlike gebonde lewe. Ek glo dus dat daar geen onderskeid is tussen die man wat 'n slaaf is van rassehaat of 'n slaaf is van sê rook of drink. Al hierdie dinge is simptome van onopgeloste penwortel-sonde.

Dit volg dan natuurlik dat solank as ek nog slaaf is van my penwortel sondes kan ek nie gebruik word om 'n "fruit sin" in iemand anders af te los nie, want wat ek nie het nie kan ek nie gee nie.

Dit is dus duidelik dat die Groep wat geen organisasie is nie, geen houding het teenoor anti-

(Vervolg op bladsy 12.)

EXPERIMENT IN VIVISECTION

The Tragedy of Ernst Toller

● By Dr. H. SONNABEND

THE eventful life of Ernst Toller is quickly told, for his varied struggles had a common denominator: rebellion against what he considered to be unjust. At school, the sensitive youth became victim of the first spiritual trauma caused by Jew-baiting. During the war he served in the artillery, later in a machine-gun detachment, and finally he applied for a transfer to the Air Force, "not for love of adventure, but to get away from mass-living and mass-dying."

The turmoil of the German Revolution made him one of the leaders of the short-lived Munich Republic, then followed defeat, arrest and five long years of imprisonment. An offer of pardon was refused because it did not extend to his comrades. His rise to fame as a poet and playwright was meteoric. It was succeeded by exile without surrender, later passionate activity on behalf of Spain. The Spring of 1939 brought disillusionment, doubt in a better morrow, despair, loneliness and finally the scornful gesture of protest — suicide.

To explain the complex figure of Ernst Toller, the inspired poet and passionate man of action, one must read his book, *I was a German*. This is more than an autobiography — it is an experiment in vivisection. Toller was a German Jew, and when the German seemed to die in him, he attempted, somewhat prematurely, a post-mortem. Toller was cutting into living flesh, for Hitler had not succeeded in making him renounce his German heritage.

The Nazi onslaught merely made him realise that he was not only a German but also "a member of that great race which for centuries had been persecuted, martyred and slain, whose prophets had called the world to righteousness, had exalted

These words, culled from Toller's confessions, reveal the motive force behind most of his dramas, the wretched and oppressed, then and for all time."

Toller has a cruel passion for getting at the truth at any cost. He throws stones into the quiet pool of the inner soul and rejoices when mud comes to the surface. Toller, the revolutionary, was no worshipper of the mass-soul: he considers the masses to be collectively divided against themselves just as modern man is divided against himself. In his play, *Machine Wreckers*, the author

draws a parallel between the irrational elements in modern mass movements and the tragic fate of the Luddites.

In prison, Toller meditated deeply on the ethical position of those who attempt to mould the destiny of mankind. Can this be done without bloodshed, or must the man with a conscience always remain a passive onlooker? Must the man of action always be dogged by guilt? In order to clarify this ethical problem, this ex-chief of a revolutionary army wrote his masterpiece, called *Masses and Men*.

The revolutionary pathos of Toller did not deter him from the poet's search for warmth and beauty. *Swallow Book*, written in prison, is a fine example of intimate, delicate poetry. Two shy little birds became so used to the kindly poet that they built a nest in his cell and twittered playfully while he worked at his table. The beautiful poems were smuggled out and published, and the infuriated prison governor took revenge on the swallows by issuing strict orders to destroy all the nests in the cells of the prisoners. The little birds built no more, but they did not desert the poet. In the evening they would fly into his cell and spend the cold night huddled together.

Toller, released from prison, was still unshaken in his belief in justice and the beauty of sacrifice. He sums up his state of mind at that period: "I was thirty, my hair had turned grey, I was not tired." In his many articles Toller admonishes, criticises and castigates his countrymen. He has many enemies because he represents their conscience. For who likes his own conscience?

Was Toller proud to be a German, or was he proud to be a Jew? This question appears to him ineffably stupid, as if one would ask: "Are you proud to have brown eyes?"

The ruthless enemy drove the sensitive poet to despair, but did not succeed in infecting him with the poison of hatred. Toller felt deeply the common tragedy of all mankind and knew the beauty of forgiveness in its sublimest meaning. In one of his works there is this significant dialogue:—

The persecutor says: "I hate you," and the victim replies: "And still I call you my brother."

IN all countries of European civilisation it is accepted as axiomatic that education must be provided for the children of all citizens, and that it is the duty of the State to see that such provision is made and that parents take advantage of it. The State is concerned to secure that its future citizens have the opportunity to develop their capacities to the full and become useful members of society.

Thus free and compulsory education up to a certain standard is provided also in South Africa for European children; and although for the mass of non-Europeans there is as yet no free education, and the schools that exist are woefully inadequate, conditions are increasingly pressing upon the attention of all who have eyes to see that provision for Natives on a similar basis, at least in urban areas, cannot much longer be delayed.

At first sight it seems a simple matter of organisation to provide schools for all. No doubt it would be in an entirely homogeneous society. But in fact few societies are sufficiently homogeneous for there to be complete agreement regarding the purpose, content and method of education, and on this question there tends to be continuous friction or uneasy compromise. Only on a totalitarian basis, where uniformity is assumed or imposed, is the task of educating the young a comparatively simple matter; and it is one of the dangers of a State educational system that it may be used to create and foster a mass-mentality which becomes a ready instrument to the hand of a dictator.

The diversity that leads to friction is generally religious; but in South Africa this is only one of the factors. There are social, cultural, linguistic differences which, apart altogether from the question of educating the non-Europeans, render it immensely difficult to devise an educational system elastic enough to satisfy all sections of the European population.

CHRISTIAN-NATIONAL SCHOOLS

An example of this difficulty is provided by the very interesting "Volkskongres oor Christelik-Nasionale Onderwys," which was held at Bloemfontein early in July under the auspices of the Federasie van Afrikaanse Kultuurvereniging. The Congress was addressed by a series of speakers each of whom dealt with a different aspect of the educational problem from the standpoint of the Afrikaans-speaking section of the community. If some of the speakers seemed at times to forget

THE PROBLEM OF EDUCATION

A Plea for Radical Diversity

By C. H. RUNGE

that there are other sections to be considered, they were recalled to reality by the Chairman, Dr. E. G. Jansen, who was careful to remind them that "we are not the only South Africans."

Three sound principles were impressed upon the Congress. First, that the primary responsibility for the education of children rests upon their parents, and nobody can take that responsibility from them. In these days, when parents frequently admit that they cannot, or are reluctant to, control and discipline their children, and at the same time schools and teachers are expected to do more and more for their pupils, it is valuable that parental responsibility should be decisively stressed, and the family duly recognised as the fundamental unit of society. That parents should feel more fully, and should have greater opportunities of exercising their responsibility for education, is much to be desired. And as a corollary of this it is equally desirable that there should be close association between home and school. This is the second chief principle emphasised at the Congress. The school should have the same cultural background as the home. The teacher should be one who shares the same language, the same religion, the same general outlook as the parents, so that home and school may be of one piece, and the whole process of education, in which the home influence should be at least as formative as that of the school, as far as possible a unity. The third principle is that the foundation of education is religion, not taught as one among the rest of school subjects, but permeating and inspiring the whole tone and spirit of the school. This, briefly, is the description of the kind of Christian-National school which the Congress would desire. The child is to grow up from roots firmly fixed in the religion, traditions and culture of its own family and its own folk.

THE CAUSE OF FRICTION

But in a country such as this, with its wide diversity of national, cultural and religious tradi-

tions, is it possible to come near to this ideal? Many no doubt would give a firmly negative answer—indeed, would deny that the so-called ideal is desirable at all in our conditions. On the contrary they would claim that it should be the aim of a South African system of education, so far from emphasising the distinct traditions of different groups, to gloss over them and seek to create a common, fully-bilingual, uniform South-Africanism. This would seem to be the policy favoured by most of our educational mentors, but it is open to doubt whether it is likely to be effective in bringing peace, harmony and co-operation between the various sections of the people. Friction is caused less by national and cultural differences than by lack of mutual respect, by suspicion of being despised and by contempt for others, by fear of being overwhelmed and pushed to the wall. It is at least arguable that the remedy is not to try to combine artificially the several traditions, but to encourage each to develop according to its own best nature.

Can this be done in the schools? The speakers claimed that it can, if there is due recognition of the partnership of family and Church with the State in the educational task. They did not desire private, or Church, schools, but State schools in the control of which this partnership should be effectively organised. No wish was expressed to force members of other groups into schools which do not represent their own traditions; on the contrary, equal facilities were demanded for others to maintain schools according to their own traditions.

UNIFORMITY OR DIVERSITY

Would they do so? Would Jews, for example, establish separate schools for their own children if they were assisted to do so? Some Christians have done so. Roman Catholics maintain many schools without State aid, and there is a number of Anglican and other private schools, few of which

receive any, or any substantial, subsidy. But the policy of educational authorities — as exemplified recently in the report of the Transvaal Education Commission — is to discourage private enterprise in education. No doubt a large proportion of parents are satisfied with the schools as they are. A good many people would be chary of admitting Church authorities to a share of control, and would doubt whether bodies of parents would be anything but a rigidly conservative force, inadequately alive to the possibilities of educational progress. Moreover the provision for minorities in any area mainly homogeneous would present considerable difficulties. Nevertheless for those who desire particular types of schools ought not the State to do its best to provide?

The real question at issue is whether in South Africa we should aim at the greatest possible measure of uniformity, or should deliberately adapt ourselves to diversity. The greater part of the strife and bitterness in South African life is due to the fears and suspicions in all sections that the particular quality of their own group is threatened by the existence of the others. Confidence in themselves, and a sense of security within the total national life, is what is chiefly influential in developing in individuals and groups sympathy, understanding and tolerance. We ought surely to be eager to preserve the values which every section can contribute to the common whole, seeking not uniformity but harmony. To this end we need an educational system of the greatest elasticity, designed to produce in all sections of the community men and women self-respecting and self-reliant, able to hold their own and suffering from no sense of inferiority — the prolific source of fear, suspicion and thin-skinned petulance.

A GREETING

Bishop Lavis writes:

Common Sense will be introduced to our Executive at their next meeting, and later to a General Meeting. My own reaction is that the paper is a very valuable asset to our Society, and I believe this will be the general opinion. On behalf of the Cape Town Society, I bid *Common Sense* a very hearty welcome.

SIDNEY W. LAVIS.

*Bishop Co-adjutor of Cape Town,
President of the Society of Jews &
Christians, Cape Town.*

The Dilemma of Our Generation

● by J. L. GRAY

AMONG the many issues that divide thoughtful men to-day one has especial poignancy. It turns on our attitude to war. If we leave aside the absolutist pacifists, there are mainly two opinions. One holds that war to-day must inevitably destroy the future hope of freedom, reason and gentleness and the mission of man on this planet which some of us find holy. The contrary view, while often conceding the dangers of war, maintains that war may be necessary in the last resort to preserve those civilised values against the violence, bluff or chicanery of others to whom they are apparently not so precious. Since most people other than pacifists agree that peace is not an end in itself, the issue between those rival camps involves no question of principle. It must be settled by carefully weighing the evidence. Is the organisation of world peace the greatest of all immediate social and ethical requirements? Or is an even more important condition the overthrow, even through war, of the active enemies of freedom, reason and gentleness? This is the dilemma of our generation.

But what if the dilemma is unreal after all? Can we not have peace *and* freedom? Cannot we take preventive action now to make it impossible for the aggressor, anti-democratic States to disturb either our peace or our freedom?

Peace Through Rearmament?

The concept of peace through rearmament may satisfy the heads of governments, but it cannot appeal to thinking men. The policy of a balance of power has been blown sky-high by history. We have travelled far these last few years from naive ideas of a League of Nations, each retaining its national sovereignty and its incompatible imperialist ends. Sir Alfred Zimmern recently remarked that States keep the peace only if one of them is strong enough to act as world-policeman. Earlier, Mr. Bertrand Russell had seen in a vast American (or perhaps Russian) Empire the only guarantee of peace in the next generation. Mr. Clarence K. Streit, in *Union Now* (Cape, 10/6), pleads with great eloquence and not a little verbosity for a close federal union of some fifteen "democracies" (excluding the U.S.S.R.), headed by the U.S.A., Britain and France. This would act as a gigantic world-policeman, preventing the Axis powers from risking further aggression and thus saving peace and freedom together. The *Pax Democratica* would succeed the *Pax Britannica* now defunct and the *Pax Romana* of history.

To many people, Mr. Streit's proposals have the almost magical quality of enabling us to escape from the cruel dilemma of choosing between peace and freedom. Let us ask, therefore, how far they can achieve each of these objects, saving peace and guaranteeing freedom. Were Mr. Streit's advice to be acted upon to-morrow, we would almost

certainly be spared an imminent war. It is probable, too, that the German and Italian régimes would tend to collapse. But Mr. Streit's proposals are of a kind that simply cannot be carried out quickly. They involve vast constitution-making, dragging on interminably, liable to be held up by all sorts of issues other than the immediate one of resisting Fascism. If time is important, they are greatly inferior to a policy of concluding military alliances for limited purposes. If military calculations matter, they suffer from the fatal defect of ignoring the Soviet Union, which Mr. Streit heartily dislikes.

But Mr. Streit's chief claim is that his proposals are superior to all systems of alliances, Leagues of Nations and the like because they are intrinsically and permanently more desirable, providing a nucleus and a constitution for a genuine world government. This claim is open to grave question. A federal union so vast must be precarious unless it is relatively inflexible (as the American Constitution has proved to be). It must stabilise British rule in India and the oppression of African peoples. Mr. Streit implicitly affirms this. The Federal Government is to come to the rescue of any part of the union threatened with domestic discontent, thus effectively fixing capitalist rule within its vast territory. A scheme which has this effect (Mr. Streit does not conceal his dislike of socialism) can hardly claim much ethical content. His union would emphasise the present inequality in the division of economic and territorial power between the demo-plutocratic empires and the totalitarian "have-not" states, in which the origin of the present crisis is to be found. The author practically ignores the Far Eastern question, which may soon be of overwhelming importance. He completely neglects the Marxist argument that capitalism is a more potent cause of economic crisis and war than state sovereignty. He does not tell us *how* the peoples of Germany, Italy and Japan are to change their form of government and join the Union of Democratic Chums. Can it be otherwise than through socialist rebellion, which Mr. Streit's Union would do its utmost to crush?

An Escapist.

It will not do. Mr. Streit is merely an old-fashioned idealist escapist, playing into the hands of reaction. Surely of all important things to do the most important of them all is *not* to stabilise the *status quo*, *not* to commit ourselves irrevocably to a union of the existing "haves" against the "have-nots." I am compelled to believe that temporary peace on Mr. Streit's terms would endanger those values I hold most dear much more than a war ending in the defeat of the Axis powers, provided that we encouraged the German and other peoples to over-

(Continued on page 14.)

THE RISING TIDE

● By A. W. ("Tubby") EATON

Scientists Rally to Defence of Democracy.

THE expulsion of thousands of Europe's best brains from dictatorship countries has provided democracy with a new bastion against the inroads of Fascism. "Ultimately democracy," says Spain's leading civil refugee, ex-Foreign Minister and philosopher Salvador de Madariaga, "is the application to collective use of the method of trial and error inaugurated in science by the era of freedom of thought, and if at times it is irritating because of its stress on error, it must be maintained at all costs because of the importance of trial." Recently 1,500 leading American scientists issued a manifesto affirming the organic connection between freedom of thought and democracy.

"We firmly believe," the manifesto declared, "that in the present historical epoch democracy alone can preserve intellectual freedom. Any attack upon freedom of thought in one sphere, even as non-political a sphere as theoretical physics, is in effect an attack on democracy itself. When men like James Franck, Albert Einstein, or Thomas Mann may no longer continue their work, whether the reason is race, creed, or belief, all mankind suffers the loss. They must be defended in their right to speak the truth as they understand it. If we American scientists wish to avoid a similar fate, if we wish to see the world continue to progress and prosper, we must bend our efforts to that end now."

A loss to the dictatorships is a gain to democracy. So pleased are the Americans with the calibre of some of the refugees that gravitate in their direction, that they now and then trot out the commentary: "Thank you, Dictators." In New York City a University in Exile has been founded primarily to offer refuge to scholars and philosophers driven out of Germany and Italy on account of their political faith or race.

J. P. Priestley on an "Old Game."

Where science leads, art and literature cannot be far behind. In the "News-Chronicle" of July 17th, J. B. Priestley, the famous novelist, launches a trenchant attack on "anti-Semitism, or the dirty old game of Jew-baiting," in reply to an anonymous letter advocating that England be purged of the Jews, "the scum of Europe."

"Compare this 'scum of Europe'," replies Priestley, "with what has been left behind in Germany. Make a list of the great Jewish exiles, headed by that saint of mathematicians, Einstein, and then compare their characters, their reputations, their attainments, with those

There is a rising tide of opinion in democratic countries against the menace of racialism and the fomenting of discord between nations, races and groups for political or economic reasons. These columns will each month reflect the growing consensus of democratic opinion that there are no problems which cannot be resolved by the application of common sense, goodwill and democratic procedure.

of the Nazi leaders. If you had a city and could choose its citizens, which group would you choose? 'Those terrible Jews, who, owing to some mysterious intrigue, have been given so many Nobel prizes, or the noble and wise Hitler, the friendly, truthful Goebbels, the compassionate Himmler, and the sagacious Von Ribbentrop?'

Station F - A - C - T.

Truth is catching up with prejudice. At an early stage in the history of the Nazi regime the Reich propaganda Ministry began to bombard radio listeners in the democracies with panegyrics of Nazism and attacks on democracy and democratic statesmen. For a time radio stations in the democracies scrupulously avoided any counter-attacks for fear of being accused of political partisanship. Recently the B.B.C. found a means of counter-attack far more potent than that of substituting rival political doctrines. Their method is that of a quiet objective statement of facts by recognised authorities. A short while ago they broadcast a series of talks on the history of the Jews by the Rev. J. W. Parkes, the well-known authority, in the course of which many notorious forgeries (among them the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion") employed to discredit the Jews were exposed. In South Africa, on May 26th, the prominent educationalist and scientist, Dr. S. H. Skaife, during a school broadcast, addressed the primary standards on the Palestine problem. He gave short accounts of Arab and Jewish history, Zionism, Arab Nationalism and emphasised the necessity of a factual approach and a correct historical perspective. Prejudice flounders badly among facts. Let us hope that the wireless will become democracy's front line in its battle for truth.

For Christians.

Thomas Babington Macaulay, speaking on Jewish disabilities in the House of Commons in 1831:

"If all the red-haired people in Europe had during centuries been outraged and oppressed, banished from this place, imprisoned in that, deprived of their money, deprived of their teeth, convicted of the most improbable crimes on the feeblest evidence, dragged at horses'

tails, hanged, tortured, burned alive, if, when manners became milder, they had still been subject to debasing restrictions and exposed to vulgar insults, locked up in particular streets in some countries, pelted and ducked by the rabble in others, excluded everywhere from magistracies and honours, what would be the patriotism of gentlemen with red hair?"

Whose problem — Jews' or Christians'?

A Well-beloved Minister.

The Rev. M. I. Cohen, M.B.E., who passed away in Bulawayo last month, was, during his years of service in that community, a standing refutation to the allegation of Jewish self-segregation and separateness. His charity and service knew no boundaries of race or creed, and he will be long remembered by Jews and Christians alike in Rhodesia for his unsparing efforts on their behalf.

The following tribute from the editor of the Bulawayo "Sunday News," a Christian, is evidence of the esteem in which he was generally held:

"Perhaps the greatest asset possessed by the Rev. M. I. Cohen was his ability to effect a working arrangement and understanding with people of all types, colours and creeds. It was his essential humanity, breadth of vision and tolerance of the other man's point of view that won him such a great recognition not only among the members of his own congregation but among those people who were of different religions or were labouring for a cause that was far removed from that usually entered into by a Rabbi."

The late Mr. Cohen followed in a distinguished tradition of communal service established by the Rev. Mr. Joel Rabinowitz, a beloved Jewish minister at the Cape during the latter half of last century, and ably continued by such men as the late Dr. Bender, of Capetown, whose efforts on behalf of the University and public charities will be long remembered.

Christianity Against Race Hatred.

Recognising that the growing anti-Semitism in the United States is a serious threat to the principles of democracy and of Christianity, and that some Catholics have been deceived into taking part in this campaign, a group of Catholics in New York has organised the *Committee of Catholics to fight Anti-Semitism*. The Committee announces that it is now ready to go ahead with its work of combating anti-Semitism and will issue a tabloid-size paper that will endeavour to present Christian teachings against racial bigotry.

An appeal to Christian churches to co-operate in eradicating anti-Semitism in the Church and the American community is contained in the current issue of *Information Service*, publication of the *Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America*. It includes a report entitled "Current Manifestations of Organised Anti-Semitism," which was prepared for the guidance of ministers and religious workers. It contradicts charges made by anti-Semitic propagandists against Jews and urges that the relation of such propaganda to Nazi methods be revealed by churchmen wherever possible.

The report states: "Of most concern to socially-minded clergymen, educators and social workers at the present juncture is the artificially inspired anti-Semitism that is copying the technique of German Fascism."

The Voice of the South African Churches.

The Church in South Africa, too, is not blind to the dangers. In a recent issue of *Die Hervormer*, Dr. Engelbrecht, of the Theological Faculty of the University of Pretoria, declared that South Africa must reject both Nazism and Communism. He pointed out that while the danger of Communism is obvious inasmuch as it rejects religion openly, the danger of Nazism is less clearly perceived, as it seeks to foster a new religion, based on the deification of the State and the Leader.

In its July issue, the *Catholic Times*, Johannesburg, reprints an article from *Commonweal*, entitled the "Crime of Anti-Semitism," by Nicholas A. Berdyaev, the well-known Orthodox writer and philosopher now residing in Paris. Berdyaev condemns anti-Semitism as blasphemous, un-Christian, and asserts the divine election of the Jewish people. He attacks racialism as un-Catholic and unscientific and brilliantly disposes of the allegation of a "Jewish world plot." He supports the view of Jacques Maritain that "it is a fact that the idea of social justice was introduced into human thought chiefly by the Jews."

DIE OXFORDGROEP EN RASSEHAAT

(*Vervolg van bladsy 6.*)

semitisme nie maar ek as 'n Groeper is absoluut oortuig dat die Vereeniging van Jode en Kristene kan slaag in sy doel alleen tot die mate waartoe die Vereeniging geslaag het om rassehaat op te los by sy eie lede deur hulle te bevry van hulle eie geheime penwortel sondes.

The Myth of "International Jewry"

● By G. CHAGY

ONE of the main barriers to a reasonable understanding of contemporary problems is a linguistic one. We tend, for example, to apply proper names to objects which they no longer fit or to apply them indiscriminately.

All persons, for instance, would agree to use the term "England" to denote a specific geographical area. It is extremely doubtful, however, whether the inhabitant of a distressed area, a country squire, a banker and a factory employer would agree as to the political connotations of the term "England." Where the differences are far-reaching the use of "England" in such newspaper headlines as "England Stands Firm" or "England Backs Chamberlain," is apt to cause considerable resentment among large sections of the population.

It is particularly important to bear these preliminary observations in mind when dealing with any aspect of the "Jewish problem." Where the atmosphere is charged with emotion, slack thinking is usually the rule and there is an almost irresistible tendency to concentrate the emotional flow by using the most general terms, because they are least liable to introduce intellectual difficulties and hesitation.

World Conspiracy.

In recent years men as different in outlook as Norman Thomas, Hilaire Belloc, Goebbels and Yeats-Brown have propagated the myth of a stranglehold of "International Jewry." "Jewry," they argue, controls international finance, the Press (surprising how much anti-Semitic propaganda they tolerate!), all essential raw materials, etc. They are even, according to the Nazi version, engaged in a world conspiracy to destroy Christian civilisation by debauching morals and by constantly fomenting economic and political trouble.

Who and what is "Jewry"? Is it composed of people like M. Litvinoff or Kaganovitch, whom Goebbels describes as atheistic-communists and whose regime was responsible for prohibiting the teaching of Judaism and the propagation of Zionist ideals? Is it composed of men like Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, of the Holy Blossom Synagogue, Toronto, Canada, who is one of the most bitter opponents of Zionism and the spiritual leader of a large and growing body of Jewish opinion maintaining that the Jews as Jews are neither a race, nation or religion?

Do those who preach the fable of International Jewry perhaps mean thereby the 5½ million Jews in East Central Europe? If they do, what amazingly

clumsy plotters the Jewish people must be! Of the 3½ million Jews in Poland two million of them are in a state of semi-starvation. Many of the remainder carry on a marginal existence under the threat of some new economic *numerus clausus*, which already bars the majority of Polish Jews from the civil service, the professions and, with the growth of Government-fostered co-operatives, from trade and commerce. In Rumania, Hungary and the Baltic countries the Jews are rapidly being deprived of their minority rights and struggle desperately to earn a living. In Germany, the home of the fable of Jewish Monopoly, in her Austrian and Czecho-Slovakian possessions, and in Italy, the Jews are pariahs.

Or does the fable intend by "Jewry" people like Ernst Lissauer, the German patriot who composed the famous hymn of hate against England, passionately sung in 1914 by millions of ardent Germans? Or do they mean Jews like Otto Weininger, the most merciless, virulent and brilliant exponent of Germanic anti-Semitism? Or men like Disraeli, the leader of British Tory Imperialism? Or Jews like Heine, whose poetry Matthew Arnold described as a blend of "French modernism and clearness with German sentiment and fullness?" Or Anatole France, the spiritual descendant of Voltaire, whose writing is in every particular instinct with "l'esprit francais"?

Poor Plotters?

Or can they possibly mean men like Ehrlich, who discovered salvarsan, or Wassermann, who helped check the scourge of syphilis, or Traube, who first discovered the medical use of digitalin for heart disease, or Kohler, who perfected the use of cocaine, or Minkowsky, who invented the use of insulin, or those brilliant Nobel Prize men, Politzer, Baranja, Warburg, Jadasshon, Bloch, Frankel . . . ? Or were these men such stupid representatives of "the plot of world Jewry" that they dedicated the whole of their lives and made public, knowledge which would benefit Christian and Jew alike?

The myth of "Jewish solidarity" must sound an ironical note for the Jewish masses in the ghettos of Poland, where there are no less than 32 separate and distinct Jewish parties who are totally unable to unite on any common programme; where the 35 Jewish members of the first Polish Sejm were divided into six warring Jewish parties. The Jewish agudist (or rigidly orthodox Jew) would vehemently deny the Jewishness of reform Rabbis of the type of Rabbi Eisendrath quoted above. The Bundist or Jewish Socialist in Eastern Europe condemns orthodox Jewry as reactionary representatives of medievalism and attacks Zionism

as an ideology of bourgeois imperialists. Jewish communists in Palestine strive desperately to stir up the Arabs against the "Jewish invasion." The Yiddish-speaking Jew in the East End of London is completely alien to "old school tie" Englishmen of the type of Viscount Samuel or Hore Belisha. Einstein is separated in outlook and culture by an almost astro-physical vastness from the stuffy conservative bourgeois who form part of the plutocracy of New York's Park Avenue or London's West End.

What international plot could the 100,000 Jewish soldiers who fought for the German Fatherland have been concocting when they poured their fire into the ranks of their co-religionists in the Allied lines? What was the nature of the "solidarity" between Lieut.-General Sir John Monash (of East Prussian Jewish ancestry), who was in command of the Australian forces on the Western front, and the German Jew, Prof. Fritz Haber, who during the war organised the German Chemical Industry and discovered how to produce ammonia from nitrogen in the air, and hydrogen—a discovery which enabled Germany to carry on their agriculture in the absence of essential imports and products?

In what sense, then, if any, can we use the term "Jewry"?

"Jewries"—not "Jewry."

In the light of the foregoing facts we find it difficult to use the term "Jewry" significantly. There are many Jews who are rich, and many who take an important part in economic life, but nearly half the Jewish people are not only poor, but desperately poor. Their culture, their outlook, their hopes, are as much influenced by their material circumstances and surroundings as are those of any other people.

Perhaps the term "Jewries" would be less misleading. A large section of the Jewish people are guided by common religious traditions, worship the same God and obey His precepts in the manner prescribed in a common body of ritual. But then a great number of Western Jews have never attended a synagogue service and an even greater number are wholly unfamiliar with Judaism as a religion and way of life. Of those who are religious some are rich, some are poor, and it is as difficult to infer social solidarity among them because of a common religion as it is to infer a common outlook among such Christians as Upton Sinclair, J. P. Morgan, Chamberlain and John Strachey.

A great number of Jews are Zionists and have subordinated their economic and cultural differences to the common ideal of a Jewish National Home. But many Jews, particularly in the United Kingdom and the United States, are not Zionists and have from the very inception of the movement presented an influential opposition to it.

It would seem that if there is any solidarity among the Jews it is the negative solidarity of the equally persecuted. Negative, because the organisations for mutual assistance which Jews have formed all over the world, are not informed by any common body of political doctrines but are motivated by considerations of common fear, common dangers and a common memory of persecution. Out of these efforts has been reborn a heightened consciousness of the dignity and worth of the individual. The Jews have through persecution discovered anew the idea of the brotherhood of man and if there is any common body of opinion which can be called the opinion of "Jewry" it is perhaps that the dignity of man cannot be maintained in a world where the insular mentality predominates and nations strain towards each others' throats. If the persecuted Jew seeks to realise ideals of social justice of whatever kind it is social justice for all and not merely his own kind. He remembers the enjoinder of his religion to promote the welfare of the city to which God has led him (Jeremiah xxix, 7). And if he has forsaken the religion of his fathers he knows from bitter experience the lesson of political economy that the welfare of the city must be his welfare; that an economic—to say nothing of an ideal—community of interests must exist among all the inhabitants of a country. But there is no one conception of social justice which all or even a large section of the Jews would pursue. Jews will to-day, as they have in the past, be determined in their actions by their feelings towards the country whose language is their mother tongue and whose civilisation has become a part of themselves.

THE DILEMMA OF OUR GENERATION

(Concluded from page 10.)

throw their rulers by making promises that we should genuinely attempt to perform. That will not be done by the ruling classes of to-day. Only when we have given up the ambition of exclusive empire, unbridled profit-making and class-rule shall we be nearer to realising our heart's desire—the desire of enjoying peace and freedom together.

"In Polish Woods"

● Reviewed by H. JENKINS

This is a publication of some importance, for *In Polish Woods** is the first novel to be translated into English by an author who is generally recognized as one of the most distinguished Yiddish writers of the present day. One may say at once that for an English reader it is no ordinary novel, but a rich compelling picture of Jewish life in nineteenth-century Poland, steeped in an atmosphere in which high imagination and popular superstition are curiously blended, broken by tantalising glimpses into a deep but rather exclusive culture. Writing in Yiddish, the author has been able to assume an acquaintance with a folk tradition which the ordinary non-Jewish reader will hardly be able to bring to the book; but the whole conception belongs so much to the spirit of a race that it must of necessity offer difficulties to an alien mind. Yet in that itself lies part of the book's value.

The somewhat diffuse incidents of *In Polish Woods* are linked together by the odd figure of Mordecai, the hero, if such he can be called. I say "odd" because, as a person, Mordecai is only imperfectly realized. At times the author attempts an insight into the mind and dimly apprehended feelings of the boy, at times transfigures him into a symbol of the regeneration of the Jewish spirit, and at times makes use of him as a mere spectator while he paints graphically objective pictures of the thronging Jews in the courtyard of the rabbi at Kotzk, or of the Polish peasantry rising in revolt against the oppressive landowners. In this realistic vein is such a superbly sharp-lined sketch as that describing the quarrel between the peasant and the widow whose pig has trespassed, or the tavern, thick with Hassidim, of which the very colour and smell seem to come undiluted to the senses. Figures like those of the wizened old rabbi, a dried secular scholar bewildered by the religious enthusiasm which it is his function to try and crystallise, and of the fanatic Barefoot Israel, with his violent and sinister curses, show an understanding and creative imagination of a higher order. One can well perceive that Opatoshu is a master of the short story. In a novel, he has the range and fecundity for a work perhaps of even epic size; but, if this single book is any evidence, he lacks the co-ordinating power which can incorporate a vast conception within a unified design. Mordecai neither dominates the scene nor subordinates himself to a place within it. The objective pictures of Jewish life are never fused with the mystical imagination which shines through rather than illumines the book.

In his revelation of Mordecai's mind the author achieves neither the meticulous detail of the writers who pour out streams of consciousness, nor the artistic

and psychological consistency which justifies an arbitrary selection of the boy's imaginings. When his revelation is successful, it is achieved by a purely intuitive insight, not by any intellectual analysis. And his intuitions seem to make him more aware of some mysterious cosmic force than of any human individuality. What is primarily significant in Mordecai is his rhapsodic dreaming. Reb Yossel, amid his translation of *Faust*, also has his dreams; Dooshke and Rebekah, the daughters of the rabbi, practise a sort of weird spiritualism; the enlightened Jew, Kahane, goes frantic in a wild narrative; and Reb Itshe, Mordecai's instructor, is filled with awful prophesying. All these dreams and visions do not really belong to the characters: they seem rather a projection of the author's own imagination. Yet though blurred and incoherent, they are indubitably authentic, and it is in his mystic world that Opatoshu generates his highest emotional power. Its relation with the tangible world is but arbitrarily imposed. Mordecai listens to Felicia playing and to Kahane's frenzy, he reads the confused raptures of Komarovski in his passionate letter; then Mordecai goes to bed and ponders and imagines, until

Something in Mordecai blazed up, and then was extinguished. His whole body, it seemed, was fettered in thongs; he began to tear at them with his nails, like a madman. The structure that he had inherited from generations began to wobble; it threatened to collapse. The fire inside him leaped about the ruins and consumed them as if they had been so much dry straw. He felt that he was shaking off everything—was being freed from the past—becoming a new man.

Compared with this the Christian idea of being born again seems almost a rational process. But the essence of Christianity is to be found in a body of ordered doctrine. The Christian mystics have created their mystical experiences out of a compact faith. To the Jew the prophetic vision seems more natural, and from the vision itself springs the faith and the sense of the divine. The Christian Bible is in reality the New Testament; the European cultures have never been able to absorb comfortably the Old Testament prophecy. And it is to the Old Testament prophets that we must turn if we would appreciate the spirit in which this book has its roots. It continues the threads that the prophets began to weave on Mount Moriah and that to this day have not been severed. The pattern of the threads is difficult to discern, the meaning of the prophecy often obscure. But one remembers Opatoshu's own words, of his character, Kahane: "To tell a tale the way he had just told it was no trick; anybody could do it . . . It was simply literature."

*by Joseph Opatoshu. Translated from the Yiddish by Isaac Goldberg. Philadelphia: the Jewish Publication Society of America. 1938.

RECENT ACTIVITIES OF THE SOCIETY

Johannesburg.

On the 26th June a film depicting Jewish life in Palestine was shown under the auspices of the Society. The attendance was very satisfactory and the public greatly appreciated the picture of Jewish colonisation work. The film, whilst very realistic in its general conception, is noteworthy for its artistic excellence.

An informal meeting of the Society took place on the 9th of August, when Adv. Lucas, K.C., gave an address *Why is Anti-Semitism on the Increase?* Mr. Lucas pointed out that economic distress offers the most fertile ground for the seeds of racialism and anti-Semitism. It is true that the dislike of the unlike is a common characteristic of all humanity, but this antipathy becomes dangerous only when large masses of people are grinded by poverty and economic insecurity. The attendance was good and an animated discussion followed the illuminating address. Father Runge was in the chair and Prof. Hoernlé moved a vote of thanks.

Kimberley.

The Society of Jews and Christians in Kimberley have undertaken an ambitious schedule of activities for the near future. Attempts will be made to place copies of Society publications in both languages in the Kimberley Public Library and to distribute the Society's literature in the country districts. Efforts will also be made to extend the activities of the Society to the country areas by arranging that some of the better-known families in each place organise drawing-room meetings which could be attended by Kimberley members. Arrangements are also being made for an "Arts" evening, at which various speakers will discuss the Jewish contributions to Music, Medicine, Science, Religion, Art and Literature. Members of the Society have been invited to address meetings arranged by various organisations in Kimberley.

It is hoped that a Public Meeting may be arranged in the near future, which will be addressed by a person prominent in South African affairs.

Cape Town.

An interesting lecture entitled *All Sorts and Conditions of Jews* was delivered by Dr. J. Herman at the Cape Town Y.M.C.A. Open Forum. Dr. Herman, who spoke on behalf of the Society of Jews and Christians, warned against the dangers of generalising about a people. It is dangerous, he said, to talk of "types" in connection with races. "There are many Scots who are generous, in contradiction to the 'stingy' type of the comic yarn; there are many Englishmen with sensitive feelings and intellects, in contradiction to the traditional practical-minded John Bull. How much more dangerous is it to postulate a "type" in connection with the Jews, who during their dispersion have been scattered to the four corners of the earth and have assimilated certain qualities from all the races with whom they have been in contact?" Referring to the Jewish participation in

commerce and the professions, Dr. Herman showed how adaptable the Jew was to agricultural and mechanical work once he was given an opportunity to engage in work in those fields.

HENRY GEORGE CENTENARY.

PREPARATIONS are now being made in many countries for the celebration of the centenary of the birthday — September 2, 1839 — of Henry George.

Between 1877 and 1879. Henry George was engaged upon writing his magnum opus, *Progress and Poverty*. During this period—in June, 1878—he delivered before the Young Men's Hebrew Association of San Francisco a lecture on "Moses." In after years the lecture was repeated in many other places, and it has come to be generally recognised as the most eloquent of all Henry George's addresses. Such is now its fame that several quotations from it are to be found in the Chief Rabbi's *Commentary on the Pentateuch* and *Book of Jewish Thoughts*. What specially struck Henry George's imagination was the practical morality of the Mosaic code. "Its Sabbath day and Sabbath year secure, even to the lowliest, rest and leisure. With the blast of the jubilee trumpets the slave goes free, the debt that cannot be paid is cancelled, and a redivision of the land secures again to the poorest his fair share in the bounty of the common Creator.

To Henry George it seemed that the spirit—not necessarily the exact forms—of this Hebrew policy needed to be applied to the solution of present-day problems. In 1879 appeared his *Progress and Poverty*, which directed attention to the fundamental importance of questions of land tenure and taxation. This work acknowledges the author's indebtedness to David Ricardo's "law of rent," and also makes interesting references to the Jewish historical researches of Emanuel Deutsch.

Henry George's writings have had considerable influence on Jewish thought. One of his disciples was Rabbi Felix Perles (1874-1933), of Königsberg. In a contribution to the *Jewish Review*, of London, entitled *Social Justice in Ancient Israel*, the distinguished scholar discusses the influence of Judaism on the social education of humanity, frequently quoting and confirming the remarks of Henry George on this topic. He concludes that the Jewish mission is to promote social justice as an essential prerequisite to peace between men and nations. It is interesting to note that the Jewish National Fund is founded on the principles that the land purchased in Palestine should be the common inalienable property of the Jewish people, that the cultivation of the soil should be encouraged, and land speculation prevented.

Secretaries of affiliated Societies are requested to send regular reports of their functions and other activities for insertion in Common Sense. These should reach us not later than the last day of each month.

The first issue of "Common Sense" has met with an encouraging response.

HELP US TO CARRY ON OUR WORK.

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

MEMBERS

of the Society of Jews and Christians, whether in Johannesburg or elsewhere, are invited to send their annual subscription of 3/- (three shillings); and

NON-MEMBERS

are invited to send their annual subscription of 4/- (four shillings)

to

COMMON SENSE,

P.O. Box 7791,

Johannesburg.

To: COMMON SENSE,
P.O. Box 7791, Johannesburg.

Please Post this Slip.

I ^{am} _____* a member of the Society of Jews and Christians, and
I ^{am not} _____*

herewith enclose my annual subscription of _____* for
three shillings
four shillings

COMMON SENSE.

NAME
(please use block letters)

ADDRESS

* *Strike out the words which do not apply.*

Common Sense

: **C O N T E N T S** :

War and Common Sense (<i>Editorial</i>).....	3
Boomerang Propaganda by <i>Dr. H. Sonnabend</i>	5
Some Historic Forgeries by <i>G. Saron</i>	6
The Position of Jewry To-day by <i>the Hon. J. H. Hofmeyr</i>	8
On "Christian-National" Education by <i>R. F. Alfred Hoernlé</i>	11
The Rising Tide by <i>the Rev. A. W. ("Tubby") Eaton</i>	13
Die Hugonote deur <i>Adv. G. F. de Vos Hugo</i>	14
Letters to the Editor.....	15
Activities of the Society.....	2

P U B L I S H E D M O N T H L Y

VOL. 1. NO. 3.

SEPTEMBER 1939

PRICE 4d.

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper

Common Sense

"Common Sense" is published monthly by the
Society of Jews and Christians, Johannesburg.

Subscription:

The subscription to *Common Sense* is 3/- per annum to members (or 3d. per copy); and 4/- per annum to non-members (or 4d. per copy). Post free.

Copies may be ordered from the Secretaries, P.O. Box 7791, Johannesburg, as well as from the Secretaries of Affiliated Societies in other centres of the Union.

Editorial Board:

C. J. CLAASSEN	C. H. S. RUNGE
A. W. EATON	G. SARON
R. F. A. HOERNLE	H. SONNABEND

THE SOCIETY OF JEWS AND CHRISTIANS: RECENT ACTIVITIES

Bulawayo.

The Society of Jews and Gentiles in Bulawayo is functioning actively. A successful social evening was held at the Jewish Guild Hall on Thursday, 17th August. The invitations were issued by His Worship the Mayor and Mayoress of Bulawayo, Councillor and Mrs. T. A. E. Holdengarde, who acted as hosts. There was an excellent atmosphere of good fellowship, and over 200 people were present.

In his address of welcome the Mayor explained the origin, aims and objects of the Society, which, he said, was founded just over 12 months ago. "Already," the Mayor said, "those interested in the Society have, since its formation, noticed greater understanding and co-operation between people in the town." He hoped that the gathering would have a far-reaching influence on the people of Bulawayo. "Personal contact is what is required," he said, "and that contact is what we are offering you to-night."

Musical items were rendered by Mesdames J. J. Abdela (who was in charge of the musical programme), N. Isaacson, Basil Price, A. W. Paddie and by Messrs. M. Griffiths and J. James.

Johannesburg.

OFFER OF SPEAKERS

The Society has always considered that one of the most effective ways in which it can carry out its work is by providing speakers to other organisations. We are glad to say that quite a number of Societies have received our speakers, whose talks have usually been very much appreciated.

The Society wishes once again to bring this phase of its activities to the notice of the public and especially

of those who are actively associated with other organisations. Requests for speakers (with suggestions as to the subject which would be preferred) should be addressed to the Secretaries, P.O. Box 7791, Johannesburg.

Capetown.

The Capetown Society can congratulate itself on a very successful function held on August 22nd, when Rabbi I. Abrahams delivered an address to a large audience at the Cathedral Hall, under the auspices of the Society, on "The Talmud." The Right Rev. S. W. Lavis, Co-Adjutor Bishop of Capetown, presided. He said that the Society was very much alive, and the Executive was arranging a panel of speakers to address Societies.

Rabbi Abrahams' address was a masterly and comprehensive exposition of the history and nature of the Talmud. It was, he said a work *sui generis*. It had been called a sea, and into it the stream of Jewish thought had flowed for a thousands years. For the rabbis of the Talmud, religion and life were synonymous. They turned the injunctions of the Bible into legal enactments, binding on the individual, but they were not guided by the letter of the Law alone, but by the spirit, too, and by their sense of equity. By quotations from the Talmud, Rabbi Abrahams showed that the Jews were interested in the forgiveness and salvation of other nations besides their own. Most of the statements attributed to the Talmud by anti-Semites were fabrications or distortions from their context.

Mr. A. Friedlander, M.P., proposed, and Mr. Watermeyer seconded, a vote of thanks to Rabbi Abrahams.

Before the address, Miss Richfield sang and Miss Ruth Cohen played pianoforte solos.

AN APOLOGY — AND AN APPEAL

We regret that owing to the outbreak of war, this issue of Common Sense has been slightly delayed. Future issues, it is hoped, will be up to time.

May we also make an appeal to readers to send in their subscriptions? Subscriptions have been coming

in steadily, but we should like to have many more. The amount (3/- for members and 4/- for non-members) should be sent to Common Sense, P.O. Box 7791, Johannesburg.

THE EDITORS.

War and Common Sense

AN appeal to the arbitrament of war is clearly a direct denial of the principles of reason. The ordeal by battle is as little consonant with common sense as the ancient methods of ordeal by fire or water. What can men prove of right and wrong, how can they adjust conflicting interests, by battering one another to pieces with high explosives? Plainly, war is not merely evil, it is lamentably silly.

Moreover, it cannot be said, as it could be said in 1914, that Europe does not realise what forces it is letting loose. We have had experience of modern war, and we know what it involves. Yet war has come again in Europe, and for another space, maybe of years, the minds of a large portion of "civilised" mankind will be occupied with problems of destruction,—how to defeat the enemy, instead of how to organise peaceful co-operation for the happiness and well-being of mankind. "Oh, Iago; the pity of it!"

The Real Issue

Yet who shall profess to apportion the blame? On one side and another there have been faults, weaknesses, hesitations, chicanery. In spite of common interests, common civilisation, mutual dependence, each sovereign state organises itself for rivalry with other states, but gives little, if any, attention to the machinery of genuine collaboration. It is assumed that national interests must conflict, and that force, or the threat of force, will have the last word. So the materials are kept ready to hand, and, when the moment seems favourable, or when threats alone have proved unavailing, reason is abandoned and resort is had to the ordeal by battle.

War has at last broken out. There is no doubt who has been the aggressor. The tragedy is that, whereas some of the aggressor's first claims appeared substantially just, only the threat of force enabled him to realise them. *L'appétit vient en mangeant*, and since threats were successful, threats have been repeated. From demands that could be justified, the threatener passed on to demands which could not, and which rode roughshod over the rightful liberties of others.

The aggressor can no longer plead extenuating circumstances. The mind of National-Socialism,

which glorifies war and justifies lies and broken faith, has been advertised to the world in Herr Hitler's own book. It is indeed surprising for how long others have tried to negotiate with the German Führer on the basis of respect for the plighted word. But they have failed to restrain him. The rulers of Germany have stuck to the principles of *Mein Kampf*.

It cannot be too often repeated that the particular matter of Danzig and the Polish Corridor is only the occasion of this war; it is not the real issue at stake. It has been asked on both sides: "What have Germany's arrangements with Poland and Danzig to do with Great Britain and France?" It will be asked again from time to time. The answer is that the Allies are much less interested in this particular matter, though there is much to be said which contradicts what the question implies, than they are with the German denial of international order and justice, with the use of armed force in pursuit of their purpose, and with the threat to the independence of weaker nations. This is the point at issue to-day, and no references to the harshness of the Treaty of Versailles, the wrongs that Germany suffered, the positive achievements of the Nazi regime, or the faults of the Allied nations, should be allowed to obscure it. For the fact that it has come to war, no nation is free from responsibility and a share of the blame; but that does not alter what the war is about.

Neutrality and Independence

Doubtless a large proportion of the people of South Africa would like to contract out of the whole business. At this distance, why should we be concerned? Let those who have ties of kinship or sentiment with either side go and take part in the struggle if they will. South Africa as a whole is not concerned, unless her own immediate safety and independence are threatened. Surely that is a view short-sighted in the extreme. The real issues do concern every nation of the world. The world is one, and all nations are bound together in mutual dependence. There is no such thing as complete independence. If the smaller nations of Europe closely preserve their neutrality, that is because they are small and fear immediate loss; it cannot be because they are indifferent to the

principles at stake. If greater nations hold aloof, it is because they feel secure in their own power, or in their distance from the field of combat.

South Africa might take the same line as other small nations. It is not an heroic line; but it is comprehensible, if no subject for applause, when one who can contribute little to restrain a powerful aggressor prefers not to get involved in the fight. Yet for South Africa the matter is more complicated. She is a free member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and enjoys certain advantages and is under certain obligations in virtue of that membership. All the other members, with the possible exception of Eire, whose position is not yet clear, have freely decided to support the Allies. For the Union to stand out would be an act more positive and significant than the neutrality of any other independent state, especially since South Africa itself is not immediately threatened by the enemy. For, apart from the difficulty of fulfilling the obligations undertaken, to maintain normal relations with Germany in present circumstances has the force not of a declaration of neutrality, but of a declaration in favour of Germany's present rulers and all they stand for.

South Africa's Task

There are surely not many South Africans who would wish to adopt this attitude. But the words "neutrality" and "independence" have been bandied about until each has been overlaid with an emotional significance which inhibits the unprejudiced consideration of present issues. To declare "neutrality" at this juncture has been made the test of South Africa's "independence," to the detriment of dispassionate consideration of what attitude it is in South Africa's interest, or her duty, to adopt. If it were not for the emotions attached to these words, there seems little reason why the policy of minimal participation, as laid down in the four paragraphs of General Smuts's amendment, should not have been accepted by all South Africans who desire harmony in the Union.

It is deeply to be regretted that we are still so far from able to reach agreement on such a question as this, and that the world-tragedy of another European war only accentuates our local differences. For in truth the outbreak of war lays upon us more urgently than ever the task of creating in South Africa the opposite temper to that which has produced this appalling result. We have on a small scale in this country our full

share of the racial, religious, temperamental, traditional differences that may lead to strife. Yet we depend upon each other, and it is in the interest of us all to reconcile our differences and to establish in collaboration a just and harmonious social order.

It can only be done by mutual respect, by frank and honest counsel, by eschewing prejudice and suspicion, by "forbearing one another in charity." It is a task far more difficult and exacting than warfare. It calls for a greater self-discipline, a greater exercise of intelligence, patience, courage — of all the qualities of men at their noblest level. If the dreadful example of war in Europe can persuade us to lay to heart the causes that lead to war, and to strive earnestly to create here at least the temper of peace, this will be the best South Africa can do for her own well-being, and the best contribution she can make to allaying the miseries of a suffering world.

C.H.S.R.

BOOMERANG PROPAGANDA

(Continued from page 5.)

into the channels of hatred. In democratic countries that hatred can have only one address, namely that of the enemy or its leaders. In the totalitarian states, however, the man in the street has, so to say, a choice of addresses. He can blame not only the enemy, but also his own leader. The latter, who has so joyfully accepted full responsibility for whatever may happen, must needs accept the consequences. When things go wrong he is bound to be among those who are blamed.

Dissatisfaction, as long as it remains vague, is a passive and manageable entity. If it is to become really active, truly militant and aggressive, it must be concentrated upon a human figure; for the masses think anthropomorphically. They understand best the *argumentum ad personam*. It is much easier to hate a man than to hate a system or an ideology. The accumulated emotions will rise higher and higher and, wisely directed, will engulf the Man of Destiny.

Will the fireworks of imaginary or real victories suffice to dazzle the average German and make him blind to the guilt of his leaders? Will not the savage beating of the propaganda tom-tom drown the subdued voice of reason?

One thing is certain: the fact that lies have an inherent weakness does not mean that truth has a magic capacity of winning victories without fighting for them. The fact that Nazi propaganda has many weaknesses does not mean that it will miraculously collapse of itself. In another article I shall attempt to discuss the weapons which truth can employ in order to become effective counter-propaganda.

Boomerang Propaganda

● By Dr. H. SONNABEND

THE printer's devil, the radio imp, the cinema witch, the goblin of rhetoric, join hands in the orgy of war propaganda. What are the chances of the Nazi propaganda machine, which has now been put to the supreme test of ruthless warfare? Is there any hope of defeating the propaganda of a country led by a master magician and disposing of thousands of men experienced in the art of manipulating public opinion? Let us first remember that modern war offers ideal opportunities for the display of propaganda tactics. The propagandist plays on the strings of the collective soul. He achieves results best *when the strings are taut*, that is, in a period of great tension, caused by social upheaval, national crisis and war hysteria. Moreover, propaganda attempts to exploit the irrational elements in human nature and the prospects multiply when war fever stirs up the deepest emotions and makes men deaf to the voice of reason.

Violence is increasingly becoming an integral part of propaganda technique. The average man respects the ruthless display of power, and often himself welcomes the opportunity of "letting off steam." The war legitimatises and glorifies violence, and thus makes easy the task of propaganda hypnosis, under the spell of which thousands and millions of human beings are welded together into masses of frenzied hate, unconquerable will, intensive and instinctive activity.

Nazi propaganda has to cope with three fronts: the home front, the enemy countries and the neutrals. It is obvious that in each case a different set of arguments and a different technique will be applied. I shall deal here only with the propaganda directed to the German people. On the home front Hitler has still the great advantage of a monopoly in "public enlightenment." He need not fear much interference with the process of mass hypnosis. Moreover, five years of collective hysteria have conditioned the average German to submit to mass thinking and to respond quickly to mass suggestion. Germany has the further advantage of possessing a bigger army of trained propagandists and experienced agitators. In spite of all this, the Nazi propaganda machine enters the war with considerable cracks in its structure and threatened by many potential dangers.

Wanted — A New Bogey

There is, first, the sudden abandonment of the main and most effective slogan of all former propaganda. Goebbels represented Germany as a country engaged in a holy crusade against Soviet Russia and in a super-human effort of saving western civilisation from the unspeakable horrors of Bolshevism. Since the historic flight of Ribbentrop to Moscow it became impossible to use this magic formula. The Communist, formerly represented as the arch-enemy, a despicable, hateful,

base sub-human, is now treated gently, as befits a quasi ally. The stories of Bolshevik atrocities, preferably with an erotic ingredient to appeal to the lascivious mind, have disappeared from the pages of the German press.

Who is going to occupy the vacant niche in the chamber of horrors? It is true the Jew is still there, but even this bogey has lost much of its original frightfulness. After all, the myth of Jewish world domination was closely linked with the alleged danger of Communist world conquest. How is the Jew now to achieve his nefarious objective when he has lost his chief allies, the arch-schemers of the Kremlin? Bolshevism and Judaism were represented as twin brothers, and the disappearance of one must greatly reduce the importance of the other. The myth of Jewish world domination must appear too ludicrous even for a well-conditioned Nazi audience.

Anti-Jewish propaganda must further suffer great damage since the Nazis themselves have come into contact with the grim picture of the Jewish tragedy in the countries of their mass settlement, especially Poland. The war has already proved that Jews are amongst the first to suffer from its consequences, and it becomes increasingly difficult to represent the Jew as a powerful and dangerous adversary.

The English — Are They "Sub-Human"?

No wonder that the Nazi propagandists have begun to march to the tune of the "Song of Hate" against England. The chief villain of the piece is now "treacherous Albion," the "nation of shopkeepers," organically incapable of appreciating the glorious mission of German supermen. Still, the British bogey cannot be an adequate substitute for either the Jewish or Communist villain. After having glorified the superior qualities of the Nordic race, Nazi propagandists find it difficult to ascribe all the base qualities to their English cousins. The German people were taught that the British Isles are inhabited by a Nordic nation misled by its plutocracy, but inherently generous and noble. It is now awkward to call the English sub-human.

Nazi propaganda, so relentlessly pursued for a number of years, is already beginning to produce "sales resistance." The constant beating of the big drum is bound to become monotonous, dull and irritating. The great achievements of propaganda have kindled the imagination of the Nazi rulers and they are now likely to overreach themselves and blunt their weapon by bludgeoning use.

The task which awaits German propaganda on the home front is stupendous. The masses have always been prone to cry "Great is Diana of the Illusions," but the more irrational the appeal, the greater the danger of its total collapse. The tragedies, sufferings and deprivations of war create emotions which have to be directed

(Continued on page 4.)

Some Historic Forgeries

● By G. SARON

OUR age is bombarded by "propaganda"—through the press, the radio, the cinema, the hustings, the pulpit and other agencies of a less overt character. People might therefore have been expected to be "propaganda-wise." At the best of times, however, only a small minority possess both the critical and factual equipment necessary as a protection against the tricks of the wily propagandist. If, in addition to a lack of critical ability and of knowledge, there is also a strong "will to believe" (as often happens with people of marked partisanship or prejudices), then the field is clear for the propagandist to do his worst.

These considerations should, I feel, be mentioned as extenuating factors in a study of how people—in their thousands and sometimes their hundreds of thousands—have been imposed upon by manifest literary forgeries and falsifications. Documents which purport to have the merit of a certain antiquity are apt to impress people more than contemporary evidence. The propagandist, therefore, who falsifies or fabricates texts often attributes their origin to an earlier generation. Compare, for instance, the interpolations in ancient texts familiar to every student of the classics or of the Bible; and the musical compositions which have masqueraded as the works of the old masters. Compare, too, the existence of such documents as the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, discovered to be forgeries only after they had had a lengthy vogue in the annals of the Papacy.

My present purpose is to illustrate the use of this device in modern anti-Semitic propaganda. Although experience has proved that the truth can never catch up with a lie, this brief study may still be useful for the light which it may throw on the technique of modern anti-Semites. It ranges from deliberate fabrication to numerous varieties of falsification, whether by the use of passages torn from their context or the careful suppression of that which does not suit the propagandist's purpose. Numerous instances may be adduced from pamphlets and leaflets which have circulated in this country; in what follows, however, I shall deal with only some of the more common examples. (Incidentally, these have all been incorporated in the book *My Lewe en Strewe* by General Manie Maritz, which was the subject of a trial recently held in South-West Africa.)

Many of them are intended to prove or support the thesis (so beloved of the anti-Semite) of the so-called "Hidden Hand" and of the alleged plot by Jews to overthrow Christian civilisation and achieve Jewish world domination. This grotesque theory (which is, however, not too grotesque to have been given credence by countless men and women) received its most elaborate formulation in the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," a classic example of forgery which deserves a

more detailed analysis (which I hope to give later). But there have been several lesser forgeries of note revolving round the same topic.

1.—A "15th CENTURY PROTOCOL"

A very interesting example is that which has been described as "A 15th Century Protocol." It purports to be the text of correspondence which passed between "Chamor, Rabbi of the Jews of Arles," of Provence, France, and "Usuff, Prince of the Jews of Constantinople." The correspondence is supposed to have taken place in 1489, i.e., three years prior to the expulsion of the Jews from Spain. In a short letter, the Rabbi of Arles conveys the information that the Jews of Provence are being threatened with the alternatives of enforced conversion to Christianity or of expulsion. The Christians, he says, "desire to take our property, menace our lives, destroy our synagogues," and he beseeches advice as to what is to be done. The reply from the Prince of Constantinople, couched in neat epigrammatic form, reads in part as follows:—

"Become Christians, because you cannot do otherwise, but let the law of Moses be preserved in your hearts . . .

"Since you say that they threaten your lives, make your children physicians and apothecaries, in order that they may deprive the Christians of theirs . . .

"Since you say that they destroy your synagogues, make your children canons and clerics, so that they may destroy their churches."

This is just the type of sentiment to satisfy a believer in the "Protocols," and it is therefore not surprising that the "Conspiracy in the Middle Ages" is used as additional proof of the "plot" disclosed in the "Protocols." It would take me too far afield to reproduce the long array of evidence by which this alleged correspondence is convincingly shown to be a forgery. It has been proved that the language and style are poles apart from those actually employed by the Jews in the 15th Century; that there was no Jewish community of any importance in Constantinople in 1489; that the Jews of Constantinople had no "Prince," and that in many other details the correspondence betrays historical inaccuracies. Further, the least that might have been expected of cunning conspirators was to conceal the proof of their plot, instead of carelessly leaving copies of the correspondence in the archives of several mediaeval libraries! All scholars—the most recent among them Marcel Bataillon, Professor of Spanish at the Sorbonne—are agreed that the correspondence is a forgery.

But it differs in one respect from other anti-Semitic forgeries, in that it is not of recent origin. It dates back, indeed, to the middle of the 16th Century, when the whole of Spain was agitated by the question

whether the Jews who had been converted to Christianity should be entitled to hold office in the Church or to practise the professions. The controversy ended by the enactment in 1547 of the "Statute of Purity of Blood," by which the Chapter of the Cathedral of Toledo excluded persons of Jewish descent from office in the Church.

All are now agreed that the correspondence which enshrined "The Conspiracy of the Middle Ages" had its origin in the 16th Century in this controversy. There is a difference of opinion only as to the purpose it was intended to serve. Some say that the correspondence was deliberately forged by a Christian Bishop in order to secure the enactment of the Statute; others, that it was produced subsequent thereto as a satirical literary prank.

2.— BENJAMIN FRANKLIN'S "PROPHECY"

By way of contrast, I turn next to a forgery of very recent origin, one which began to circulate in the United States in 1934 after the rise of the "shirted" fraternity in that country. It purports to be an extract from the "private diary of Charles Pinckney," of South Carolina, in which he is said to have recorded the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention of 1789. At this Convention Benjamin Franklin is alleged to have issued a warning against the immigration of Jews, which concluded as follows:—

"I warn you, gentlemen, if you do not exclude the Jews for ever, your children and your children's children will curse you in their graves. Their ideas are not those of Americans, even when they live among us for ten generations. The leopard cannot change his spots."

When this document began to be circulated in America (and soon found its way into various Nazi publications overseas), it fortunately aroused the interest of Charles A. Beard, the eminent historian and joint author of *The Rise of American Civilisation*, a student of the writings of Pinckney and Franklin. It is extremely difficult to prove a negative — that Franklin did not utter such a prophecy — but, as a result of his personal researches and his intimate knowledge of Franklin's writings, Beard was able to show among other things: (a) That it is almost certain that Pinckney did not keep a diary of the Convention proceedings; (b) That the prophecy attributed to Franklin is in direct contradiction to his known liberality in matters of religious opinion; (c) That the phraseology is not that of the 18th Century, nor in the language of Franklin. Beard came to the conclusion "that this alleged prophecy ascribed to Franklin is a crude forgery."

This opinion has since been reinforced by that of Henry Butler Allen, D.Sc., Director of the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia, and Alfred Rigling, M.A., Librarian of the Franklin Institute, who roundly asserts that neither the original of Pinckney's journal nor any copy thereof exists. Further disproof of the authenticity of this "prophecy" was provided by Mr. John Clyde Oswald, of the International Benjamin Franklin Society, who adduced the following points: First, there is no record of Franklin having made a formal address on any occasion

throughout his long career; Second, the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention of 1789 were secret and no official record was kept; Third, as Franklin was then 81 years of age and in poor health, he made his contributions to the deliberations not orally, but in written memoranda, which have been preserved; and, Fourth, William Pinckney, the alleged author of the diary, was not even a member of the Constitutional Convention in 1789!

And still the Franklin "Prophecy" circulates in America, England, South Africa and elsewhere!

3.— AN AMERICAN "SECRET SERVICE" DISCLOSURE

My third example is of a twenty-year-old forgery that was revived in the U.S.A. last year. A "sensational" report of the "American Secret Service" was published. It furnished direct "evidence" that leading Jewish bankers in the U.S.A. had fomented and financed the Bolshevik revolution. It even gave the names of the bankers and the form of assistance rendered by them. It also purported to give particulars of the part which other Jews played in the revolution. Lest the point might be missed the conclusion was triumphantly announced in the text itself: "Here again we see the connection between Jewish multi-millionaires and Jewish proletarians"—and (it might have been added) once again the "Protocols" are vindicated!

The document was brought to the notice of the American public in November of last year through the broadcasts of Father Coughlin, the priest turned demagogue, whose activities have been a thorn in the side of responsible Catholics in the U.S.A. Very soon, however, it was proved to be a forgery, by, among others, the eminent Catholic historian Monsignor John Ryan, of the Catholic University, who gives the results of his investigation in *The Common Weal* of December 30. Seeking the "authorities" for this document, Monsignor Ryan found that Father Coughlin had taken his information from a volume entitled *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World* by an Irish priest, Father Fahey, of known anti-Jewish bias. The latter was himself quoting from an anti-Semitic London weekly called *The Patriot*. *The Patriot* in turn appears to have obtained its "facts" from *Documentation Catholique of Paris*, March 16, 1920. Where did this French journal get it? From an alleged report made by the "American Secret Service."

Unfortunately for this "cloud of witnesses," it is at this point that the forgery is revealed. In a statement published on November 28, 1938, Frank J. Wilson, Chief of the United States Secret Service, declared: "I have investigated our records and questioned members of the service who were on duty from 1916 to 1920, including my predecessor, William H. Moran, with respect to the statements made and quoted by Father Coughlin. They know of no such investigation or report as that which Father Coughlin discussed, and it is quite certain that no such report was ever made by the United States Secret Service."

THE subject on which I am about to speak—The Position of Jewry To-day—is, of course, a subject which has its political implications. I am concerned now, however, much more with the human than with the political aspects.

In a remarkable speech which General Smuts made at a Jewish gathering in Johannesburg recently, he made use in a graphic way of the incident of Abraham and Isaac and the goat. He used the goat as a symbol of the material sacrifices which the Jewish people is called upon to bring for the benefit of the youth of Jewry so as to ensure the perpetuation of the race. But, unhappily, that is not the whole of the significance of that Old Testament incident. That incident foreshadows, I think, the way in which the Jew in history, especially modern history, has come to be the scapegoat of the Christian nations, the scapegoat bearing the responsibility for their discontents, their disabilities and their disappointments, regarded as an appropriate sacrifice to appease a jealous God. That picture of the Jew as the scapegoat seems to me to be the central feature of the position of Jewry in the world to-day.

I would like to say something about the way in which the conception of the Jew as a scapegoat has arisen and has been worked out in our own time. I am speaking from the point of view of what seem to me to be the essentials—certainly the essential starting point of the Christianity which I profess; and I believe that what I have described as the essential starting point of Christianity is after all essential also in the Jewish religion.

THE CHRISTIAN APPROACH

The Founder of Christianity summed up the Law and the Prophets in two precepts: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart" and "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." That is the essence of the Jewish religion—that is the essential starting point of Christianity. Those two commandments taken together mean, in the first place, the Fatherhood of God, and in the second place, the Brotherhood of Man. It is from those essentials that I feel that I must approach this question of the position of Jewry to-day. To me it is a never-failing source of wonder how people in this country and in other countries, who profess Christianity, can preach and practise anti-Semitism. To me the two things seem to be entirely hostile and alien to one another. If you profess Christianity, if you accept the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, there can be no room in your practice or your preaching for that evil thing anti-Semitism.

An essential part of anti-Semitism is that extremist form of nationalism, which has come to be one of the features of our own time. There is a sound as well as an unsound nationalism. The first sets itself to develop the best in a nation by stimulating the national feeling and national pride with a view to enabling the nation to bring its full contribution to the common stock of the peoples of the world. Unsound nationalism, however, concentrates on the stimulation of that same national feeling in order to breed hatred and hostility towards other nations. That is the nationalism of the hedgehog, the nationalism which worships the concept

THE POSITION OF JEWRY TO-DAY

By the Hon. J. H. Hofmeyr
Minister of Finance and Education

We are privileged to publish the substance of an address delivered by Mr. Hofmeyr to the Pretoria Jewish Guild August 23rd.

of Race. You know how it works: "We belong to one race. The Jews belong to another race; therefore they must be inferior to us." When I hear or read of people talking like that, I recall an old American tag which runs something like this:

*We are the sweet selected Jew;
Let all the rest be damned.
There's room enough in Hell for them,
We won't have Heaven crammed.*

There can be nothing in common between that kind of doctrine and the conception of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man.

A question which must puzzle the thinking Jew very much is: why has the Jew become the scapegoat of the nations? What is there in the Jew that makes him disliked by other people? Let me try to answer that question. I want to give two reasons why anti-Semitism has grown and developed. The first is the distinctiveness of the Jew, or as someone once put it, the "otherness" of the Jew. Those who are not Jews think of the Jews as in some respects different from themselves, and—as a result of a common fallacy—to many people difference means inferiority. The consciousness of difference is always a seed-bed of intolerance and dislike.

THE CAUSES OF DIFFERENCE

Why is the Jew different from the rest of us? Partly for reasons peculiar to himself; partly because of his peculiar history. The Jew has had a unique history. The continuance of the Jewish nation is a miracle of survival. Think of the dispersal of the Jews; of the persecution to which they have been subjected. It is an amazing thing that Jewry has survived and has retained this measure of national unity. I go back to another symbol in the Old Testament, the symbol of the burning bush which was not consumed—that is a picture of Jewry. Jews have reason to be proud of that achievement, of having retained their distinctiveness. But they must not take it amiss if, because of that distinctiveness, those who are not Jews are conscious of the fact of difference; and they must understand, too, simply on the psychological basis, that the consciousness of difference does serve as the seed-bed of dislike.

But the Jews are also different for reasons not peculiar to themselves—reasons for which we as non-Jews are responsible. After all, it was the Gentile peoples who forced the Jews to live in ghettos, who forced them to have their own national and economic life. We who are Gentiles complain to-day of the distinctiveness of the Jews when we talk about what we

to believe that "the Jew is the enemy, the cause of all its ills." These people are given a scapegoat. With Nazism especially this form of anti-Semitism has taken on a particularly aggressive form. Nazism has declared war not only against the faith and ideals of Jewry, but against the entire Jewry, and has sought to carry the war into other lands. The anti-Semitism of Nazism has been an article meant for export, and the world to-day knows that too well.

Now let us take the position of Jewry in South Africa to-day. In the light of our traditions—our traditions of religion and reverence for the Bible, of hospitality and of the love of freedom—it might have been hoped that anti-Semitism would never get a foothold here, but our traditional attitude towards the Jews has in a measure been broken through. Anti-Semitic propaganda is being spread vigorously in this land. The stock libels of Nazi propaganda are being sedulously disseminated, and sometimes they are skillfully adapted to our local circumstances.

Why has anti-Semitism made a measure of headway? People may say that it is because of the high proportion of Jews in South Africa; they may say that we have reached "saturation point," inasmuch as the Jewish population is 5 per cent. of our population. They forget that the population of South Africa does not only consist of white people: that for statistical purposes account must be taken of the whole of the population of South Africa. Compare Germany with the United States of America. In Germany the proportion of Jews was never, I believe, more than 1 per cent. In the United States the proportion is 3 to 4 per cent. Anti-Semitism has been more virulent in Germany than in America. I cannot help feeling that the factor of the proportion of the population has nothing like the significance which is sometimes attributed to it.

THE JEW AS SCAPEGOAT

One of the main causes of anti-Semitism in this country—apart from resentment at the comparative success of the Jew to which I have already referred—connects itself up with the fact that we have in South Africa a large native population. The existence of that native population makes it possible for the professional man and for the skilled worker to live at a higher standard than he would otherwise enjoy. But, on the other hand, it does make things very difficult for the unskilled worker; and the experience of other nations shows that there is a proportion of the population which never advances beyond the stage of the unskilled workman. Here in South Africa we have the unskilled workman, proud of his European race, but forced into direct or indirect competition with the non-European and resentful of that fact. That resentment provides a fruitful ground for the stimulation of economic discontents. The element of which I have spoken wants a scapegoat, and to it the Jew is presented as the scapegoat.

I have shown how anti-Semitism has been used elsewhere as one of the instruments in Dictatorship; in our own country, too, anti-Semitism is undoubtedly a very acceptable ally of Nazism; for the fomenting of Jew-

are pleased to call their "unassimilability." But let us not forget that that is very largely the consequence of the action of our own forebears, who compelled the Jews to be distinctive. History has a queer way of taking its revenges. If you make a ghetto, it nearly always comes back on you or your descendants. Not only those who live in ghettos suffer; the others who compel them to live in ghettos also suffer.

But there has been another reason, and that has been the Jew's success. In pretty nearly every country where the Jew has had a fair chance, the Jew has been disproportionately successful. Why? Again, very largely because it is the natural reaction to the repression of the ghetto state. I came across, the other day, this description of the characteristics of the Jew:—

"Clannish and cosmopolitan, fervent and sceptical, home loving and adventurous, mean and munificent, contentious and pacific, obsequious and insolent, artistic and uncreative, beneficiaries of capitalism and its keenest critics, the Jews are remarkable not so much for particular qualities as for combining qualities which appear contradictory. Indeed, I should say that the only generic Jewish characteristics are energy and the will to make this energy felt. A lazy Jew is almost unheard of, and a Jew who hides his light under a bushel is very rare."

I think that is true. I think those are the outstanding qualities of the Jewish character:—energy and the will to make that energy felt. It is something for which to respect the Jews. This, too, is linked up with a very common fallacy—the fallacy that the prosperity of one element of the population is always secured at the expense of another element. That has sometimes been true, for instance, in feudal times, but it is not true in a modern democratic nation. In such a community the prosperity of one element creates prosperity for the other elements. The prosperity, in so far as it exists, of the Jews, has helped to create prosperity for the other sections of the South African community.

THE RISE OF DICTATORSHIP

Let me now briefly mention two factors which have given anti-Semitism a special virulence in our own time. First, there has been the growth of nationalism in the perverted sense that is part of the aftermath of the last war, and one form of which is "racism." Secondly, there has been the trend towards dictatorship; and in the building up of dictatorship, anti-Semitism has come to be part of the recognised technique. A people in despair, oppressed by its burdens, is gradually made

hatred is an essential and dominating factor in the scheme of operations. It is an indispensable prelude to the conversion to Nazism. The people who are preaching anti-Semitism in South Africa are what in most cases one might call the "Fifth Column" of Nazism here.

I have been asked what my advice to Jewry is. It is very difficult to give advice, for Jewry is up against world forces of such magnitude that no weapon which it has at its disposal can control those forces. One can say no more to Jewry than to carry on and to retain its faith, while using such weapons as it has at its disposal. The present madness of the nations of the world which we call anti-Semitism must spend itself. The reaction must come.

THREE WEAPONS

What are the weapons which Jewry can use? I would mention three things: First, they should do all they can—more than they are doing now—to keep before the public the facts and the truth. They should counter propaganda, not with propaganda, but with truth. Nor should they be merely on the defensive. They should point to the constructive contributions that Jewry has made to South Africa and to the world. Most of the things that are worth while in our modern civilisation on the material side go back directly or indirectly to two small nations, the Greeks and the Jews. Hellenism and Hebraism and the forces they have released have made our modern civilisation.

The contribution of the Jew to South Africa—in magnitude and diversity—is much more than people realise. I confess that when I read the diary of Nathaniel Isaacs I first woke up to the fact that one of the most intrepid pioneers of Natal had been a Jew. One could mention many names. But I would summarise the position in two sentences. If no Jews had ever come to South Africa, South Africa would have been an infinitely poorer country than it is to-day. Secondly, if it were possible, as some people would like, to have all the Jews removed from South Africa to-morrow, the shock would be irreparable to South Africa's prosperity and credit. But the Jewish contribution has not only been on the material side. It has also been on the spiritual side: in the universities, in research, in contributions to art and music and the development of South African literature.

My second point of advice is this: Jews must not forget that there rests a very great responsibility on them as individuals. More than the members of any other nation, they are the representatives of their people in a very special sense. Because Jewry is the scapegoat of the Christian nations, the conduct of every Jew to-day is being meticulously scanned for arguments to be used against Jewry. That places a very great responsibility on them as individuals. The very highest standards are expected from them as a matter of duty, not only to South Africa, but to the whole of Jewry.

ZIONISM

One thing more I would say by way of advice to Jewry: to hold fast to their faith in Zionism. The Jewish community growing up in Palestine to-day, for the first time in many centuries, has the opportunity

of expressing the true spirit of Jewry. There it is possible to have a truly creative Jewish life. I believe it is the Zionist ideal that can alone save Jewry. I have always been a wholehearted believer in the Zionist ideal, not only from the point of view of Jewry, but also from the point of view of the world. I believe that when the Jewish nation is again firmly implanted in Palestine, then the spiritual force of Hebraism will revert to its old vitality and be of benefit to the whole world. Latterly Zionism has been almost under a cloud, and the ideal of the National Home has been threatened. Nevertheless, for my part, I believe as an article of faith that the ideal of the Jewish National Home is going to be adequately realised.

In advising Jews to hold fast to the Zionist ideal, I am not unmindful of the fact that a charge of "unassimilability" has been made against them, and that it has been suggested that true South Africanism and adherence to the ideal of Zionism are incompatible. The contention is that one cannot be a good South African if one owes allegiance to something outside South Africa. That question must be faced. I have frequently stated my view that assimilability does not mean sameness but likeness. The test of assimilability should be love of South Africa and willingness to serve it, and that is a test of which the Jews of this country have no reason to be afraid.

DIVIDED LOYALTIES

It is suggested that there is a divided loyalty in being a good South African and a good Zionist. Is divided loyalty incompatible with true patriotism? Roman Catholics owe allegiance to a world-wide Church, the head of which rules from the Vatican and often expects implicit obedience. Yet I have not heard it suggested that a good Roman Catholic cannot be a good South African. I go further, and would suggest that any genuine Christian must of necessity have a divided allegiance. The Church of Christ is essentially a universal Church, which transcends the limits of the State; and there is always the possibility of any true Christian finding a conflict between his duty to his Church and his duty to the State. That conflict has presented itself before now to modern Christians, and many of them have been prepared to face the consequences. That conflict will present itself again. It is a very poor sort of Christian State which is not producing the kind of men who are prepared, when the occasion demands, to face the conflict between loyalty to their Christian religion and to the demands of the State.

No, this bogey of divided loyalties is part of the tendency of our times to exalt the omnipotent State. It means the elevation of the State above the human being. And so I say that South African patriotism has no more right to require of Jews that they should abandon their ideal of Jewry than it has the right to ask me to abandon my loyalty to the Universal Church of Christ. What South African patriotism should and does ask of Jews is to put South Africa first in their affections and devotion, to give South Africa the full measure of their service. And that, I have no doubt, they will gladly do.

On "Christian-National" Education

● By R. F. ALFRED HOERNLÉ

IN the August issue of *Common Sense*, Father Runge has given his blessing to the educational policy advocated at the recent Bloemfontein Congress on "Christelik-Nasionale Onderwys." In this article I want to play the *advocatus diaboli* to his argument.

The Christian Nationalists assembled at Bloemfontein were concerned with Afrikaner Nationalism and Calvinist Christianity. They based, however, their particular case on general principles, and it is partly on account of these general principles that they have received Father Runge's blessing.

The fundamental principle, as Father Runge phrases it, is that "the child is to grow up from roots firmly fixed in the religion, traditions and culture of its own family and its own folk." Hence, home and school ought to be "of one piece," having "the same cultural background," with the teacher having "the same language, the same religion and the same general outlook" as the child's parents.

If these propositions are interpreted literally — and that is, surely, how Father Runge would have us interpret them — they imply that no Jew can be a teacher of a non-Jew, or *vice versa*; that no Roman Catholic can be a teacher of any Protestant, or *vice versa*, not even in Mathematics; that no Afrikaner may teach English South African children, or *vice versa*; above all — for here the differences in culture and outlook are greatest — that no European ought to teach any non-Europeans, and no Native nurses to look after White children. Does Father Runge intend any, or all, of these consequences to be drawn? I, for one, would like to know. For they seem to demand a sorting out of our schools and social relations according to racial, national, religious differences far beyond even what we practise now, and to a point at which the achievement of the harmony desired by Father Runge could come about only by a sheer miracle.

Logical Consequences

Again, our Christian Nationalists want schools which, as part of a *suiwer Afrikaans* spirit, inculcate the outlook of Calvinist Protestantism. Father Runge approves, because "the foundation of education is religion . . . permeating and inspiring the whole tone and spirit of the school."

Presumably any and every religion is entitled to the benefit of this principle*: Calvinist schools for Calvinist children; Anglican schools for Anglicans; Roman Catholic schools for Roman Catholics; Jewish schools for Jews; Mohammedan schools for Mohammedans; and, last but not least, schools for Bantu children permeated and inspired by the ancestor worship which is the traditional religion in Bantu culture. If this is what the

principle means — and I do not see what else it can mean — then Mission schools stand condemned in principle. To Christianize the children of heathen parents is then an impertinence and an educational crime, divorcing the child from its "roots in the religion of its family and its folk." I do not suppose that this is what Father Runge intends: but it is certainly implied in what he says.

Turning from general principles to the particular case of Afrikaner Nationalism *plus* Calvinist Christianity, we find Father Runge welcoming it with sympathy, on the grounds that the Afrikaner people are demanding Christian-National schools of this type as part of their fight to assure the future of their own language and culture and the continued existence of themselves as a distinctive "nation"; and that, when once the fear of absorption into an English South Africa, or of assimilation into the Native majority, is lifted off their shoulders, they will be easier to live with, and will contentedly take their place alongside of other national and racial groups within a truly united South Africa.

There is, no doubt, a section of the Afrikaner people whose attitude and aims are as here described; and if this were the only, or the dominant, attitude, most of us would gladly join our sympathy with Father Runge's. But, there is a large and energetic section — I believe it to be the section which supplied the real driving power at Bloemfontein — which is convinced that the future of the Afrikanervolk and its culture will not be secure until the Afrikaner is again master in South Africa; until he has recovered his "liberty." For this section, Christian Nationalism is not merely an educational ideal but part of a policy which aims at the restoration of Afrikaner domination in South Africa. As an educational policy, it is designed to close the ranks of the Afrikanervolk in preparation for the achievement of this destiny.

The Dominant Partner

In the compound, "Christian-Nationalism," Nationalism is the dominant partner. The Calvinist factor is important only because it happens, for historical reasons, to have become a constituent in Afrikaner Nationalism. This can easily be verified: Afrikaner Calvinists, no doubt, have a preferential sympathy for, e.g., Scotch Presbyterians who are also Calvinists (as against, e.g., Anglicans who are not Calvinists, or as against Roman Catholics, who are not even Protestants). But, if there were a Scotch form of Christian-Nationalism, Afrikaners would regard the "national" difference between themselves and Scotchmen as far more important than their affinity to each other as fellow-Calvinists. There was a time when Scotch predikants were imported into the service of the Dutch Reformed Church: there is now, especially in the North, an oft-expressed feeling that they brought an undesirable English, or British, influence into Afrikaner life; an alien temper which has to be extruded again in order to restore the *suiwer* Afrikaner

* Nazism and Communism, too, are religions: pagan religions, if you like; false religions, if you like; but still religions, and extremely intolerant ones at that. They certainly practise the principle: Nazi schools, Communist schools, for all children who ought to grow into good Nazis and Communists.

spirit. Given many "Christian" nations, the important thing for the true Nationalist is not their common Christianity, but their distinctive national characters.

"Tolerated Aliens"

I repeat: to an important section of the Afrikaner people, Christian-Nationalism means using the schools as an instrument for the re-integration of Afrikaner unity, as part of an effort to make South Africa an Afrikaner State, in which every non-Afrikaner, whether English South African, Jew, or non-European, will be at best only a tolerated alien—an "uitlander" in language, religion and culture. Christian-Nationalism is not merely an educational policy and is not meant to stop in the schools. Its ultimate aim is a Christian-National State, in which no Jew, being non-Christian, will be admitted to citizenship, as little as non-Europeans will be, whether they are Christians or not.

The history of the Union is the history of the efforts of the Afrikaner people to undo the Treaty of Vereeniging, just as the Germans have been busy undoing the Treaty of Versailles. (This similarity goes far to explain the sympathy of Afrikaners with Germany, coloured in both cases by anti-English feeling.) The whole campaign for *onafhanklikheid* and *selfstandigheid* has had, and still has, the single aim to break the bonds which tie South Africa to the British Commonwealth of Nations, which means to these Afrikaners being tied to Great Britain. The emotional drive behind this movement has come, and continues to come, from the Afrikaner side. English and Jewish South Africans have had no part in it: they have been outvoted, or, for the sake of peace, have voted for a policy which at heart they did not desire. Of every "concession" they have hoped it would be the last, and that the Afrikaners would now be content. But, the logic of Afrikaner Christian-Nationalism leads straight to an Afrikaner Republic, and the adherents of the movement will not be content until this aim is achieved. To shut one's eyes to this is to live in a fool's paradise.

History versus Logic

Even Afrikaner Christian-Nationalists would admit that, ideally, they would prefer a homogeneous Afrikanervolk territorially segregated from all other nations and races. History, unfortunately, has willed otherwise. Afrikaners find themselves living in the same country with all sorts of other Europeans; and, worse, with a large non-European majority. Under these conditions, their ideal is realizable only by, first, closing the ranks of the Afrikanervolk as a unity of blood, religion, and culture; and, secondly, making South Africa the Afrikaner State of this Afrikaner nation—a state excluding from membership all non-Europeans and admitting other Europeans as members only in so far as they are willing and able to be "assimilated." Even now, Afrikaner Christian-Nationalists are busy distinguishing who is "assimilable" and who is not!

My own sympathies are with Father Runge's dream of "unity in diversity," of harmonious co-operation between the multi-racial, multi-religious groups of South Africa's population. Regretfully, I cannot share his hope that Afrikaner Christian-Nationalism will be content with what he offers, for what he offers is far less than what it wants.

THE RISING TIDE

(Continued from page 13.)

"Let me give you the latest information of the **Plight of the Persecuted** in Germany. My correspondent tells me:—

"If the evacuation of Jews and non-Aryan Christians from Germany proceeds at the same rate as hitherto, an official of the Christian Council for Refugees points out, the last party of fugitives will not get out till the year 1951. In the six years since Hitler came into power, only 350,000 of the 1,100,000 then in residence have succeeded in escaping.

"Actually, according to the Christian Council, the need for evacuation is becoming more and more urgent. In the Pfalz, which is regarded as Streicher's stronghold, Jews and non-Aryan Christians are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain food, and a similar position is arising in Vienna.

"Shopkeepers refuse to sell provisions to them, and they thus become dependent on supplies specially imported by sympathisers. Meals are taken at communal kitchens, of which there are now 14 in Vienna. Each of these deals with from 2,000 to 3,000 persons daily."

* * * * *

Coming back to South African affairs, many of us welcomed the appeal of the Editor of *The Star* that he issued to the Minister of the Interior to ban from further publication and sale **My Lewe en Strewe**, for unfortunately this extremely bad and harmful book can still be purchased within the Union. But sane public opinion, both Afrikaans and English, is making itself felt, and I venture to forecast that it will not be long before the Minister exercises the necessary discretionary power.

* * * * *

And then we go to **Mayor Foster**, of Capetown, who, I am sure, put his finger on the right spot recently when he said: "We cannot imagine that Bible-loving, rugged individualist, the South African Boer, throwing over his freedom and independence and goose-stepping to the commands of a shirted dictator." Luckily for us, the true South African Boer spirit will be our salvation. Politicians may stamp from their platforms, make many promises and demands, but few will follow. The true old Boer, with his "alles sal reg kom," his deep faith in God and the Bible, with his real love for the land and his own shack, run entirely his own way, will keep South Africa sane. Our industrial progress may be slow, we may be obstinate, but you may lead the old Boer—you will not drive him. I wonder our Nationalist friends do not see this. Let the pessimists go their own way, but for myself I am glad to be on the sane, strong, rising tide of public opinion that is going to build a new world—and, incidentally, a new South Africa.

THE RISING TIDE

● By The Rev. A. W. ("Tubby") EATON

New Year Greetings: For Jewry throughout the whole world has dawned yet another New Year, and it is meet and right that I should begin to comment on the rising tide with a word of greeting to all our Jewish readers. The year 5,700 opens with a great question mark behind it, but that question mark is only there because of the great tide of public opinion which says "Might shall never triumph over right." Whatever else the New Year may have for Jewry, it certainly brings with it the knowledge of that action which has now been taken, the result of which is bound to make the world more secure for the children of Israel to live in.

* * * * *

Perhaps the cynical and pessimistic will sneer at my optimism, but I really do believe that the world is slowly waking up to the fact that there must be an entirely new approach to our political and social and economic problems, and as an illustration of this new approach let me call your attention to a **Swiss Example**.

Leaders of the Swiss Parliamentary parties have set an example to all other politicians. In a statement issued on the eve of the General Election, the leaders pledged themselves to confine their activities to their constructive programme and to avoid attacking and personally disparaging those of other parties. The signatories, who included representatives of the Radical, Catholic Conservative, Socialist, Liberal, Farmers and Trade Union Parties, state that in the spirit of moral rearmament they will present simply and honestly the constructive force of their own party programmes, and leave the electorate to make their own choice. "We have all failed in this respect at previous elections," they say, "and to-day we must attempt to strike out a new path. Then Europe will be able to understand the strength that lies in a nation which unites to use all its forces to the full for the good of the whole."

This is a gratifying gesture, which we are confident will be appreciated in Switzerland, and we hope the example may one day be followed in South Africa.

* * * * *

It is well for us to remember that Switzerland is not the only place where a new approach is being made to international problems. Only a few Sundays ago I tuned in on the wireless to San Francisco to hear yet another demonstration of the rising tide of new outlook and heard that **Apostle of Peace, Frank Buchman**, of Group fame, at the mike. With him was a team comprising Japanese, Chinese, a Burmese student, an Indian Nationalist, a German professor, a French journalist and a Scandinavian statesman, a Catholic priest and a dock labourer. The broadcast followed a conference that

had been held at the Exposition and had been specially arranged to demonstrate to the world that they had discovered a new basis of dealing with their personal and national prejudices and problems. Whatever we may feel about the Swiss demonstration, or even this from San Francisco, let the hotheads say what they like, it is a demonstration of the fact that when the love of God gets into men's hearts racial and national prejudices are broken down.

* * * * *

Writing of broadcasts brings me very much nearer home to refer to **Bishop Clayton**, who, when broadcasting at the Cathedral on the day of the outbreak of war, finished up his sermon by saying: "I speak to you not as an Englishman to Englishmen, but as a minister of the Church of the Province of South Africa to South Africans. We ministers of the Church in this land have been called, whatever be our country of origin, to associate ourselves, our interests, our affections, with the people to whom we have been sent to preach the Gospel of Christ. We are not an English Church preaching an English Gospel. We are a South African province of the Universal Church, preaching the Gospel of Christ, which is the same in every land. Yet we and you alike are bound close to England, both by our allegiance to the Crown and by the innumerable ties of kinship and friendship which so many of us have with England, and England has thrown herself into the cause which (not only, I hope, because I am English by birth) I believe to be the cause of the success on which the future of the world depends . . . However, there is no reason why the war should not be a war without hate." Many will value this very outspoken lead particularly for its impartiality, for this is one of the hardest things these days, and yet so tremendously important. Few of us can sink our national heritages and prejudices and sum up quite regardless of the consequences.

* * * * *

For instance, here in South Africa we unfortunately hear far too much about **Christian Nationalism**, and it is refreshing to hear the constructive words of the Reverend C. Crabtree, President of the Free State Methodist Synod: "We are not Christians if we are narrowly nationalist. True Christianity will always oppose a nationalism which responds only to the call of blood, egotistic, superior, contemptuous and derisive of other races and colour." Those are very hard words, but we are dealing with very hard facts. For instance, though this is only one of the many difficulties in the world to-day, it is rather important for us to realise just what is happening to Jews and Christians alike.

(Continued on page 12.)

Die Hugenate

ONS leef vandag weer in 'n tyd waarin daar terruggedink word aan een van die belangrikste gebeurtenisse in ons geskiedenis, die aankoms van die Franse Vluggelinge in ons land, en as ons wil hulde bring aan hierdie deel van ons stoere voorgeslag dan moet ons weet waarvoor hierdie mense gestry en gely het, en probeer om self getrou te wees aan oortuigings vir die handhawing waarvan hul alles feil gehad het. Ons moet dus kortliks let op die vernaamste historiese feite in verband met die Hugenate en op die inhoud van hul ideale.

Toe Martin Luther op 31 Oktober, 1517, sy beroemde 95 stellings aan die kerk deur van Wittenberg in Duitsland vasgespyker het, het 'n nuwe dag begin breek oor Europa. Die uitgediende middeleeuse lewensorde het begin verbroekel om plek te maak vir die Sturm en Drang van Modern Geskiedenis. Soos dit met alle groot bewegings gaan was die eerste leiers van die Hervorming maar net die vonke wat die reeds voorhandige kruit aan die brand gestee het. Luther self was verbaas oor die ingang wat sy oortuigings by die volk gevind het, en byna elkeen wat hierdie geskiedenis bekyk, word getref deur die skielike verspreiding van die Gereformeerde geloof in byna al die Europese lande. Hierdie verbreiding en die taaie volharding waarmee die nuwe geloof verdedig is is byna ongelooflik as ons dink aan die bykans onbepaalde wereldlike oppermag wa die Roomse kerk in daardie tyd behad het en die feit dat die stryd hoofsaaklik gegaan het om geestelike waardes en nie om materiele voordele nie.

DIE STRYD IN FRANKRYK

In Duitsland en Switserland was die stryd gou beslis, maar in die Nederlande en veral in Frankryk het die bloed gevloei. Heel spoedig na Luther se optrede het daar in Frankryk ook mense opgestaan wat die nuwe leer bely en verkondig het. Vervolgings van Roomse kant het van stapel geloop en toe die trouelose Frans I in 1547 gesterf het het daar al duisende martelare in Frankryk vir die nuwe geloof gesterf. Onder Hendrik II het daar geen aanmerklike verbetering gekom in die behandeling wat die Gereformeerdes ontvang het nie, maar nogtans het hul getalle aangegroei en hul het 'n groot leier gekry in Gaspard de Coligny, Admiraal van Frankryk. Met die troonsbestyging van Frans II in 1559 as onmondige het die bestuur van die land en daarmee die lot van die Gereformeerdes geheel en al oorgegaan in die hande van die Koningin Moeder, Katharina de Medici, en die huis van die Guises. Hierdie felle haters van die Protestantisme het geen steen onaangeroerd gelaat om die lot van die Gereformeerdes te bemoeilik nie. Die koninklike hof was so vyandiggesind dat daar vir die Gereformeerdes niks anders oorgebly het as om hul ook op politieke gebied te organiseer nie.

● Deur Adv. G. F. de VOS HUGO

Die party wat hul in die lewe geroep het was die anti-Guise party en die aanhangers van hierdie party het die naam van Hugenate gekry.

Teen die einde van die Regering van Karel IX het die Koningin Moeder en die Guise familie hul seggen-skap in die regering begin verloor want Karel IX was toe al oud genoeg om vir homself te begin dink en het 'n goeie raadgewer gehad in Admiraal Coligny. Daar moes 'n plan gemaak word om Coligny uit die pad uit te kry en die simpatie wat Karel IX vir die Gereformeerdes gehad het teen te gaan, en die plan wat die Koningin Moeder uitgedink het was die afgryslieke bloedbad van Sint Bartolomeusnag wat vroeg op Sondagmore, die 24ste Augustus, 1572, in Parys plaasgevind het toe letterlik duisende Gereformeerdes op 'n wreedaardige wyse om die lewe gebring is. Die eerste slagoffer was die eerwaardige grysaard, Admiraal Coligny, wat toe reeds siek was as gevolg van 'n wond wat 'n sluipmoordenaar hom die vorige Vrydag toegedien het. Van Parys af het hierdie bloedwoede hom versprei na ander dorpe en alleen die hiernamaals sal openbaar hoeveel mense hierdeur om die lewe gebring is. Die verontwaardiging wat daar in ander Protestantse lande opgegaan het oor hierdie gruweldaad was gevaarlik. In plaas van dat die Gereformeerdes vergoed van kant gemaak is het hul getalle en hul determinasie om te wen aangegroei, en in Julie, 1573, moes Karel IX met hul vrede maak. La Rochelle en 'n paar ander Protestantse stede is feitlik tot onafhanklike gebiede in Frankryk verklaar en die koning moes die Gereformeerdes as loyale onderdane erken.

DIE EDIK VAN NANTES

Onder Hendrik III, wat van 1574 tot 1589 geregeer het, moes die Gereformeerdes nog maar gedurig stryd voer vir 'n veilige bestaan. In 1590 kom Hendrik IV van Navarre op die troon en in April, 1598, kom die lang verbiede rus en vrede: die Edik van Nantes.

Die 92 artikels van hierdie wet het die regte van die Gereformeerdes omskryf en artikel 6 het vir gewetens en godsdienstvryheid gewaarborg. Toe was hul tenminste vry van die wrede vervolgings wat hul in die verlede moes verduur omdat hul God op hul eie manier wou dien. Die Hugenate party het toe sy doel bereik en daar was dus geen rede meer waarom hierdie party wat op politieke grondslag gestaan het sou voortbestaan nie. Die ontbinding het egter nie vrywilliglik gevolg nie en in November, 1628, was dit vir Richelieu nodig om die stad La Rochelle stormenderhand in te neem voordat die Hugenate as politieke organisasie buite werking gestel is.

(Continued on page 16.)

Letters to the Editor

From the Rev. J. V. COETZEE

Sirs,

Since its inception I have followed with interest the work of the Society of Jews and Christians and read the different publications which have been issued in the name of the Society.

I have also read the second issue of *Common Sense*, which you were so kind to send to me. I do not wish to express an opinion about the paper, as it is perhaps a little too early to do so. In passing, I only wish to say that it is clear that Prof. Hoernlé, when he formulated the Working Faith of a Liberal, has omitted to take into account the evidence of history.

One thing has struck me concerning your Society and its publications, and this is *that Jesus Christ is studiously being avoided*. People, calling themselves Christians, are members of the Society. But I have the impression, judging from the publications of the Society, that the cardinal question between Jews and Christians: What do you think of Jesus Christ? is purposely being avoided. Am I wrong, and, if so, will you please inform me in your paper whether Jews and Christians, belonging to your Society, have given an answer to this cardinal question, and what the nature of the answer is?

Perhaps you are aware of the Jewish views about Jesus which are to be found in the Talmud — both the Palestinian and the Babylonian. In the Talmud Jesus is more than once called *Ben Stada* and *Ben Pandera* (or *Panthera*), as also *Bileam*. These views about Jesus have during the Middle Ages been collected in the "Toldoth Jesjoea" — a publication which has wrought immeasurable evil amongst many Jews who have read it.

Won't your Society be prepared to conduct an enquete amongst the rabbis and leading figures of South African Jewry to determine whether or not they accept the views of the Talmud concerning Jesus? I am prepared to give assistance if the Society should decide to conduct such an enquete.

I do not doubt that Christians will concur with my statement that the Jewish question is, for us, Christians, primarily one of religion, and not an economic or racial one. It appears to me that your Society is of opinion, judging from your publications, that it is a question of race relations and that the cardinal question: What do you think of Jesus Christ? has no bearing on the problem.

Thanking you for publication of the above,

I am,

Yours truly,

J. V. COETZEE.

POTCHEFSTROOM.

"It is the part of Christians to live their faith to the full, to practise in all its splendour the law of divine charity, and so to win Jewish hearts to the light of Christ. In that light the shadows, which centuries of separation and mutual enmity have deepened, will disappear, and we shall break the fetters, less Talmudic than social, which hinder the progress of Israel to their Messiah and Saviour."

C. H. S. RUNGE.

AN EXPLANATION

As President of the Society of Jews and Christians in Johannesburg, I venture to write a brief reply to the foregoing letter.

The Society was started in Johannesburg on the initiative of the Witwatersrand Church Council, in order, as Article 2 of its Constitution expresses it: "to maintain and promote good relations between Jews and non-Jews, and to spread knowledge concerning the factors (social, economic and others) which lead to friction."

Though a beginning was made by people who subscribed definitely to either the Jewish or the Christian faith, it was found at once that there were others, both Jews and non-Jews, who, while disclaiming definite religious adherence either Jewish or Christian, were eager to forward the objects of the Society.

When the title of the Society was considered, it was objected by some non-Jews that they could not sincerely call themselves Christians. It is difficult, however, to find another name under which to include those who, while not subscribing to the Christian faith, are yet, as against Jews, the product and the inheritors of the Christian tradition. Many Jews are similarly divorced from Jewish faith, yet belong within the Jewish racial and cultural tradition; and in the same way as "Christians" are accustomed to class the latter as "Jews," whether or not they adhere definitely to the Synagogue, so Jews class as "Christians" Europeans who are not Jews. Moreover, present-day anti-semitism takes no account of religion; people of Jewish antecedents suffer persecution, whether they are of the Jewish faith or are, and in some cases have been for generations, Christians. Taking all these things into consideration, it was decided that the title of the Society as it stands best expresses its character and purpose.

As a Christian, I agree whole-heartedly with our valued correspondent regarding the fundamental question: "What think ye of Christ?" It is as pertinent to many non-Jews as it is to Jews. But, in view of the past history of relations between Jews and Christians, I believe that the first need is to lay foundations of goodwill and mutual respect before we can expect that the mass of Jewry will consider seriously our Christian faith.

With regard to the Talmud, I am not qualified to speak. We hope to publish shortly an article on the subject by a South African Jewish Rabbi. In the meanwhile, I would quote the concluding paragraphs of a short account of the Talmud recently published by a Belgian Christian scholar:—

"The hatred, the hereditary resentment, which some Jews, still confined in a moral ghetto, continue to nourish against Christ and Christians, are much less the product of lessons inculcated by the teachings of the Talmud, than the instinctive reaction against a whole system of persecutions, vexations, degradations, the memory of which cannot be effaced in a day . . .

(See foot of preceding column.)

Letters to the Editor (contd.)

From Miss EVA SACHS

Sirs,

I have read with great interest the article "A Campaign for Goodwill in the U.S.A.," in the first issue of *Common Sense*, and I feel that much could be done on similar lines in South Africa.

It is easy enough to create strife among different sections of the community by means of inciting propaganda, particularly on racial and religious grounds. Usually such hatreds are artificially introduced into the home life of the individual, and it is *there* that they should be counteracted. If the home can be kept free from poisonous hatreds a great obstacle has been removed in the path of general peace and harmony.

To counteract pernicious propaganda in this way is particularly imperative in overcrowded areas. Here the principle of harmonious relations becomes an absolute necessity, and it is here that vast possibilities of creating goodwill arise for a body such as the Society of Jews and Christians.

As an instance of where such work may be of great value, I would like to refer to the so-called sub-economic housing schemes. Many schemes have recently been developed in this country on the principle that a hundred or more families live together on one estate as a community under the same organisation — either the Municipality or a Housing Utility Company. On such an estate there are Europeans of all nationalities, creeds and religions. There is only one condition common to all — they are all small-salaried workers who cannot afford to pay higher rents and therefore are granted the privilege of benefiting from sub-economic housing schemes.

An Afrikaner family lives next door to a Jewish family. Why should they not be good friends? They are strangers when they move in, but by reason of close contact they learn to know one another and become friendly neighbours notwithstanding their differences of origin.

In my experience as the housing manageress of such an estate, I have found that generally the tenants agree very well. Of a total of 120 families, there are about 70 Afrikaner families, 40 English and 11 Jewish families on this estate. Jews and Gentiles are as a rule very good neighbours, helping each other in difficult situations, in times of illness or distress. There is a tenants' committee, some of the members of which are English and Dutch Gentiles and others Jews; and they work together most amicably.

It would appear that anti-Semitic feeling was originally not strong among urban workers, but racial propaganda during past years has had the effect of spoiling a good relationship. And on the estates the possibilities of countering such influences are, in my opinion, great.

Why not send out the right type of lecturer to the tenants of these housing schemes — a lecturer who can speak convincingly to them? Facts should be put before them in an easily understood manner. This would help to bring about that spirit we all desire in human beings.

Yours faithfully,

EVA SACHS.

52, Garden Mansions,
JOHANNESBURG.

DIE HUGENOTE

(Continued from page 14.)

Onder Lodewyk XIII en ook vir 'n lang tyd onder Lodewyk XIV het die godsdienstvryheid van die Gereformeerdes voortgeduur, maar die Sonkoning het later ander insigte begin kry wat hom op sy ou dag 'n ding laat doen het wat 'n skandvlek is op die geskiedenis van Frankryk en vir homself 'n bron van gewetenswroeging geword het. In Oktober, 1685, het hy die Edik van Nantes herroep en toe het die wreedhede wat vir byna 'n eeu lank verban was weer te voorskyn gekom, en 'n nageslag wat getrou was aan die duurverworwe vryheid van sy vadere moes vlug na oorde van veiligheid, en selfs hierdie vlug is hul misgun want dit was 'n misdaad om oor die grens te vlug na 'n vryheid wat binne die grense van die eie vaderland nie te kry was nie. Ongeveer 350,000 egter het daarin geslaag om die grense oor te gaan, en in die aangrensende land vryheid en gasvryheid te ontvang.

Verreweg die meeste van hierdie vlugtelingte het in die Nederlande tereg gekom en dis vandaar dat 'n kleine 150 tal van hul na Suid-Afrika verskeep is as koloniste. Hier het hul ongeveer 'n tiende van die totale blanke bevolking uitgemaak en omtrent 30 jaar na hul aankoms was hul geheel en al geassimileer met die bestaande bevolking.

'N HELDEGESLAG

As 'n mens in 'n kort woord moet rekenskap gee van die ideale waarvoor hierdie eenvoudige boeremense gestry en gely het, dan kan 'n mens sê dat dit was vir die vryheid wat elke mens moet hê om sonder die tussenbemiddeling van 'n mens na God te gaan en met Hom selfstandiglik die kwessie van die hiernamaalse wel of wee uit te maak, en verder alles wat daarmee saamhang. Dit is die gekristalleerde waarheid wat 'n stoere voorgeslag met naamlose lyding en uiteindelik die marteldood vir ons vrygekoop het, en die benouende vraag wat ons in hierdie dae beëtpak is of ons temidde van 'n ontardaende ongodsdienstige samelewing nog getrou is aan die oortuigings waarvoor hierdie heldegeslag gesterf het.

As daar gevra word wat is nou die konkrete bydraag wat die Hugenote tot Suid-Afrika gemaak het dan is daar net een antwoord: hul het die geringe bevolking versterk op 'n moment toe dit getalversterking broodnodig gehad het. Daar was egter ook nog 'n geestelike bydraag en dit is veral wat van belang is. Die Hugenote het karaktereïenskappe gebring wat vandag nog voortleef, nie as nuwe eienskappe wat hul vir die eerste maal hier kom inent het nie, maar in die versterking van die sedelike waardes van ons mense. Die vryheidsin en karakteradel wat 'n Voortrekkergeslag die woesteny ingestuur het leef vandag nog en vandag nog kan van die Boerevolk gesê word dat hul 'n grenslose vermoë het om te ly vir wat hul as heilig en dierbaar beskou.

HELP US TO CARRY ON OUR WORK.

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

To: COMMON SENSE,
P.O. Box 7791, Johannesburg.

Please Post this Slip.

I ^{am} _____ * a member of the Society of Jews and Christians, and
am not

herewith enclose my annual subscription of _____ * for
three shillings
four shillings

COMMON SENSE.

NAME _____
(please use block letters)

ADDRESS _____

**Strike out the words which do not apply.*

Common Sense

: CONTENTS :

Economic Fallacies at Bloemfontein (<i>Editorial</i>)	3
The Christian Church and Nazism by <i>the Rev. A. W. Eaton</i>	5
Die Rassevraagstuk deur <i>Prof. R. F. A. Hoernlé</i>	7
Is the Talmud Hostile to Christians? by <i>Rabbi W. Hirsch, B.A.</i>	8
Sigmund Freud and Common Sense, by <i>L. Melamed</i>	10
The Papacy and the Jews by <i>the Rev. Father W. P. Whelan, O.M.I.</i>	11
The Rising Tide by <i>the Rev. A. W. ("Tubby") Eaton</i>	13
The Forgotten Man by <i>Rabbi Moses Cyrus Weiler</i>	15
Letters to the Editor	16

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

VOL. 1. No. 4.

OCTOBER 1939

PRICE 4d.

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.

Common Sense

Editorial Board:

C. J. CLAASSEN
A. W. EATON
R. F. A. HOERNLE

C. H. S. RUNGE
G. SARON
H. SONNABEND

"Common Sense" is published monthly by the
Society of Jews and Christians, Johannesburg.

Subscription:

The subscription to *Common Sense* is 3/- per annum to members (or 3d. per copy); and 4/- per annum to non-members (or 4d. per copy). Post free.

Copies may be ordered from the Secretaries, P.O. Box 7791, Johannesburg, as well as from the Secretaries of Affiliated Societies in other centres of the Union.

IS THE TALMUD HOSTILE TO CHRISTIANS ?

(Continued from page 9)

not mentioned at all, and the statements about "Ben Stada" were not intended for Jesus (as some thought), but for the Egyptian false messiah mentioned by Josephus (Ant. XX, 8). This has been proved by Travers Herford in his book, "Christianity in Talmud and Midrash." Herford has likewise shown that the Rabbis did not speak of Jesus under the name of Balaam. How, indeed, could they when the two names are mentioned at the same time, clearly referring to two different persons?

There are hardly half a dozen passages in which Jesus is spoken of as the "son of Pandera" and "Yeshu of Nazareth." Some of these allude to offensive legends which were current among others besides Jews. They are also mentioned by pagan and Christian heretical writers, and the Christian Anti-Christ legends are connected with them (Bousset, *Der Anti-Christ*). Offensive as some of these passages are, they are not altogether devoid of historical value, inasmuch as they prove the existence of Jesus, and refute the theories of Bruno Bauer (*Christus und die Caesaren*) and of Albert Kalthoff (*Das Christusproblem*) who denied the existence of Christ. For this alone Christians might be charitable in judging these relics of an age that is already far behind us, and which suffered from heated controversy and bitter polemics.

These passages were removed from the Talmud several centuries ago by censors and also by Jews themselves who realised their utter worthlessness, and regretted the hurt they imposed on Christian sentiment. In 1631 a Jewish synod held at Petrikau, Poland, issued a circular letter ordering that all such passages in the Talmud which referred to Jesus should be omitted in the future. (Pick, *Jesus in the Talmud*.)

The excisions were later collected by Jewish and Christian scholars from old manuscripts and published separately for such historical value as they might possess. They are of interest only to the specialist. The average Talmud student knows nothing about them, for they are not found in the

text. If he were asked whether he believed in what the Talmud said about Jesus, his first question would be, What *does* the Talmud say about him?

As for the "Toledoth Yeshu," this screed originated in the 12th century, somewhere in Syria by an unknown author. It may have been a feeble attempt at revenge by a Jewish victim of the Crusaders. It has been out of print for a long time, and I imagine that not a single Jew in South Africa has ever seen or read it.

Be this as it may, Jews judge Christianity by the life and action of Christians, not by an absurd concoction like the "Toledoth Yeshu" or the futile Jesus-legends of the Talmud. Contact with a noble-minded Christian attracts the Jew to Christianity, brutal persecution repels him. Where Jews are treated with liberal humanity they drift unconsciously towards Christianity. But they turn away from it where Christians deny Christ more effectively than Jews by their inhuman treatment of his kinsmen. The present Lord Melchett was brought up as a Christian by his Catholic mother. When the Nazi persecutions started, he reverted to the Jewish faith of his father.

Christian Defenders.

In the Middle Ages, when the Talmud was a sealed book to non-Jews, it was several times burnt at the instigation of denunciators, mostly Jewish converts, who hoped to demonstrate their loyalty to their new faith by casting stones into the well from which they had drunk. Later, when Christians learned to understand the Talmud they valued and defended it. Johann Reuchlin saved it from being burnt through the endeavours of the infamous Pfefferkorn. The renowned German scholars Noeldke and Wuensche defended it from the attacks of Rohling, while Dr. Hermann Strack, whose scholarly "Introduction to the Talmud" shows a thorough mastery of the subject, more than once broke a lance in its defence. The learned works of Travers Herford, George Foot Moore, Oesterly, and Frank Chamberlain Porter (to mention but a few) prove that, while some are content to judge the Talmud by its foibles, others take it more seriously and spend many years of labour to get at the information which this literary store-house offers to the student of religion and religious history.

Economic Fallacies at Bloemfontein

THE keynote to the economic and also to much of the political history of the Union of South Africa is to be found in the poverty of both its Native and its European populations. All serious attempts, therefore, to consider ways and means by which the condition of economically backward groups in the population can be improved are to be welcomed. But such attempts must be based on reality.

The real task is how the adaptation of the South African economy to world economic forces can be expedited. There will be many who believe that this can be done somehow by the exercise of force. But this is a fallacy for which we in the Union have paid as dearly as many other countries in the last fifty years.

The characteristic feature of all economic effort in the modern world is that it is specialised effort, and that it requires the greatest possible development of the personality of every member of the society. Every member plays a complementary part in provoking and making possible the efforts of every other member. Anything, therefore, which cripples the working capacity of one, ultimately cripples the efforts of others. (This fundamental truth applies not only to nation states but also to the world as a whole.)

Economic Interdependence.

It follows from the fact that the national income is created by the efforts of all, that attempts to achieve progress for some by retarding the progress of others cannot promote the national welfare. Such attempts may indeed for a time improve the position of the favoured section. It is this fact which blinds many to the ultimate effects of such action.

This is where many of the speakers at the Afrikaner Economic Congress held at Bloemfontein went seriously astray. They advocated a policy by which the Afrikaner section of the community would somehow

organise itself in order to extract by forceful methods (organising of buying power, boycotting of non-Afrikaners, etc.) advantages which it was felt would otherwise not accrue to that section. We believe, however, that this line of thought is dangerous not only from a national but even from a purely Afrikaner point of view. The history of the Union in the last fifty years is the history of expanding economic opportunities created by the increase in the national income. It is the expansion of opportunity which provides the real foundation on which the poorer section of the community can step towards a greater degree of economic welfare. An expanding national income means that we are doing more things, different things, and, we hope, better things than we did previously. It means, for example, that the rural population is no longer tied to a subsistence standard of life, but gets opportunities of education, of acquiring skill in various occupations for new potential effort and a higher level of well-being. But these opportunities depend on others being able to exercise a similar degree of specialisation. If X wishes his son to be an oculist there must be somebody able to spare from his income a sufficient sum to pay fees for the services of X's son, and the demand for those services will only be there if others have been able to register economic advance (and higher income) in other directions.

A Popular Fallacy.

Let us take another analogy. To try to cure unemployment by throwing people who have jobs out of work, in order to make room for those who do not have them, will not really solve the problem. Similarly, to endeavour to raise the Afrikaner people by methods which refuse to others the right of exercising their present callings will only succeed in creating a new kind of poor instead of the old.

As a matter of fact, it is very doubtful whether the organisation of purchasing power by any one section in order to dra-

goon others to its will is feasible. Those from whom we buy also buy from us; and if we kill the opportunities which make it possible for them to buy, we shall have less people to whom we can sell. The economic history of the Union is full of examples of outworn political attempts to restrict the potential efforts of particular sections. All these attempts have had but one result: they have kept more people poor than would otherwise have been the case. When, for example, we restrict the opportunities of Native and Coloured people to do the kind of work of which they are capable, or for which they are prepared to acquire training, we cut our own flesh: we reduce the opportunities for young South Africans to find new and more things to do, because owing to these restrictions the market for their efforts is lacking. The market is lacking simply because these native peoples have not created **other** things against which young South Africa can exchange the results of its work.

A Fixed Number of Jobs?

There is the same error of thought in the objection to immigration on the ground that the country is already "full up." The fallacy consists in the belief that there is a fixed amount of work to be done, a fixed number of jobs, and a fixed number of superior posts. If one has that belief, one naturally concludes that the only way to improve the position of some is to undermine the position of others, and to organise to do so or to pass legislation which will have the same effect.

Professor Frankel has written with admirable good sense:

"There are reasons for believing that the immediate limitations in South Africa, as also in other parts of the Continent, still lie in the institutions and traditions of its inhabitants rather than in the inadequacy of natural resources. One cannot as yet assume that the social and economic obstacles to the creation of additional income in farming and elsewhere have been realised, still less that adequate measures have been taken to overcome them."

We believe that this Continent is underpopulated, both in the sense that it can absorb a far greater European population (through whose work new opportunities

will be created for the potential efforts of the existing European population) and in the sense that we must realise the pent-up opportunities of the indigenous population and make it economically "effective."

The Afrikaner people, and all other people in South Africa, will benefit most by policies based on a frank desire to develop to the full the economic power of every man, woman and child who can be trained to play a worthy part in increasing our national income and in developing our natural resources. Moreover, beyond the northern borders of the Union there exist enormous opportunities for the men and women now being trained in Commerce, Industry, Agriculture, Science in the Universities of the Union. We must look further afield in order to specialise in directions which, while stimulating our own development, will assist in stimulating the development of all Africa, and particularly of those parts of Africa with problems similar to our own.

There is much work to be done. But it will only be done if we can overcome that age-old chimera; that false promise — to cure poverty by the use of force, rather than by reasoned co-operation based on the recognition of the dignity of man as man.

AN AMERICAN ANSWER TO INTOLERANCE

Prepared by Frank Walser, with the assistance of Annette Smith and Violet Edwards. *Council Against Intolerance in America.*

Most handbooks designed to prepare the public against onslaughts of propaganda have usually dealt with specific attacks as they occurred. The Council against Intolerance in America, in its first manual for teachers, seeks to inoculate youth against the dread disease of hate *before* it strikes. The manual, which is intended chiefly for high school students, presents the subject under such headings as Recognition of Prejudice, Study of Propaganda Devices, Reaffirmation of American Ideals, Accurate Knowledge in Propaganda Domains, together with a discussion of anti-democratic groups and forces. The manual also provides excellent reading references for teachers and students. In America this volume of 121 pages has been endorsed by leading educators and has already been widely distributed to school-superintendents throughout the country. Similar means of educating the youth to the responsibilities entailed by living in a democracy might well be considered in our own politics-ridden country.

The Christian Church and Nazism

● By the Rev. A. W. EATON

THE flags of holy wars are easily raised, and the present world conflict finds many who can see in the attempted smash of Hitlerism every justification for designating him as the anti-Christ, the enemy of righteousness. On the other hand, far too often has the "cause of righteousness" been no more than a tool in the hands of statesmen prepared to go to any length to get public opinion to back their action. Having said that, let me also say that perhaps to-day as never before the Christian Church is alive to the possibilities of being involved when there is no real justification for their being so, and the larger majority of clergy, for instance, are by no means prepared to back their country just because it is their country.

The modern Church realises the terrific danger to her own cause in not making sure of the facts before she speaks and acts, and of the necessity of speaking against her own national state if the cause is not in her opinion a righteous one. We here in South Africa are divided. There are those of the Church in this land who are convinced that the European conflict is nothing more or less than a struggle between two political theories backed by age-long national prejudices, and therefore certainly no concern of the Church in this land. There are others who will go further, and with an inborn objection to anything English go out of their way to emphasise the high religious standard of Germany, and insist that the last thing that could be said of Germany is that she is either anti-Christian or anti-Church. On the other hand, there are those within the Church of this land and many other lands who without prejudice or fear quite honestly say that the one dominating factor that makes Hitlerism so dangerous for the world is because of her overthrow of historic Christianity, and that this fact is much more important to humanity than any other.

Historic Christianity Overthrown.

Now what are the facts governing the position of Christianity in Germany? In using that phrase, "the facts," I ask you to bear with me—I am not a German or a Nazi, therefore the element of bias may creep in. I ask indulgence if it does, but I will try as far as possible to give the facts as I myself have learned them from authoritative works that have come from various leaders of Germany. In doing so, I shall attempt to show that it is true that Germany has overthrown historic Christianity as is accepted by the universal Christian Church, and is prepared and in fact does persecute those who would try and hold her to the truths as revealed in Jesus.

Nobody questions the truth of the statement that at the beginning of the Nazi regime Hitler

had no intention of waging a war against religion. His main pre-occupation was the building up of a new Germany of the wreck of the old. To a country war-worn, humiliated and reduced to a third-rate power by the Treaty of Versailles, he held out the vision of a new Germany. He himself was and still claims to be a Catholic—although he admits not a practising one—and one of the things that he strenuously tried to avoid was a clash with the Churches of the land. In "Mein Kampf," on page 379 of the sixth edition, he says: "The task of the national-socialist movement is not that of a religious reformation, but that of a political re-organisation of our people. It sees in the two religious denominations (Catholic and Protestant) equally valuable supports for the stability of our people." In the Reichstag on March 23rd, 1933, he said: "The National Socialist State declares itself for positive Christianity—it will be my earnest endeavour to protect the two great Christian denominations in their rights, to shield them from attacks on their doctrine, and as regards their duties to establish harmony with the ideals and requirements of the present state."

All this seems fair enough, and if that were the end of the story none would be particularly critical; but unfortunately it is not the end. Every political theory has to be worked out, and apparently Hitler soon found difficulty in reconciling his mission with the teaching of the Christian Church, for on August 27th, of that same year, he said at Bad Godesberg: "Christianity was incapable of uniting Germans and that only an entirely new world theory was capable of doing so."

The Myth of the XXth Century.

On January 24th, 1934, he appointed, as the theologian of Nazism, Dr. Alfred Rosenberg, who had in 1930 written the book, "The Myth of the Twentieth Century," which is to-day accepted as the text book of the National Socialist Party, second only in importance to "Mein Kampf."

Rosenberg's responsibility was to set out for purposes of instruction to young and old the new teaching, which was to be based on his own thesis of 1930. In this book, which can be obtained in English, he aims at three things, (1) the justification of the Nazi theory of racial purity, (2) to show that national socialism has no real quarrel with Christianity, and (3) to lay down the creedal basis for all who would follow the Führer. Now, without being unduly critical, one must admit that the book is full of absurdities, mis-statements and wild theories. Let me quote his comments on the Old Testament:

"The Old Testament must go, the God of the Old Testament is the demon Jahweh, whose creation of the world out of nothing by the exercise of his own will is for us an idiotic idea. Once and for all, the Old Testament as a book of religion must be done away with and therewith the unsuccessful attempt of the last 1,500 years to make us spiritually Jews. In the place of the Old Testament must be put the Nordic Sagas and fairy stories received at first as they stand and later interpreted as symbols. They represent not the dream of hate and murderous messianism but the dream of honour and freedom."

Let me also give you what he teaches Germany on the origin of Christianity:

"The real founder of Christianity we know was the apostle Paul, his so-called conversion was the clever trick of a political Jew, a trick so successful that it has taken 1,900 years for its discovery. His hypnotic preaching appealed mostly to women, he lifted the national Jewish opposition to the Government on to an international scale and thus increased the race chaos of the ancient world. He aimed at a world revolution exalting the humble, the meek, the outcast, the least desirable elements in the population. It is St. Paul who is responsible for the bastardising, the orientalisising and the Judaising of the Christian religion."

"Jesus the Warrior God."

In his teaching about the New Testament and our Lord he goes on to say:

"Whilst the Old Testament must be repudiated, the New Testament must be purified of all its lying assertions, Christian legends and Jewish Messiah. There is not the least valid reason for the view that Jesus was of Jewish origin. The great personality of Jesus Christ was dragged down in the dirt of the near East. He is not the degenerate nor the magical sufferer nor the Lamb of God, nor the meek and humble of heart, but Jesus is the warrior God, the disturber out of Nazareth bringing not peace but a sword. It is this positive Christianity which awakens anew the powers of the Nordic blood."

The personality of Jesus is for this writer "a great personality," but nothing more, recognition of the divine sonship and the work of Christ as Saviour is ruled out—they belong, according to the writer, to the "falsifying trimmings." When talking about the significance of the Cross he makes it quite clear that the Crucifix, the symbol of death, must disappear from all German teaching. "A German Church by and by will abolish the Crucifix and replace it by the hero in his highest manifestation." Indeed, so much must disappear from the New Testament for the good German that Dr. Rosenberg has anticipated a fifth gospel: "The necessary fifth gospel cannot, of course, be decided upon by any synod. It will be created by one man who longs as deeply for the purification of the New Testament as he has studied it scientifically."

Of the real business and responsibility of the Church, he is quite explicit:

"The Churches, whether Catholic, Confessional or of German Christian leadership, have essentially only one task, to make known to the people to whom they speak the belief of the Church concerning the life beyond. The earth on which we live has absolutely nothing to do with the Church. With regard to the earth and its affairs, national socialism alone can prescribe for us."

Having given these various extracts about the fundamental facts as they affect Nazism and Christianity, it is not surprising that the Church throughout the world sees in Nazism its greatest modern opponent, for there is no question that she considers she has here her greatest enemy. It is not quite the same with Communism. Communism is openly declared Anti-God and Anti-Christian and makes no attempt to hide its feelings about the Church. It is convinced that Christianity is completely irrelevant to the life of the people. There is something very honest about such an opponent. Nazism, however, tries to give the impression that it is not opposed to Christianity, and one can only think that it is to the Church as a wolf in sheep's clothing.

A New Religion.

Now, I have just given a rough picture of some of the salient points at which the Christian Church finds herself at war. I use that last term guardedly. I will not be expected in the space at my disposal to give a full picture. It is enough to raise the question for those who do not see in national socialism of Germany a menace to the faith of Christ. However, I think there is one more word to say. Some may ask: "Does this mean that Germany is irreligious?" and the answer is "By no means." In fact, I think it is true to say that she is becoming intensely religious and is prepared and actually is ready to fight her cause with a religious impetus. What we do well to realise is that her religion is not Christian.

I have purposely refrained from writing about the intense persecution of Priests and people, of the relationship between the Catholic Church and the Reich, and of the more wild statements by those who would go much further than Dr. Rosenberg. I leave out the processions of "the blessed sacrament of the swastika," the replacement of the picture of Christ by one of Hitler in nearly every home, fire ceremonies so reminiscent of old German gods, and a newly-written psalter. For I myself would not like Christianity to be judged by fanatical extremists or emotional madcaps. National socialism has two text books: "Mein Kampf" and "Der Mythus des Zwanzigstens Jahrhunderts," both of which are obtainable in English. It also has one leader, Herr Hitler, and he has one official theologian, Dr. Rosenberg. I am prepared to let them speak for themselves and in doing so I believe that they convict themselves out of their own mouths.

Die Rassevraagstuk

NIETEENSTAANDE die publikasie van *Koers in die Kriesis*, 'n paar jaar gelede, verwelkom ons hierdie verdere bespreking van die rassevraagstuk op grond van die Calvinistiese lewensopvatting. Veral diegene onder ons wat nie Calviniste is nie en van die Calvinistiese gedagte-wêreld min kennis het, kan uit hierdie boek waardevolle inligtings oor die standpunt van 'n groot seksie van hul Afrikaner-medeburgers verkry.

Van die vier Hoofstukke van die boek, is die twee eerste, wat oor die huidige toestand van rasseverhoudings en ras-teorieë handel, baie swakker as die twee laaste, waarin die skrywer die Calvinistiese grondbeginsels en hul toepassing op die Suid-Afrikaanse toestande uiteensit. Sy oorsig in die eerste Hoofstuk oor moderne ras-teorieë is te eng en meestal tot Duitse skrywers beperk, en hy blyk nie bekend te wees met die kritiek wat buitokant Duitsland deur deskundiges op hierdie teorieë uitgeoefen is nie. In sy houding teenoor die Duitse outoriteite is hy te onkrities: hy rapporteer net wat hulle sê, maar hy bespreek dit nie. Meer nog, hy bring sy eie beginsels in Hoofstuk III nie in verband met hierdie moderne teorieë nie, sodat die leser nie reg weet nie hoever die skrywer met die Duitsers saamgaan of nie. Die paar bladsye (42-54), wat hy in sy tweede Hoofstuk aan die nie-Blankes in Suid-Afrika toewei, is te kort en te eensydig vir 'n noukeurige en juiste beskrywing van die toestande; en sommige van sy bewerings is verkeerd en in botsing met die feite. Die grootste deel, egter, van hierdie Hoofstuk handel oor die Jodevraagstuk (bl. 54-103): hier vereenselwig die skrywer hom met Kuyper se oplossing wat op die Kerstening van die Jode blyk uit te loop. Tenminste, "alles wat na haat teen die Jode sweem moet onder die Christene uitgeroei word" (101).

Die derde en vierde Hoofstukke, soos ek alreeds gesê het, is baie waardevoller. Hier kry ons Ds. Badenhorst se uitlegging van sy Calvinistiese grondbeginsels, betreffende die eenheid van die menslike geslag; die opsplitsing van die mensheid in verskillende rasse; die verhouding tussen Kerk en Staat en Maatskappy; verskillende staatsfilosofiese stelsels, soos b.v. die Humanistiese, die Nasionalistiese, en die Christelike, waaronder die skrywer die Roomse met die Reformatoriese skerp kontrasteer. Dan leer ons hier ook oor die verskil tussen die Algemene en die Besondere Genade; oor die roeping van die Sending wat al te lig verlaag word tot die taak van uitbreiding van Europese beskawing; en oor baie ander onderwerpe. Die begrippe van volk, ras, nasie

***Die Rassevraagstuk, veral betreffende Suid-Afrika, in die lig van die Gereformeerde Etiek.** Deur Francois Gerhardus Badenhorst, Amsterdam, N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgewers Maatschappij, 1937.

● Deur Prof. R. F. ALFRED HOERNLE

en staat word noukeuring onderskei, sodat die verskil tussen staatseenheid, rasenheid en volkseenheid duidelik word.

Ook vind ons hier alreeds sommige van die "konsekwensies" van die bogenoemde beginsels, soos b.v. die bewering dat die Blanke ras in Suid-Afrika nie as voog oor die "nie-verwante" en "onmondige" rasse van nie-Blankes kan optree nie, so lank as hy nie self "vry" is nie. Blykbaar bedoel die skrywer daarmee dat Suid-Afrika nog nie "vry van die vreemdelingsbestuur" (bl. 218) is nie, maar sover as ek kan sien verduidelik hy nêrens waarin die onvryheid van die Unie bestaan nie, of deur welke buitelandse mag die Unie in die uitwerking en toepassing op sy eie Naturelle-beleid belemmer word.

Die "konsekwensies" wat vir ons in die vierde Hoofstuk voorgelê word sluit 'n menigte van interessante suggesties in, soos b.v. die voorstelle dat verteenwoordiging deur Senaat en Volksraad so ontoereikend is, dat ons nog 'n addisionele staatsliggaam, 'n "Sosiale Raad," nodig het (173); en dat ons kieserstelsel "in sy wese onsedelik is, omdat dit nie rekening hou met die volk se organiese saamgesteldheid nie" (194). Om op sy kritiek van ons konstitusie en die besonderhede van sy nuwe voorstelle nader in te gaan, het ek hier nie die ruimte nie. Maar dit sou die moeite werd wees.

Wat die Jode in Suid-Afrika betref, is die skrywer beslis teen diegene gekant wat verlang dat die Staat sy mag moet gebruik om Jode van professies en besighede uit te sluit, waarin hulle buite hul proporsie in die totale bevolking van Suid-Afrika verteenwoordig is. "Die fout sit by die Afrikaanssprekende deel wat sy pligte teenoor die maatskappy nie voel of nog nie voel nie. Die Jode mag nie deur staatswetgewing van professies uitgesluit word nie." (178). Alleen selfopheffing en selfversorging kan vir die Afrikanervolk redding bring.

Die Organiese Beginsel.

Wat die nie-Blanke bevolking betref, lê die skrywer die klemtoon op die *organiese* beginsel: elke volk met sy eie kultuur is 'n organisme wat histories opgegroeï het en die reg het om homself te handhaaf, en sy verdere ontwikkeling volgens sy eie ideale te bepaal. Hierdie beginsel is beslis teen die atomistiese eenvormigheids-beleid van die Franse Rewolusie gekant. Geen volk mag oor 'n ander "tiranniseer" nie. Prakties loop dit op 'n *desentralisasie*-beleid uit, wat die skrywer as volg opsom: benoeming van aparte bestuurshoofde vir Blankes en nie-Blankes; afsonderlike bestuursliggame vir elke ras-groep, en selfs, soveel doenlik, vir elke onderdeel van die nie-Blanke ras-groep; eie administratiewe regspraak vir elke ras-groep (bl. 206).

In die toepassing van hierdie beleid op die nie-Blanke bevolking, behoort die Blanke Owerheid
(*Vervolg op bl. 10*)

THE Talmud has come in of late for a good deal of publicity, thanks to anti-Semitic propaganda. At first sight it may look strange that this "literary monument," as a Christian scholar aptly called it, could be put to such a use. After all, it is about two thousand years old, representing the religious life and activities of the Jews in Palestine and Babylon for nearly a thousand years, from about the fifth pre-Christian to the fifth post-Christian century. How can Jews of to-day be called to account for every utterance, for every opinion, for every form of belief that found its way to this vast literary record? On the whole, the Talmud breathes a spirit of justice and tolerant humanity much in advance of the raw times in which it had its growth, and despite the bitter persecutions Jews experienced inside and outside Palestine. Yet, it would be idle to measure it, as regards manner, method and outlook, by twentieth century standards. Also in the Bible, in the Old as well as in the New Testament, are words which must be read in the light of the time in which they were spoken and of the conditions to which they applied. Wrenched from their historical setting, they are meaningless and even unedifying. Utterances of this kind abound even more in such a wide and varied work as the Talmud. To take them as representing Jewish opinion and outlook of to-day is unreasonable as it is untrue.

To get over the objection it is alleged that "the Talmud is the Jewish Bible," and everything that is written in it is law for the Jew even to-day. The analogy is preposterous. Every Jewish child attending a Hebrew class learns more or less of the Bible, in the original or in translation. But not one in five thousand of the Jews brought up in South Africa or in West European countries knows anything at all of the Talmud. Only in East European countries and in Palestine is this literature still a subject of study.

Old Lore and Modern Usage.

Not everything that is written in the Bible is law for the Jews to-day. Time has put much of it out of practice. The numerous laws of sacrifice, of purity and impurity, the agricultural laws and many more are not observed now. Time has wrought even greater havoc with Rabbinical law. Besides, the Talmud is not a code. It is a collection of opinions. Some of these opinions are concerned with law, civil, criminal, religious; others with ethical and religious instruction; others again with history and the science and superstitions of the time. During the thousand years which we may vaguely describe as the Talmudic period the Jews developed an elaborate system of law, more humane and more advanced than Roman law. This might form a basis for a judiciary in a Jewish state; in the dispersion it has only a theoretical interest for the student. In practice it fell out of use by the adoption of the Rabbinical

Is the Talmud Hostile to Christians? Some Misconceptions Explained

By Rabbi W. HIRSCH, B.A.

maxim: "the law of the country is the law." This means that Jews are bound by the civil and criminal code of the country in which they live. Jews do not now take their disputes to the Rabbi but to the law courts. Only the religious laws of the Talmud, and such as have not become obsolete, are observed by practising Jews. The extensive homiletical portion, or, as it is called, the Agadah, has no binding force at all.

Another misrepresentation which is foisted upon the public makes the Talmud a pleasant hunting ground for anti-Semitism.

The Struggle against Paganism.

Judaism, like Christianity, waged determined warfare against idolatry. But while the early Christian found paganism in the last stages of decadence, Jews struggled against it when it was yet full of vigour, a power dominating the world. The Talmud, like the Bible, discriminates against idolaters, not so much offensively as defensively. The Rabbis were eager to guard the Jews from pagan influence which worked so powerfully about them. The term for idolater is "Akum," an abbreviation, meaning "worshipper of stars and planets." Now, anti-Semites, ransacking Rabbinic literature for their nefarious propaganda, translate "Akum" by "non-Jew," thus giving the impression that the anti-pagan enactments applied to Gentiles generally, include Christians. Rabbinic authorities, from the 10th century onward repeatedly declared that a Gentile with a belief in God, and leading a moral life, is, according to the Talmud, a "proselyte of the second degree," or in Biblical parlance, a "sojourning proselyte," and must be treated as a Jew.

Rabbinic tradition has it that God gave to the "sons of Noah," that is, to all mankind, including the Israelites of the pre-Sinaitic dispensation, seven commands which are: to practise justice, to abstain from blasphemy, idolatry, lust, bloodshed, robbery, and the eating of flesh from an animal before it is dead. Gentiles who observe these seven commands stand high in the favour of God, and must be treated with brotherly love.

Maimonides, a sage of the twelfth century, who was the first to abstract the laws of the Talmud and to compile them into a code, writes of this proselyte:

"His bread, his wine and his oil are clean for use. One must not over-reach him, nor keep him out of anything, nor owe him his wages overnight. His place of residence must not be inferior or near the frontier, but you must settle him in a fine place of residence, in the middle of the land of Israel, in a place where his trade supports him, for thus it is written (Deut. 23, 17). He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in the place which he shall choose in one of thy gates where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him." (Gerim, section 3.)

Juda ben Samuel of Worms (1200), in his book, *Sefer Chassidim*, says:

"Concerning a Gentile who zealously practises the seven commandments of the children of Noah, take care. It is forbidden to deceive him; give him back what he has lost, and do not slight him, but honour him more than an Israelite who does not study the Torah."

The well-known Rabbinic authority, Isaac ben Shesheth (1400) writes in his *Responses*:

"The Christians must call us brethren; they do not belong to the category of sojourning proselytes, they are more closely connected with us."

The Jew and his Neighbour.

Rabbi Elia Pinchas ben Meir, in his book, "*Sefer Ha Berith*" (1797), says in the chapter "On Love of Our Fellow-men":

"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. This is not only meant for the Israelite, for it does not say, Thou shalt love thy brother as thyself. Rather is everybody thy neighbour who is a human being like thyself. This implies all the nations, for our wise men never excluded the nations from the love of the fellow-man. Even when the Torah says 'Thy brother,' or 'the sons of thy people,' they only excluded the heathens of that time among whom rapine, and murder, and lust were rife, but not the other nations of the present time who all of them are humane, righteous, merciful, charitable and just."

The prolific Rabbinic writer, Jacob Emden, 18th century, after discussing at length the virtues of Christianity, says:

"The Nazarene (Jesus) has brought a double boon into the world, as nowadays appears clearly and evidently. He has destroyed idolatry, removed the graven images from the nations, laid upon them the seven commandments of the children of Noah and also the Decalogue, that they shall not be like the beasts of the field; and, secondly, he has given them moral precepts, and he has made life much more difficult for them than the Mosaic Law, as we know."

Another criticism of the Talmud turns on its alleged hostility to the early Christians and its alleged offensive allusions to Jesus.

Much of this hostility is based on surmise. Not all statements about "MINIM" refer to Christians. The word "MIN" in the Talmud is

applied only to a Jewish sectary, not to a non-Jew, and is used for the Samaritan, the Sadducee, the Gnostic and the Jewish Christian. There is evidence that during the first century the Rabbis and the Judaeo-Christians lived on friendly terms. It is related that a certain Jacob of Sekanya quoted to Rabbi Eliezer the interpretation of a Biblical verse in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, and the Rabbi liked the interpretation. On another occasion Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Dama, was bitten by a snake, and a Jewish Christian, Jacob of Sama, offered to cure him in the name of Jesus. Rabbi Eliezer wanted to prove from the Bible that he was permitted to receive such cure, but his uncle, Rabbi Ishmael, objected.

Relations with Early Christians.

Such friendly relations indicate that during the first century, at any rate, there was no hostility between the Rabbis and the Judaeo-Christians, or Ebionites, who were still conforming Jews. As for their belief in Jesus as the Messiah, that apparently constituted no heresy. Did not the great Akiba, in the face of ridicule, acclaim Bar Kochba the Messiah? When the High Priest Anan the son of Anan, had James, the brother of Jesus, put to death, the Jews were outraged, and sent two deputations to Agrippa and to Albinas, the new governor, who was on his way back to Jerusalem and had the High Priest deposed (Josephus Ant. XX, 9). Bar Kochba, who revolted against the Romans, persecuted the Jewish Christians. He did not kill them, but had them scourged (Justin Martyr, Apology 1, 31). He did this not on religious but on political grounds, because the Christians refused to join the rebellion. Pacifists during the last war were treated nearly as badly. The same Bar Kochba also killed the most renowned Jewish saint of his time, because he suspected him of not being wholeheartedly for the war, and the crime so horrified his followers that they lost all hope of success.

Only in the second century when the Judaeo-Christians began to break away from the synagogue, and under Pauline influence started to discard Jewish ceremonial did a feeling of bitterness develop. The Rabbis showed no hostility whatever towards the Gentile Christians. They could look only with favour upon Gentiles who turned from the hated paganism to a belief in God. But Jews who made light of the Law they suspected of heresy, and looked upon them as dissenters. For all that, dissenters from the synagogue fared a great deal better than dissenters from the Church; and Christians who are so severe in their condemnation of the Talmud because of its hostility to the Judaeo-Christians should remember the wise words of the Sermon on the Mount, "Judge not that ye be not judged."

The Talmud and Christ.

The Talmudic references to Jesus are few. In the Mishna, the oldest part of the Talmud, he is

(Continued on page 2)

Sigmund Freud and Common Sense

● By L. MELAMED

BY calling reason by such terms as common sense, mother wit and even horse-sense, the popular mind has shown that it considers that mental quality to be the rock bottom minimum endowment we all possess. Yet, whether we possess it or not, it is not much in evidence. Much to our cost and grief we all clearly realise that it is not reason but "passion and prejudice that govern the world." Surely such phenomena as wars, Nazism and lynchings belie the notion that good sense is common.

This is indeed a puzzle: On the one hand we are told that man is but "a little lower than the angels." On the other, we see him behave like the world's "sick beast." True, theology has grappled with this baffling problem; but in vain does one turn to natural science for a solution.

Most unbiassed thinkers and students of mankind are to-day agreed that Sigmund Freud, if he has not completely solved this problem, has at least put us on the right road towards a solution.

Freud has taught us that man is at once more chaotic and more orderly, more immoral and more moral than we were accustomed to suppose. The mind of every one of us, Freud has shown, does not consist alone of the sun-flooded noon of consciousness; there is also the twilight of our Fore-conscious and the deep, dark night of our Unconscious. But Freud and his collaborators have not only discovered the Unconscious; they have also (what is perhaps even more important) care-

fully and successfully explored it and sketched its nature and extent. The chaos of the lowest recesses of our mind has been reduced to some order.

Reason and Unreason.

Furthermore, Freud and his School have taught us that our impulsive nature, "the evil imagination of man's heart," is far more powerful, violent, and primitive than was thought possible. At the same time, they have described and defined the exact place which our critical faculty and our moral censure find in the structure of our mind and character. Thus Freud brought life and meaning to Reason by first throwing into relief the real force of Unreason. He did not vaguely speak of conflicts raging within the human breast, but clearly mapped the forces engaged in the struggle and the fortunes of war as they move to and fro.

There are highly significant lessons to be drawn from the discoveries and teachings of Freud. A rational mind, together with other attributes indispensable to civilised existence, are not a natural heritage but an *achievement*. Indeed, they must be largely attained anew by each individual, and not without pain and travail. An achievement implies deliberate effort and some planning. Above all, conditions of life must be right and congenial for the tender plant of sweet reasonableness to grow. *In fine*, it is only a just, humane and intelligent society that can hope to give forth men and women of "capability and godlike reason."

DIE RASSEVRAAGSTUK.

(Voortgesit van bl. 7)

egter rekening te hou met die verskillende grade van "onmondigheid" wat nog onder die nie-Blankes te vinde is. Maar as ek hom reg verstaan, veronderstel die skrywer nie dat hierdie onmondigheid 'n vir altyd bestaande minderwaardigheid aandui: "duidelik moet uitgespreek word, dat die gekleurde rasse nog nie sosiaal uitgegroeï en geryp is nie, maar dat hulle nietemin daartoe gelei en opgevoed moet word" (bl. 223, artikel 65 van die finale opsomming.) In hierdie gees, beveel hy aan dat algemene opvoeding en onderwys ook op die gekleurde rasse moet toeges word (art. 19), al sou dit ook onder verskillende bestuursliggame gebeur (art. 20); dat die stoflike welvaart van alle rasse verbeter moet word (art. 62); dat die finansies van die verskillende rasse van mekaar geskei moet word, sodat die oorskotte by die gekleurde rasse vir hul eie opheffing aangewend kan word (art. 59); dat "die inwendige aangeleenthede van die verskillende rasse al meer self-reëling moet verkry" (art. 57), terwyl "van vereuropesing geen sprake mag wees nie." (art. 2).

Ek het nie die ruimte om hierdie voorstelle uitvoerig te bespreek nie. Ek kan die skrywer net gelukwens met sy grondige en diepgaande deurdinking van die probleem en vir hom verseker dat baie sogenoemde "liberale" met hom op hierdie pad sal kan saamgaan, mits dubbelsinnige woorde soos "vereuropesing" eers duidelik uitgelê is. Dis klaarblyklik dat sy *desentralisasie* beleid iets totaal anders is as die gewone *segregasie* beleid, wat 'n deel van die tegniek van Blanke heerskappy of diktatorskap oor die nie-Blankes is—'n diktatorskap wat op 'n kastesistiem neerkom, waarin die nie-Blankes altyd aan Blankes onderhewig sal wees en waarin vir hul eie organiese ontwikkeling tot selfstandigheid geen moontlikheid bestaan nie. Persoonlik glo ek nie dat die Blanke ras ooit gewillig sal wees om hierdie desentralisasie-beleid eerlik te handhaaf nie, want uiteindelik sal dit van die Blanke ras 'n vrywillige oorgawe van sy oorheersende posisie vereis. Maar soos die skrywer in sy laaste artikel (68) van opsomming sê "oor wat die uitkoms van die rassevraagstuk in Suid-Afrika sal wees, beskik God."

THE PAPACY AND THE JEWS

● By the Rev. Father W. P. WHELAN, O.M.I.

In any discussion of the relationship between the Catholic Church and the Jews, it is important to bear in mind that activities of certain Catholics in any particular time or place, are not necessarily a true reflex of the Catholic attitude. Catholics and Jews do indeed have this much in common, that they have been found living in every part of the world; the Jews by reason of a dispersion, which must be regarded by them as the greatest tragedy in all their history; and Catholics by virtue of their essential claim to universality.

This fact that Catholics and Jews have come together under a variety of changing circumstances, must therefore lead the historian to expect that the contact between them would not always have had uniform results. While men do agree in the acceptance of certain principles, it will often happen that their personal application of principle to practice will be governed less by logic than by a number of psychological and sociological considerations. If in this instance, then, one would ascertain in principle some knowledge of the Catholic attitude towards the Jews, it will be necessary from the outset to ignore entirely isolated acts of individual Catholics, or of certain bodies of Catholics, and to concentrate exclusively on the pronouncements of the one person, whose voice through the ages is alone authoritative—the Pope.

Gregory the Great.

From the latter part of the second century B.C., when the Jews first settled in Rome, until the end of the sixth century A.D., they were under the control of the Roman civil power. During most of this time, they were free to practise their religion, but they had no security in the maintenance of civil privileges. Indeed, it might be said that the Jews did not enjoy freedom with any assurance of its continuity until the advent of Pope Gregory the Great in 590 A.D. Dr. Gottard Deutsch (*Jewish Encyclopaedia*, X, 126) says that the history proper of the Popes in relation to the Jews, began with Gregory I. "He often protected the Jews against violence and unjust treatment on the part of officials and condemned forcible baptism." Graetz, in his history of the Jews (1892, iii, 34), writes: "Gregory, surnamed the Great and Holy . . . gave utterance to the principle that the Jews should only be converted by means of persuasion and gentleness, not by violence. He conscientiously maintained the rights of citizenship of the Jews, which had been recognised as belonging to them, by various Roman Emperors."

Canon F. Homes Dudden, a former Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University, in a detailed study of the life and acts of Pope Gregory, says, "The Jews found a resolute champion and defender in Pope Gregory the Great. For some reason or other, the Pope set his face steadfastly against all persecution of the Jews and refused to permit any violation of their legal rights or any attempt at forcible proselytism. Thus, when the Jews suffered from an injury, they got into the habit of appealing to Rome and, if their complaint was reasonable, they were sure of obtaining redress at the hands of the Pope."

Forcible Baptism.

During the years following the Pontificate of Pope Gregory the Great, many questions affecting the Jews were dealt with by succeeding Pontiffs. Among these questions, two constantly recurred. The first was about forcible baptism, and the second about the Jewish possession of Christian slaves. Wherever instances occurred of forced baptisms, they must always be regarded as abuses in direct disobedience to the Papal Decrees. Pope Nicholas II., Clement VI., twice in 1345; Martin V. in 1418, 1420 and 1429; and Eugenius IV. in 1432, authoritatively condemned the coercion of Jews into the Faith.

On the question of Jewish ownership of slaves, the early Popes were unanimous in decreeing that no Jew could have a Christian slave. Their reason for this attitude was that according to the Talmudic prescription, slaves had to be circumcised on the day they passed into Jewish ownership, and circumcision implied renunciation of the Faith. This fact is admitted by Jewish historians like Graetz, Max Radin, Israel Abrahams, and Cecil Roth.

Frankish Persecution.

Early in the eleventh century Pope Alexander II. (1061-1073) was conspicuous in the defence of the Jews who had become victims of a Frankish persecution in Spain. The Spanish Bishops heartily associated themselves with the Pope's condemnation of the Franks for their inhuman conduct. In Narbonne, Viscount Berengar was highly commended by the Pope for thwarting an anti-Jewish outbreak in 1063. At the same time, the Bishop of Narbonne was instructed to offer protection to the Jews of that city. The *Jewish Encyclopaedia* (I., 344-345) records that Pope Alexander II. always demanded justice for the Jews.

In 1145, when Pope Eugenius III. entered Rome after his election, he received a special

welcome from the Jews of the City, who carried into his presence their copy of the Pentateuch. In recognition of this greeting, the Pope ordered that at his consecration there should be placed before him, in addition to the Greek and Latin, a Hebrew copy of the Gospels.

Graetz (History of the Jews III., 421) speaks of the humane treatment of the Jews by Pope Alexander III. In reference to the Third Lateran Council held in 1179, he also says: "The final decrees bear witness to the gentle spirit of toleration that prevailed over the mania for persecution. While the Council renewed the old prohibition against the Jewish employment of Christian servants, it particularly forbade any interference with the religious rights of the Jews.

Popes Clement III. (1187-1191) and Celestine III. (1191-1198) were equally assiduous in protecting the Jews against the aggression of their neighbours.

Margolis, the Jewish historian, says of Pope Innocent III. (1198-1216) that although he regarded the unbelief of the Jews as in many respects blameworthy, yet he held that Jews were not to be persecuted by Christians. In 1199 he renewed the privileges granted by Alexander III., which insured to the Jews inviolability of their faith, their life and limb and their property.

Pope Honorius III. (1216-1227) in an encyclical letter forbade the molestation of the Jews and took them under his special care.

Pope Gregory IX. (1227-1241) continued the same treatment and met with considerable opposition in his attempts to stem the Jewish persecution in Germany and France.

The Blood Accusation.

It was Pope Innocent IV. (1243-1254) who in 1246 had to deal with the mad outburst of German mob fury against the notorious Blood Accusation. This accusation he condemned as false and unfounded; he declared further in an instruction to the Bishops that far from ritual murder being ordered by law, any suggestion of it was directly contrary to the law. It was after the Pope had been approached by a deputation of German Rabbis that he issued an order for the redress of wrongs to which the Jews had been subjected, whether at the hands of ecclesiastics or noblemen.

In connection with the so-called ritual murder, it is not without interest to recall the witness of Dr. Hermann Strack in the Jewish Encyclopaedia, where he declares that "many Popes, either directly or indirectly, have condemned the

Blood Accusations: No Pope has ever sanctioned it." In 1913, Lord Rothschild wrote to Cardinal Merry del Val, Secretary of State, to enquire whether the letter of Innocent IV. exonerating the Jews from the charge of ritual murder, was authentic. He received an answer in the affirmative.

Pope Alexander IV. (1254-1261) assisted Jewish merchants by exempting them from road tax anywhere in the Papal possessions.

Both Gregory X. (1271-1276) and Nicholas III. (1277-1280) renewed decrees in favour of the Jews commanding that their possessions were to be safeguarded, their customs to be respected, and their cemeteries to remain undisturbed.

Nicholas IV. (1288-1292) and Boniface VIII. (1294-1303) also came to the rescue of the Jews when they were persecuted by the civil power. So, too, did John XXII. (1316-1334) and Benedict XII. (1334-1342).

When a fierce persecution broke out against the Jews in France and Germany during the reign of Clement VI. (1342-1352), he issued three Bulls in three years, protesting vehemently against the mad slaughter of thousands of innocent men and women. To the homeless wanderers he gave refuge in the tiny Papal States. Some hundred and fifty years later, Alexander VI. (1492-1503) also gave refuge in the same way when he received 15,000 Jews who had been expelled from Spain.

The Spanish Inquisition.

The Spanish Inquisition in relation to the Jews would have to be made the subject of a separate article, for it is too large a subject to be dealt with in these notes. Unfortunately, there have been too many historians "with a purpose" during the past few hundred years whose official work has been to create malicious propaganda instead of helping people to understand historic truth and historic movements; the Spanish Inquisition has unfortunately been the happy hunting ground for these subverters of truth, with the result that few non-Catholics have ever come to know the facts of the case. Suffice it here to say that Jews, as such, were not subject to the Inquisition, whose operations were confined mainly to those Jews (Conversos or Maranos), who for material advantage, had professed the Christian Faith and had then again relapsed into Judaism. In support of the Catholic assertion that the Inquisition was a Crown Institution and not a Papal Institution, we need only refer to the testimony of Elkan N. Adler, brother of a past Chief Rabbi of England. The fact remains, too, that the one Ruler who gave permanent refuge to exiled Spanish Jews was the Pope.

(To be concluded)

THE RISING TIDE

● By The Rev. A. W. ("Tubby") EATON

There is a rising tide of opinion in democratic countries against the menace of racialism and the fomenting of discord between nations, races and groups for political or economic reasons. These columns will each month reflect the growing consensus of democratic opinion that there are no problems which cannot be resolved by the application of common sense, goodwill and democratic procedure.

Mud-Slinging.

FEW of us will approve of the mud-slinging that appears to be a daily feature of certain elements of our South African press. It is surprising how quickly some people can change their tune, and one is tempted to think that it is very much a question "Whatever Pope or King may reign, I shall still be the Vicar of Bray, Sir." Few of us agree with the bitterness being displayed, but it is not common sense to go out of one's way to cast slurs upon one's opponents, and for myself I believe that the sanest policy is to give men at least the credit for their convictions. An incident over the past month, for instance, that is not particularly full of common sense, was that of the burning of Union Jacks at Heidelberg, in the Transvaal. There are the diehards who literally fumed at such an indignity, but forgot that actually it was six of one and half-a-dozen of the other. Such incidents are not in the interests of the community, and I would plead at this time for a spirit of toleration and a refusal on the part of those who have very strong convictions to participate in those things which are an offence to either side of the community.

The Church and War.

Many in this country will be grateful for the lead given in the churches of this land by the Rev. Wm. Nicol, Moderator of the Dutch Reformed Church in the Transvaal. In a recent article in the "Kerkbode," he said that the Afrikaner churches had a special duty towards the Afrikaner nation and in time of need did not hesitate to give the nation any advice. In the present day, it was the right and duty of the Church to condemn every war in which an attack was made by one nation on another. When such a war was started for our own benefit and without provocation it was in conflict with the will of God.

"It is the responsibility, however, of the Christian Government with its special knowledge to determine whether the circumstances justify a declaration of war . . . If the Government cannot persuade the people (that war is justified) the people have the means and power to put others in their place and carry out their will. All this, however, does not absolve the Church from seeking to know what is the will of God in this matter."

There are those who cannot get it out of their heads that the church groups in the land must by the very circumstances of things be racial and political. It is quite untrue to say that the Dutch

Reformed Church is solely an Afrikaans political group, as it is also unfair to say, and untrue, that the Anglican Church is an imperialistic group. The Bishop of Johannesburg had some very hard things to say on this subject to his own clergy and laity when he spoke to them a few days ago at his Diocesan Synod.

"We are met as citizens of a country which is at war. And it is inevitable that that fact should colour all our discussions and all our plans. I shall first say what I believe to be the position of our Church. The Church of the Province of South Africa is one of a group of self-governing Churches, spread throughout the world, which has its centre in England, and looks to Canterbury, not for authoritative direction—there is no Anglican Pope—but for help and guidance. It is therefore natural that, of the European members of our Church, a very large proportion should be English in origin or by descent. But our Mission is not only to one section of the inhabitants of this land.

"There is room and a welcome within our fold for all who will submit themselves to the doctrine and discipline of our Church, whatever be their racial origin, whatever be the language they speak, and the political opinions they hold. The very fact that the great majority of our members are of English descent should make us the more careful to avoid acquiescing in being the Church of a section of the population. For historical reasons that is what we at present tend to be. But it is not what we want to be. No human being is excluded from membership of our Church by reason of his race or of his political opinions. And it is not our desire that those who join us should become Englishmen, but only that they should become better Christians, which is not necessarily the same thing."

Somebody pointed out to me the other day that at one time it used to be said that the Church of England was the Conservative Party at prayer; and if we are not careful the Church of the Provinces will become the Smuts Party at prayer, and the Dutch Reformed Church the Malan Party at prayer. But I cannot help feeling that most sane South Africans realise that patriotism is not enough.

A Brilliant Teacher.

South Africa has been privileged to have the mental stimulus of the presence within its borders of Professor Sigerist, one of the most brilliant speakers and teachers of this age. He is out here to assist those who would bring about more state aid in medicine. He is no theorist alone but a man of colossal intellectual and practical experience. Having travelled the world over, he has mastered many languages and studied probably wider than any other man on the subject of medicine. He has

the highest regard for the Soviet and is giving South Africa many hints on that country's very successful state-aided medical programme. The value that I got from his visit was that he reminded me that South Africa has plenty of scope for those who would really serve the nation, and that there are other problems besides republicanism, fusion, neutrality and what-not, which true South Africans must face up to, and, I believe, will. There is a whole lot of common sense behind his remark: "Disease knows no colour bar." The Rising Tide of sane South African opinion has long known this and is working towards this end.

Roman Catholics and Racism.

Roman Catholics in this country will value the article in this edition written by Father Whelan on the Papacy and the Jews. It is well worth studying. I am also indebted to another Roman Catholic, Cardinal Van Roey, Archbishop of Malines, for a declaration full of common sense on the Catholic Church and race theory. His Eminence declared that one heard much nowadays of the doctrine which was propagated and applied in Germany and was also making itself heard in Italy.

"These theories," he said, "and their applications are in evident and irreducible contradiction with the Catholic religion and are manifestly opposed to its teaching, dogmatic and moral. These propositions and others like them, the S. Congregation names absurd, untenable and detestable theories. The doctrine of blood, then, as I have just exposed it and as it is being cried up to-day, must be repudiated as erroneous and harmful. The totalitarianism which derives from blood and is embodied in the exigencies of the race is a doctrine of absurdity and constitutes an immense moral danger."

Jews and the War.

Unfortunately for South Africa, Jew-baiting seems to be a byword in certain sections of the Press and of their political platforms. One paper, for instance, recently said: "It is the good Christians who are fighting on the battle-fields of Europe and Jews who are staying at home and profiteering." One expects this kind of thing from the gutter presses, but not from the opposition presses, which ought to be leading a sane opposition from deep-rooted convictions.

To accuse the Jew of sitting at home and strengthening his bank balance at the expense of Christians is, in the face of the facts, a sad commentary on the mentality of those who make it. The great Polish Jewish community of three and a half million souls have become the chief sufferers of the war. The Nazi conquerors of Poland, after the first excesses, may seek to propitiate the Polish peasant and keep him quiet so that the main German forces will be free to meet the threat on the Western front. But for the Jews there will be no mercy, as the Nazis have already shown in the occupied areas of Western Poland.

One newspaper correspondent wrote recently:

"The harrowing tales of carnage in the predominantly Jewish towns and villages of Poland are already

known. Eye-witnesses have described the mass murder from the air of thousands of Jewish women, children and aged folk fleeing before the advancing Nazi hordes. What is now left? A broken, penniless, decimated people whose rescue and rehabilitation will be a task challenging the utmost resources of the Jews of the entire world."

We do not realise that the fate of the Jews now comes from two sides. They have to flee from the Germans who will not have them at all, and those who wish to retain their religious freedom have to flee from the Russians.

The story does not stop at Poland. It is stated that a hundred thousand Jews in France alone have joined the colours in gratitude to the country which has given them a home. In Palestine over a hundred and thirty thousand Palestine Jews are enrolled in the country's defence forces and practically every able-bodied Jew and Jewess in the country has volunteered for war service.

Propaganda that Promotes Crime.

The crime of killing Charles Harris was not the crime alone of one individual, Jacob Moller Hugo. In so far as the motives for the crime were born and shaped in an atmosphere of half-hysterical mysticism, of sentimentality and race complex which were in turn due to a long campaign of perverted, racial propaganda, one may well agree with the "Friend" that "in a very real sense this purposeless tragedy, which led to the death of one human being and the miserable death-in-life of another, must lie at the door of those who, by their reckless crusade of incitement, set in motion the forces of hatred and destruction."

The Union Press is almost unanimous in its agreement. The "Star" puts the case clearly in its editorial of October 14:

"There is in circulation in some parts of this country and among certain classes a propaganda which, although not deliberately directed to lethal ends, may promote a disposition to violence, serious or less serious, among the more ignorant and brutal elements of society. Educated and instructed men and women know how to discount the palpable absurdities of such propaganda . . . But sometimes these follies lodge in uncritical minds." Hugo "is to make expiation, but his instigators are still in the dock, arraigned by their own and public conscience."

Summing Up.

Summing up Rising Tide for this month, I again take courage in those signs of constructive thinking and action that are going on all round us. True, the forces of destruction are making much noise and do much damage even here in South Africa itself, but there are those who see it as their duty to face the future calmly and courageously, believing that common sense will prevail. The important thing for us to remember is that these are not just a few isolated clergy or negro-philists, or sociologists, but a large number of sane, healthy South Africans of all schools of different races and creed, and colour, for which we thank God and take courage.

The Forgotten Man

TO understand fully the swift-moving world events of to-day and their resultant evils, one must probe deeply into the background of the 19th and 20th centuries, which was largely responsible for the present chaotic state of affairs.

The 19th century was the champion of individualism; it pleaded sincerely for the "self-determination" of the individual jealously guarding his rights; it emphasised that man was made in the image of God and, above everything else, that society must not encroach upon the sanctity of human personality but, on the contrary, must pay homage to the individual and his needs. The philosophy of the 19th century could be epitomised in the well-known words: "To thine own self be true, and thou canst not then be false to any man."

The 20th century, on the other hand, particularly as a result of the Great War, witnessed the growing tendency to suppress the individual. During the Great War, the statesmen of Europe could not possibly take heed of the individual, as the war-machine forced all men into one melting pot. As a result, the germ of mass-intoxication entered the innermost being of a large number of people. Many men and women in Europe stand to attention when hearing a voice of a demagogue or when seeing an upraised arm. Men constantly marching in glittering uniforms think with their feet. They indulge in the luxury of complete self-forgetfulness, leaving to someone else the task of making decisions for them. This mass-intoxication has transformed the individual into a helpless, dependent and utterly denuded, robot-like being, completely under the spell of a Fuehrer or Duce.

Mass Intoxication.

The germ of mass-intoxication has spread its poison far afield and has forced upon many countries a mass-mentality which has brought into existence the authoritarian and totalitarian states of Europe. Under the spell of this mass-mentality the individual has tended to dodge all personal responsibilities and to give up all private initiative. Nations—in the last analysis an aggregate of individual men and women—have sunk low and have turned into mindless mobs. Man, in many parts of Europe, can be likened to the keys of a typewriter upon which fanatic maniacs pound their coarse fingers with utmost severity.

This mass-intoxication and mass-mentality has, however, deprived man of the most precious human gift—freedom, and by fettering his actions and movements, gradually engendered within him an inner feeling of revolt, of which he is constantly becoming more and more conscious. He is

beginning to feel insecure, uncertain of the morrow, nervous and jittery.

We can safely assume that there will never be peace in the world as long as the individual, even the least important, *the forgotten man*, does not come back to his own. There will never be permanence in human affairs unless a stop is put to the pathetic spiritual and moral suicides committed by so many men and women who, whether due to force majeure or to their own free will, kill their real selves. The world will recover from the mess in which it has been thrown when nations begin to respect individuality, and when they succeed in changing into real free human beings the many dehumanised and regimented automata who have only one objective in life—to obey, follow and merge into the will of the leader.

Mankind will be saved when the individual achieves "Self-determination."

THE FOLLY OF ANTI-SEMITISM

by Sydney Dark and Herbert Sidebotham. London, HODDER & STOUGHTON, LTD., 1939. pp. 92. 1/-.

One of the most balanced short surveys of anti-Semitism yet published. Contains an exposé of the myth of "international Jewry," outlines the Jewish contributions to European civilisation and analyses the significance of Zionism for any comprehensive plan for resolving the problems of the Jews. The book contains much valuable factual material in refutation of common anti-Semitic allegations.

"Common Sense" tries to bring common reason and common sense to bear upon our various racial, political and economic problems. It seeks to substitute objective and dispassionate thought for the tyranny of slogans, labels and prejudices.

All who wish to further these objects are invited to co-operate:

Subscribe to the journal:

Bring it to the notice of your friends:

Submit contributions for publication.

The annual subscription, which is 4s. for non-members and 3s. for members, should be sent to

"Common Sense," P.O. Box 7791, Johannesburg.

Letters to the Editor

THE "MURDER OF JESUS"

In days when hatred is very vocal and condemnatory expression unthinkingly bandied about, will some experience of the opposite bring relief or cheer to any?

We are constantly hearing that Gentiles always accuse the Jews of the "Murder of Jesus"—that the Gospels, Acts and Epistles bear out the accusation, and even that our Lord hated the Jews, that therefore the stain attaches, etc., etc. We all know the rubbish that is talked.

But—there are, and have been, countless people of my age and generation who though steeped in the New Testament from childhood have not interpreted it in that sense, but in the following:—

1. Addressed to Christians:— If *they* shall fall away . . . *they* crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh." (See Heb. VI., v., 6).

2. St. Paul cautions the Gentile Christians against insulting the Jews, who were like branches broken off from the tree through unbelief, whereas "Thou standest by faith . . . be not high-minded but fear . . . lest God also spare not thee"—"God is able to graft them in again."—"My heart's desire for Israel is that they shall be saved."—"God hath concluded them all in unbelief that He might have mercy upon all."—"I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen, according to the flesh." (From the Epistle to Romans, Chapters IX, X and XI.) *That* does not sound like hatred, from the man who could write "To me, to live is Christ."

3. St. Peter—Yes, he says, "You killed the Prince of Life whom God raised from the dead," but adds, "and now, brethren, I know that through ignorance you did it, as did also your rulers." (See Acts III., verses 15 to 18.)

4. The wondrous words of Him Who was crucified—"Father forgive them for they know not what they do." (St. Luke XXIII, v. 34. Compare also St. Luke XIX, v. 41.)

5. The actual records in the Gospels are a marvel of dispassionateness and detachment. The *facts* of the acts of each actor are just stated, with no rancour or words of abuse.

6. The *sins* against which our Lord Himself thundered when visible on earth are the very ones against which the Old Testament prophets inveighed, and against which, committed by Jew and Gentile alike, He is thundering from Heaven now.

7. Ever we are taught by the Church that it was the sins of the *world* which crucified Christ—the greed and selfishness of the Judases who yet keep company—if only with "the civilized" to-day—the cowardice of the office-loving Pilates—the hypocrisy and cruelty of those in power, and:—

"It was *my* pride and hardness that hung Him on the Tree;

"Those cruel nails, Oh Saviour, were driven in by *me*."

"O break, O break, hard heart of mine,
Thy weak self-love and guilty pride,
His Pilate and His Judas were,
Jesus, Our Lord, is crucified."

8. There is a remarkable absence of any spirit of revenge in the writers of the New Testament. Why should it be otherwise? They were not men who had given up all to pin their faith on one who had *disappointed* their hopes by His death, but were the buoyant agents of the risen and living Lord, Who had by His Resurrection transcended and transformed their wildest dreams and Who by His personal Presence enabled them to endure unto the end through years of persecution, dullness, strenuous labour, misunderstanding, bold witness and imprisonment, until death became to them "the Gate of Life."

Capetown.

L.G.

"DIE HUGENOTE"

Ek het met besonder belangstelling die stuk van Adv. G. F. de Vos Hugo gelees in u uitgawe vir September, 1939. Dit is 'n goeddeurwerkte stuk van diepgaande studie. Ek neem aan dat Adv. Hugo ons tussen die reëls wil laat lees watter lesse ons kan leer van die Hugenote immigrasie in Suid-Afrika. Vir my is die groot les, die groot betekenis van die oorplasing van die Franse vlugtelinge dit:— Dat manne en vroue wat vir hul geloof 'n land verlaat maar altyd blyk gee deurdring te wees van sedelike waardes wat van nut is, en tot die welsyn strek, van die land wat hul ontvang as setlaars—ook vir die stoffelike welsyn van die ontvangende land is hul nuttig.

In hierdie dae moet ons nie vergeet nie hoeveel voordeel ons van die immigrasie van uitgewykte Jode getrek het. Hul gee ons 'n voorbeeld van amper onuitputlike energie en van 'n oorspronklike gedagtegang, 'n uitvindingsgees wat hom op verskillende maniere geopenbaar het. Sonder twyfel sal ons nageslag wat in minder bevooroordeelde tye sal leef, besef dat die immigrasie van die Joodse vlugtelinge van amper net soveel betekenis was as die van die Hugenote. Ek wil nie sê nie presies soveel, maar tog van groot betekenis.

My gedagte is dat onder President Paul Kruger was daar meer Godsdienstvryheid as nou.

Die Uwe,

G. A. LEYDS.

9, South-West House,
Greenmarket Square,
Kaapstad.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM.

To: COMMON SENSE, P.O. Box 7791, Johannesburg. Please Post this Slip.

I am * a member of the Society of Jews and Christians, and herewith enclose my
I am not *
annual subscription of three shillings * for COMMON SENSE.
four shillings

NAME
(please use block letters)

ADDRESS
.....

**Strike out the words which do not apply.*

Common Sense

: CONTENTS :

The Way of Peace (Editorial).....	3
Propaganda: The Counter-Attack by <i>Dr. H. Sonnabend</i>	4
South African Neuroses by <i>Prof. I. D. MacCrone</i>	5
The Heart Bowed Down by <i>A. C. Partridge</i>	7
Democracy v. Totalitarianism by <i>Prof. R. F. A. Hoernlé</i>	8
The Rising Tide by <i>the Rev. A. W. Eaton</i>	11
The Papacy and the Jews by <i>the Rev. Father W. P. Whelan, O.M.I.</i>	13
Die Boer en die Jood deur <i>L. de Hart Larkins</i>	15
Letters to the Editor.....	16
Recent Activities of the Society.....	2

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

VOL. 1. NO. 5.

NOVEMBER 1939

PRICE 4d.

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.

Common Sense

"Common Sense" is published monthly by the Society of Jews and Christians, Johannesburg.

Editorial Board:

A. W. EATON C. H. S. RUNGE
R. F. A. HOERNLE G. SARON
 H. SONNABEND

Subscription:

The subscription to *Common Sense* is 3/- per annum to members (or 3d. per copy); and 4/- per annum to non-members (or 4d. per copy). Post free.

Copies may be ordered from the Secretaries, P.O. Box 7791, Johannesburg, as well as from the Secretaries of Affiliated Societies in other centres of the Union.

The Editors welcome articles, comments or correspondence bearing upon the objects of the journal: to combat prejudice and racialism and to further common sense and goodwill in South Africa. Contributions should be addressed to Box 7791, Johannesburg.

THE SOCIETY OF JEWS AND CHRISTIANS RECENT ACTIVITIES

Johannesburg.

At the invitation of the Society of Jews and Christians, Mr. Abe Herman addressed two gatherings of the Baptist Society on the 24th and the 31st of October. At these gatherings, which were held at the Central Baptist Church, De Villiers Street, Mr. Herman spoke on the subject "Palestine as it is to-day." He described the motive forces which had led to the development of the Zionist Movement, which in turn had undertaken the great transformation that Palestine had witnessed in the last 20 years. In his second talk Mr. Herman dealt with some of the spiritual aspects of the Jewish revival in Palestine, and referred, among other things, to the revival of the Hebrew language and literature, and the spirit of co-operation which was at the basis of the economic and social organisation in the new Palestine.

The talks were followed with close interest by the congregation. At the conclusion of his second address, Mr. Herman passed round the audience a number of photographs of Palestine.

Kimberley.

"Under the auspices of the Kimberley Society of Jews and Christians, Professor R. F. A. Hoernlé delivered a lecture on "Democracy versus Totalitarianism," on Monday night, the 13th instant. The well-attended meeting was held in the supper room of the City Hall.

THE SOCIETY OF JEWS AND CHRISTIANS. THIRD ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING.

Members of the Society in Johannesburg and the General Public are reminded that the Third Annual General Meeting will take place on **WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 22nd**, at 8.15 p.m. at the **JOHANNESBURG PUBLIC LIBRARY THEATRE.**

In addition to the formal business, Addresses will be delivered by

THE HON. H. G. LAWRENCE
(Minister of the Interior and Public Health),
RABBI ISRAEL ABRAHAMS (of Capetown),
and
PROFESSOR R. F. A. HOERNLÉ

Agenda: (a) Adoption of the Report of the Executive Committee.
(b) Election of President, Vice-Presidents and Council for the forthcoming year.
(c) General.

Seats may be reserved on application to P.O. Box 7791, Johannesburg.

ALL WELCOME.

During the course of his lecture, Professor Hoernlé analysed the differences between the two systems of government and expressed the view that remaining neutral, which was recommended to South Africa, would have been as little safeguard as it was likely to be for other democracies in Europe. If Germany won the war there was little doubt that her opponents would be made vassals, and that democracy would nowhere be tolerated.'

The Dean, the Very Rev. H. S. Chignell, president of the Society of Jews and Christians, presided. Votes of thanks were proposed by the Rev. W. Illsley and the Rev. W. Yesorsky.

Membership:

Membership subscription to the Society of Jews and Christians is 2/6 per annum.

Full particulars and membership forms may be obtained from the Secretaries of the Johannesburg Society or Affiliated Societies.

Membership of the Society of Jews and Christians is open to all persons, whatever their religious or political affiliations, who are in sympathy with its objects.

The Way of Peace

(EDITORIAL)

THE present number of *Common Sense* appears almost simultaneously with the third Annual General Meeting of the Society of Jews and Christians in Johannesburg. It affords, therefore, a fitting opportunity to review the principles of the Society and the contribution it desires to make to the well-being of our common life.

It has sometimes been made a reproach to the Society that its title implies a religious interest which is not reflected in its outlook and methods of work. No doubt this title may mislead those to whom the religious difference appears to be the primary cause of differences in other spheres. But in a community where religious adherence, both Jewish and Christian, is often only nominal, it seems plain that this difference is not the only one to be considered. The title is retained, despite criticism, as the aptest way of conveying to the average man the purpose and the significance of the Society. Actually the Society is concerned with all the varied relations—including the national, social, political, economic — of one group, the Jews, with the rest of their fellow-citizens in South Africa.

A second reproach has been levelled at the Society: that it is pro-semitic; and it is held, quite rightly, that pro-semitism is no less a danger to the commonwealth than is anti-semitism. It is not easy to be patient with a charge of this kind. It is true that the juxtaposition of the words "Jews" and "Christians," in a context that is not confined to religion, tends to suggest differences which in happier circumstances might be better ignored. But the fact is that the Jews are bitterly attacked and persecuted in other parts of the world, and that there are those who are busy fomenting similar discriminations against them here. The so-called "Jewish question" cannot be concealed.

But the Society's aim, clearly stated and often repeated, is not that of protecting Jews from their detractors, nor yet of defending Jews from criticism. That would be a purpose inconsistent with the honour and dignity both of Christians and of Jews. To defend Jews just because they are Jews is as illogical and immoral as to attack Jews just because they are Jews. The purpose of the Society is to bring Jews and non-Jews together in co-operation to examine frankly and to try to elimi-

nate the causes of misunderstanding, mistrust and suspicion between them. Its Jewish members are as eager as its non-Jewish to find just and righteous solutions of a complex and many-sided problem.

But this common enterprise has more than a merely practical aim. It has a significance deeper than appears on the surface. For it manifests a common conviction regarding human relations which rests ultimately on a religious foundation. In face of the general assumption that individuals and groups of different race, nationality, language, culture, must be in conflict one with another, that their concerns and interest must be in opposition, and that if one is to prosper it must be at the expense of another or of all the rest, the Society holds fast to the opposite faith: that only in co-operation can the best interests of all be achieved. Adherence to this truth in the economic sphere was expressed in the editorial article in our October issue. Its application extends beyond the economic into every department of human life.

We are faced in this country, apart from all political and economic problems, with an acute problem of human relationships. In this respect South Africa is a microcosm of the whole world. The war that is raging in Europe only represents in an active and accentuated form the normal state of international rivalry and strife. Fires are blazing now which have been smouldering for years, and which will continue to smoulder as long as men believe that they can get more for themselves by forceful constraint of others than they could attain by co-operation with them. Yet the fallacy is obvious, for, even if in the short run advantage may be gained by the stronger, in the long run a system that consists in a balance of forces is unstable and precarious for all.

We shall never achieve on this earth a tolerable order of society until all the diverse individuals and groups that go to make up the complex unity of mankind are given the opportunity, and undertake the duty, of collaboration to this end. It is only on foundations of justice and mutual co-operation that we can hope to establish and maintain genuine peace. To make a contribution, however small, to this end is the final purpose for which the Society of Jews and Christians exists.

Propaganda: The Counter-Attack

● By Dr. H. SONNABEND

MODERN wars are waged by military action, economic pressure and the weapon of propaganda. In a previous article I attempted to sketch some of the weaknesses of the present Nazi propaganda. What about the chances of Democratic counter-propaganda?

Only too often one comes across the argument that it is utterly impossible to fight the unscrupulous Nazi appeal to primordial hatreds and emotions by the use of reasoned arguments and common sense. And yet reason has a chance, for it is not true that Nazi propaganda is made up of emotions only. Every promotional endeavour, just as every form of advertising, contains a nucleus of facts. These facts may be very meagre and immensely exaggerated, but they are essential to keep the whole structure together. The process of mass-hypnosis is thus greatly impeded once the factual ingredient is destroyed. The letters of Commander King-Hall were purely rational documents, but they greatly irritated the master-magician Goebbels. To expose the lies of enemy propaganda means to blunt the spear of the enemy's attack.

Lie-detecting is important, but it can never achieve final victory. To remove a divinity from the shrine is not sufficient. The masses will continue to worship the empty shrine. In order effectively to destroy the old worship, it is imperative to replace the old divinity by a new one.

Man's Real Needs.

It is here that the weakness of the promotion of democratic ideals lies. We are often ineffective, not because our appeal is too factual, but, on the contrary, because it does not face the challenge of reality. Counter-propaganda must be realistic, and its appeal must be based on the true conditions of the masses, i.e., their real needs, fears, hatreds, emotions, hopes, wishes and prejudices. It is too often forgotten that preaching an idea does not create new conditions, but exploits a position which already exists.

Our weakness is not in our appeal to reason, but in our aloofness from the realities of human nature. Is it rational to demand sacrifices from the masses without offering concrete advantages? Is it rational to attempt to win the sympathies of the Germans by boasting of the great might and the moral righteousness of the Allies? One or two examples will serve to illustrate this point.

Allied propaganda directed to the Germans has so far consisted in boasting of the tremendous power of Britain and France. By means of leaflets and broadcasts the Germans are told that the two allied Empires are immensely rich, have unlimited resources and dominate the seas. Typical in this respect was a recent broadcast (in German) by a London woman on the ease with which one can procure the necessities of life in England. Similarly, Mr. Burgin in a wireless talk (in German)

described the tremendous American resources now at the disposal of those who rule the waves.

This type of propaganda can only serve to confirm in the minds of the average German the belief that his Nazi leaders were right: Germany is poor, the plutocracies of the West have monopolised the world's riches, Britain dominates the seas and can starve German women and children whenever she pleases. The natural German reaction must be: It is just because Britain and France are rich and prosperous that we have to fight them.

The alternative to this form of intimidation is propaganda keyed to the real hopes and deep-seated wishes of the German people. This is what Lord Northcliffe attempted to do when, in 1918, he took control of the Ministry of Propaganda. His appeal to the enemy was based on concrete promises of a better morrow. To the nations of the Austrian-Hungarian Empire, self-determination was promised. To the Germans the assurance was given that surrender would mean redemption from militarism, a reorganisation of international trade, a League of Free Nations. Lord Northcliffe and H. G. Wells, the two chief exponents of the Information Ministry, went further than this. They demanded from the Allied Governments a clear and unequivocal announcement of their war aims. This was only natural; before starting an advertising campaign, you must know what is to be sold. After some hesitation the politicians accented a memorandum on war aims submitted by those in charge of counter-propaganda. Now, as then, those who have to co-ordinate public opinion must not be the slaves of a policy, but the mentors of the politician.

War Aims.

The success of Nazi propaganda was based on the same principle. Hitler and Goebbels, who were essentially propagandists, said to themselves that the things which the masses demand must become the basis of the party programme and the mainstay of the propaganda campaign.

Those who are in charge of the Allied Information Services ought to tell their Governments: "You must announce your war aims, for we must know what we have to put across to our own people and to the enemy." The Labour Groups, Trade Unions, Liberals, sections of the Government Party, writers, scientists, urge a clear definition of peace aims. In this chorus the voice of the propagandist must not be missing.

This is not the place to discuss the peace aims which could be most effectively used in the work of persuasion. One thing is certain: The Germans have not forgotten the blandishments of the last war. The broken promises are still in their mind. The more reason to make the new peace terms as clear as possible and their announcement as solemn as only perhaps a declaration by the House of Commons could be. A

(Continued on page 14.)

South African Neuroses

● By Prof. I. D. MacCRONE

SOUTH Africa, in spite of having achieved political union as long ago as 1910, presents to-day a scene of such internal disharmony and dissension between its jarring elements that it would be difficult to find a parallel for a similar state of affairs within any other state in the world. In the thirty years that have elapsed since the Union of South Africa was established, a new generation has reached maturity only to find itself plunged afresh into a welter of inter-racial strife and discord.

Some of us who belong to that generation will recall the high hopes with which the brave new world magically created by the Act of Union was anticipated — hopes which have been only too woefully disappointed and which we now realise must have been very largely the result of wishful thinking divorced from reality. Our elders at the time, of whom some had experienced at first hand the most extreme forms of inter-racial strife, evidently desired a different fate for the coming generation.

The very extravagance of the enthusiasm with which Union was hailed, however, might at the time have been regarded as a somewhat ominous sign—a kind of loud and cheerful noise designed to stimulate an optimism that hoped for the best but feared the worst.

A Thwarted Impulse.

When we of this generation look back into the minds of the previous generation, it seems clear that the main impulse which found expression in the behaviour of the founders of the Union, was the result of a revulsion of feeling aroused by the tragedy of the Anglo-Boer war. It was this impulse that was the driving force that led so swiftly and even precipitately to the formation of the Union in a political sense. But, like all impulses that are the result of a reaction, it did not provide the basis for a Union in any genuine sense. For one thing, however sincere the impulse at the time — and no one doubts the sincerity of those who were animated by it — there was bound to be some falling off, a relapse back to the other and very different impulses that had for the time being undergone repression as a result of the reaction. For another thing — and this is a much more serious matter — the impulse which had arisen in this way in the

minds of the previous generation, will not necessarily reappear in the minds of the succeeding generation, who have not had the same experience at first hand. On the contrary, it seems that the members of the present generation are much more likely to be embittered by the vicarious living through or suffering in imagination the experiences of their fathers and of their forefathers even to the third and fourth generations, although their own personal experiences provide no real justification for any such bitterness.

Common sense tells us that the existing state of affairs should not be, and that there is no real justification for having converted the Union into a kind of madhouse of racial strife and antagonism. As things are to-day in the so-called Union of South Africa (and recent events have only made it all the more clear), it seems that to an ever-increasing degree more and more individuals in their capacity as members of different groups of our people, are losing their hold on reality, with the result that:

*"We are here as on a darkling plain
Swept with confused alarms of struggle
and flight,
Where ignorant armies clash by night!"*

Abnormalities.

The plain fact of the matter is that we South Africans, whether Afrikaans-speaking or English-speaking, whether Jew or Gentile, are all suffering from mass or group neuroses of one kind or another. In our individual capacity we may behave in a comparatively normal manner — we appear to be, and probably are, quite sane. But as soon as we begin to feel, think and act as members of one or other group, we behave like neurotics and become incapable of either straight thinking or fair dealing, especially with regard to members of other groups. And when groups depart to the extent that they have done in the Union from the categorical imperatives of common sense, brotherly feeling and just action in relation to one another, they must be pronounced to be insane.

One result of this morbid intensification of group consciousness in the individual is to rob him of the ability to think things out for himself. He

becomes progressively less capable of exercising common sense in matters that concern the so-called vital interests of his own group. The personal insecurity which is engendered in him whenever he finds himself likely to deviate from the prevailing dogmas of his group makes it very difficult, if not impossible, for him to exercise his own independent judgment. Hence the elevation of feeling at the expense of reason, the substitution of emotionally charged catch-words and slogans for genuine thought, which is such a conspicuous feature of public life in the Union to-day. At all costs the group must be preserved against the ever-present threat of group extinction — a threat which though it may have some foundation in reality, is very largely an expression of the neurotic state of the group itself. Common sense may suggest that there are more effective ways, ways that are more in accordance with economic, social and moral truths and values, by means of which the group may be preserved. But in an atmosphere in which every group both hates and fears every other group, it is only the very exceptional individual who can subdue his group prejudices to the extent of being able to see things as they really are.

The Prison of Group Illusions.

For the general run of neurotic individual who has become identified with his group — and the more neurotic he is, the more fantastic and abnormal becomes his identification — such a feat is quite out of the question. He is imprisoned in his little world of group illusions in which the shadows projected by his own neurotic anxieties and aggressions are mistaken for realities since they are shared in common by all the other members of his own group. It is this nightmare situation which prevails so widely in the Union to-day, with the result that the different groups of our people with their perpetual conflicts, aggressions, fears and anxieties, are like 'ignorant armies that clash by night.'

The effects upon the individual who grows up in this kind of environment are bound to be disastrous. We know as a matter of fact that the children of neurotic parents are almost certain to grow up to be neurotics themselves. The neurotic tendencies are not directly inherited, but the atmosphere created in the home by the behaviour of neurotic parents is likely to induce neurotic tendencies in the children. In the same way the individual who grows up in an abnormal, neurotic group environment will sooner or later become

infected by the prevailing group neuroses. And since the relations between the various groups in the Union are, and always have been, relations of chronic conflict, these neuroses will mainly take the form of morbid fears and hates for other groups together with all the other ills that follow in their train, such as the feelings of intolerance, distrust and suspicion. It is true that contacts between individuals belonging to different groups may be quite friendly so long as they do not meet on a group footing; but as soon as they confront one another as members of distinct groups which, so far as the groups with which we are concerned, means confronting one another as members of opposed groups, the friendly feelings are soon displaced by their opposite.

Function of the Scapegoat.

Needless to say, the members of each group are quite convinced that the behaviour of their own particular group is quite normal — that they are really quite blameless. It is always the other group that is at fault. But this failure on our part to recognise the abnormalities of our own group, this tendency to put the blame for our difficulties upon some other group, is itself a well-known symptom of abnormality. And it is just the individual who is involved in difficulties of one kind or another, who has failed through his own efforts to make the adjustments required to deal with the demands of his environment and who suffers from frustrations of one kind or another, that is most likely to display a heightened group consciousness. We have already suggested that the individual in such a state is more dependent upon his group and that he is less capable of feeling, thinking and acting on his own. Hence his difficulties, failures and conflicts may in some cases be both the cause as well as the consequence of his group neurosis. A kind of vicious circle comes to be established in the mind of such an individual, from which, however, there is one readily available avenue of escape, namely, to put the blame on some other group or groups. When the times are out of joint, the neurotic must seek and always will find the scapegoat whose function it is to relieve him and those like him of his own group from the burden of their failures, conflicts and anxieties.

A serious study of these scapegoats with which our country abounds is long overdue. We may even claim that for a study of the phenomena of group pathology at close range, the Union offers opportunities that must be quite unique.

The Heart Bowed Down

● By A. C. PARTRIDGE

THE delight of discovery in opening an anthology which contains no poem one has seen before is now possible only of an alien literature. It is accompanied, however, by an initial disadvantage which, from the reviewer's point of view, is likely to be serious: he is compelled to base his estimate solely upon the impression derived from translation. How far can we speak of Yiddish poetry when we have laid aside a book which contains only English poetry? Is the criticism of a translation in any way relevant to the original poem? It looks as though the reviewer will have solid ground beneath his feet only if he is content to assess in general terms the spirit that informs the poetry as a whole and that tempers it to the specific needs of a people living under a certain clearly-defined tradition.

The Golden Peacock is largely the work of one man, himself a poet of talent and, we may add, with a considerable gift for translation. Despite an unavoidable uniformity in the treatment, which does not in any way disguise the present critic's want of discrimination, there seems to be little trace of pastiche or frivolous experiment. Mr. Joseph Leftwich, the editor and translator-in-chief, has saturated himself in the traditions of his people, and it is surprising to find that so scattered a race have still such community of spiritual interest. The dominant note is one of stolid resignation and a melancholy but grateful acceptance of the simple joys that come by the way. Their pleasures, like those of all romantics, are principally retrospective.

It is natural that the lyric should find greatest favour with the anthologist, for it is the form which is best adapted to the short emotional flights and limited leisure of modern life. The lyric note of Yiddish poetry, if we are to judge by the translations, is remarkably simple, limpid and spontaneous. The rhythm of Abraham Reisen, who is representative of the "singers born," has the delicate virginal freshness of Herrick, though there is not the 17th Century poet's unerring sense of beauty. Nor is there a pagan love of life for its own sake, even in the best of their poets. Underlying the naive pleasure of such a poem as *Cherries* by Salman Schneour is the wistfulness and conscientious artistry of Christina Rossetti and the later romantics. Nature in Yiddish poetry is a subsidiary deity; in the mongrel-ballad of I. L. Peretz's *Monish* one reads

*We do not apostrophise
Sun and moon and her eyes.
It is not befitting us
About such things to make a fuss.*

The Golden Peacock, An Anthology of Yiddish Poetry, compiled and edited by Joseph Leftwich. ROBERT ANSCOMBE & Co., LTD., London; pp. lviii & 910.

Their romanticism finds ampler expression in the domestic pleasures or in their poverty, woes and pathetic attempts at national regeneration. Peretz assures us that he would sing differently if his song were intended for gentiles; for Yiddish

*has no proper sound or tone.
It has no words for sex-appeal
And for such things as lovers feel.
Yiddish has but quips and flashes,
Words that fall on us like lashes,
Words that stab like poisoned spears,
And laughter that is full of fears,
And there is a touch of gall.
Of bitterness about it all.
It is drenched with tears and blood,
That come pouring like a flood
From the wounds that never cease,
Of our Jewish agonies.
In Yiddish I have never heard
A single warm and glowing word.*

The last couplet may be phonetically true of the original language; it is certainly not true of the verse in translation. In spite of Peretz's "poisoned spears" and touch of bitterness and gall, one hears, all too seldom, the note of defiant scorn hurled at the oppressor. Humour they have, of the melancholy, quixotic type; but what their poetry stands most in need of is a stiffening of stoicism which would give it masculinity and liberate it from the 'whimsical-pathetic' influence of 19th Century humanitarianism, such as appears in the following:

*When all around is gloomy,
And life is a dismal flood,
Let my heart with lovingkindness
Be full, Lord God!
And my arms make brawny,
Sinewy, strong,
To embrace the whole world,
With its sadness and wrong.*

But if self-pity is often indulged in to the verge of masochism, there are a few writers, notably Ch. N. Bialik and Joseph Bovshover, who face the fate of Jewry with courage and hope, and when occasion demands, make no attempt to stifle their disgust. Bialik's *In the Slaughter Town* and *I Want to Weep* are powerfully phrased and, even in translation, suggest some of the divine despair of the true poet. But he has his jewelled moments, too, which are reminiscent of Tennyson. Take, for instance, the third of his sea poems:

*With moonlight silvered
The water-mirror flickers and swings,
The night is spread over us
With her blue-velvet wings.
It is no night, it is the Sheban Queen!*

(Continued on page 10.)

IT is one of the paradoxes of history that, a few years after the end of a world-war, professedly fought "to make the world safe for democracy," a rival method of governing men and organising human societies should have risen in the form of totalitarian dictatorships.

Being aligned, in the present war, on the side of two democracies against a totalitarian enemy, it is part of our moral equipment for the war to make clear to ourselves the essential differences between the democratic and the totalitarian ways, and, if we prefer the former, to give reasons for our preference.

THREE DIFFERENCES.

There are, I suggest, three main differences which are also three good reasons for holding fast to our democratic heritage.

FIRST, no human society, whether democratic or totalitarian, can do without leadership and obedience. These are fundamental to any form of social organisation. Without them, a multitude of men is a mere rabble or mob; with them it becomes an organised whole, having unity in co-operation, direction, purpose, efficiency.

But there is a wide difference in spirit between democratic and totalitarian forms of leadership and obedience.

Totalitarian leadership is authoritarian and dictatorial. It functions through a "party," i.e., through a close-knit, highly-organised minority group in the total population, which acts as the leader's private army and police force, and which watches, directs, controls all aspects of the people's life: public opinion, education, the press and radio, the civil service, business activities, etc. Obedience to the leader is demanded on the ground of his infallibility: the leader is always right; he knows best; he can do no wrong. On this premise, obedience has to be blind. There must be unquestioning, unthinking surrender to the leader, in the spirit of a faith which does not criticise or doubt, and which for this very reason is the more zealous and enthusiastic. The one thing the leader and his movement cannot tolerate is doubt, dissent, lack of faith. They undermine obedience. They are disloyalty and treason. They threaten the discipline on which the unity and strength of the movement depend. A leader who is followed in this spirit cannot be removed except by force, at the price of a rebellion, either within his party, or among the people at large.

LEADERSHIP AND LOYALTY.

How different are leadership and loyalty under a democratic system! The member of a political party can join or resign at will. The people can give their allegiance to a leader or withdraw it, as they think best. They can vote him out of office as easily as they voted him into it. They support him so long as they trust him: they turn away from him when he loses their confidence. A democratic leader cannot compel obedience: his ascendancy and authority are moral. He has no private army, no *Gestapo*, no concentration camps, with which to suppress discontent and opposition. He

DEMOCRACY vs. TOTALITARIANISM

By Prof. R. F. ALFRED HOERNLÉ

does not claim infallibility: nor do his followers surrender their right of private judgment. They follow him as free men, who, in binding themselves, retain the right and power to unbind themselves. They are, in the mass, neither fanatical devotees, nor bondsmen held in line by impotence and terror. The leader and party in power have to hold their own against a relentless fire of criticism from an extremely vocal opposition.

By all means, let us admit the well-known defects of the democratic method—the wire-pulling of special groups pursuing their own interest; the low level of knowledge and wisdom in the electorate as a whole; the frequency of appeals to prejudice and emotion, etc. Still, a system which works by eliciting from a diversity of conflicting interests and opinions an agreed policy, is more consonant with the dignity of a human being as a free man, than a system which first indoctrinates him with its orthodoxy and then demands his unthinking loyalty to what he has been taught.

"THE ABSOLUTE TRUTH."

NEXT, behind this difference in leadership and obedience, there lies a deeper difference. Every totalitarian system inculcates a doctrine which it offers as *absolute truth*; and enforces a programme of action through which this absolute truth is to be realised and embodied in the lives of its adherents. Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, Marx's *Das Kapital*, are defended by zealots against criticism as if they were infallible and contained the last word of human wisdom. Now, given that a doctrine is absolute truth, every opinion at variance with it must be false. To hold such opinion is to be guilty of error; to propagate such opinion is to poison the minds of others with error. The critic of the official orthodoxy is a heretic and a spreader of heresy. As such, he is a public enemy, a source of moral infection, a danger to the faith. He must be ruthlessly suppressed. For, he represents darkness against light, weakness against strength, unbelief against faith. To destroy him, or at least, to make him innocuous, is a duty: it is an act of moral surgery.

Men of such totalitarian temper are common in democracies, too. But there they checkmate and cancel each other. The very multiplicity of rival truths, each claiming to be "the" truth, reduces them all to relative proportions. A democratic society does not attempt to

follow him is an enemy: hence, persecutions and purges are the order of the day. By a successful revolution, the leader and his party have gained the opportunity of effecting political changes in accordance with their programme. Having effected these changes, they now see no other problem than that of maintaining and protecting what they have achieved. They regard the order which they have established as perfect, and what is perfect can change only for the worse. Hence, totalitarian systems are conservative in proportion to their success. But, their stability rests on insecure foundations: else they would not need their elaborate defences against the discontent and dissent which they have driven underground. They would not need their spies, and their spies spying upon spies. They would not exist in an atmosphere of morbid fear and distrust.

DOMESTICATING REVOLUTION.

Historically considered, democracy, too, has often been the child of revolution, but, if so, it was, one might almost say, a revolution to make future revolutions superfluous. For democracy is a method of domesticating revolution by transforming it into reform by "constitutional" methods. It is a technique of effecting political changes by consent, i.e., without revolution. It is not part of the democrat's faith that the established order is either perfect or permanent. But he is committed to the principle that, if the established order is to be changed and bettered, it shall be done by the democratic method. And the only change which, as a good democrat, he is pledged to resist, is the change which would abolish the democratic method itself and put the totalitarian method in its place. In that sense, he is a defender of "liberty."

This suggests a final reflection: No modern dictatorship has arisen among a prosperous and contented people. Dictatorships have arisen where, to peoples suffering from poverty, misery, humiliation, unemployment, internal disunity, external weakness, a "leader" has promised a new heaven and a new earth. Some of these ills our modern dictatorships have remedied in greater or less degree. Whether the cure is permanent, remains to be seen. Whether it is worth the price that has to be paid for it, remains an open question. Meanwhile, no citizen of a democracy, if he is honest with himself, will pretend that there is any democratic state in the world in which the people as a whole are as prosperous and contented as they ought to be. The real test is whether states which conduct their affairs by democratic methods, can realise for their peoples the essentials of a life worth living more successfully than can be done by any other method. In this comparison democracy has, however, one great initial advantage, viz., that its very method of self-government is a contribution to a life worth living, because in a very real sense it allows to its individual members a freedom to think and feel and speak, and even act, which a totalitarian system, depending on rigid discipline and regimentation of mind and body, cannot afford to tolerate.

be single-minded after the totalitarian pattern. It has no uniform set of beliefs, or official standard of conviction. It has no orthodoxy, whether religious, political, economic. It is influenced by many winds of doctrine and hospitable to many ideals. Often enough these doctrines are mutually contradictory and these ideals mutually conflicting. The democratic method is to keep these conflicts on the plane of argument and discussion, until a preponderant opinion defines and declares itself. If action has to be taken and a choice made, the decision is reached by discussion and vote, and it is taken as embodying the "will of the people" in the sense that it has the approval of a majority, whilst the dissentient minority acquiesces rather than pushes its opposition to the point of passive disobedience, or "armed protest," or downright civil war.

A good democrat must always be prepared to find himself in a minority, and to accept the verdict of an adverse vote in Parliament or at the polls, however convinced he may be of the truth and rightness of his policy. Undoubtedly, this is easiest for those who have a dash of scepticism and self-criticism in their make-up, and are not victims of the pitiful illusion that whoever does not agree with them must be either a knave or a fool. The genuinely democratic temper has no room for fanaticism. It makes for tolerance and sanity. No totalitarian leader but has to be heavily guarded against assassination. A democratic leader normally needs no special protection.

FEAR AND DISTRUST.

THIRDLY, totalitarianism and democracy differ as methods of doing two complementary things, viz., effecting political changes and securing political stability.

Every totalitarian system now in existence is the child of revolution and feels itself ever threatened by counter-revolution. Even in victory it is not secure. The leader and his party seized power by force and the threat of force: by force and the threat of force they maintain themselves in power. Propaganda and education, as used in a totalitarian system, are not a substitute for force, but another kind of force. Men's minds are moulded to the orthodox pattern, the pressure of which is reinforced by visible reminders that non-conformity leads to the concentration camp and to death.

Every totalitarian leader acts on the principle: He who is not for me is against me. Whoever does not

THE HEART BOWED DOWN—(Cont. from page 7).

Robed in blue, with gold on the hems,
 She breathes quietly, and on her breast
 Shimmers gold, shimmer gold and gems.
 Like scattered sheep the little waves
 In silent slumber lie,
 The stars are quivering in the sea.
 Which is here sea and which is sky?
 Two seas are sleeping here together,
 Like equal brothers silently,
 A third sea in between them sleeps not,
 My heart with my new songs in me.

Mr. Leftwich has estimated the ability of his great figures with fine taste. They are all contained in the first section of about 180 pages, which is the artistic kernel of the book. But there are good things to be found scattered here and there in every region where Yiddish is read and spoken. Very striking is the success which has been achieved by the Yiddish poets in the short and nimble-footed metres of Herrick, Shelley, Hood and Swinburne: as experiments in this direction, H. Lutzky's *Storm* and *Waters* are both delightful and original. There is sufficient variety for every taste except the satirical. The quaint puritanism of Jacob Sternberg's *Legs* may be set beside the crude realism of Moses Shifris's *Life*, or the riddling introspectiveness of Halpern's *My Restlessness is a Wolf's* which is one of Mr. Leftwich's best translations. South Africa is represented by David Fram in no less than five poems; his sonorous and flowing measures are rather Keatsian in their preciousness and poetic nostalgia; but of their kind they are very worthy.

It is rather a pity that Mr. Leftwich has seen fit to include so few translations by other hands: they would have given the work a much-needed diversity of interpretation and technique. He quotes with approval the saying of Anatole France that "the good critic is he who relates the adventures of his own soul among masterpieces." Apparently he justifies the suppression of other versions of the poems in favour of his own on the ground that the personal and unsystematic anthology has the greatest interest for the reader. But here he is mistaken: the renderings of Yehoash's poems by Marie Syrkin and Isadore Goldstick are among the most satisfying things the anthology contains. The former's translation of *An Old Song*, it is interesting to note, is the only Yiddish poem which finds a place in Mark van Doren's *Anthology of World Poetry*.

To compare Mr. van Doren's *Anthology* with *The Golden Peacock* may be somewhat invidious, but at the same time it is illuminating. Failing often to suggest the delicate nuances of phrase, the final distinction of style that is inseparable from great poetry, there are nevertheless many translations which have the authentic note of the artist—for they are the work of other artists. As a body of verse it is cunningly varied in technique, interest, colour and spirit.

This *Anthology of Yiddish Poetry* cannot hope to succeed in the same way. For along with Mr. Leftwich's very admirable zeal has gone, one fears, a good deal of temerity: ". . . all that is necessary in translating poetry," he says, "is to have a poet translate it"—as though Fitzgeraldis and *Rubaiyats* were two a penny.

But it would be ungracious, as well as ungrateful, not to commend the vast industry that has devoted half a life-time to this labour of love. Mr. Leftwich has enabled us to enter the dwelling places of many rare and beautiful spirits, whose message, if we read it rightly, is without rancour and bitterness. Tacitly it appeals, through its own sensitive nature, for that human tolerance without which art is unable to penetrate and mollify the spirit of man.

RECENT BOOKS.

SECRET ARMIES.

The New Technique of Nazi Warfare, by *John L. Spivak*. MODERN AGE BOOKS, INC., N.Y. pp. 160.

The material in this small volume—though the author claims that it barely scratches the surface of a problem which is becoming increasingly grave—presents an alarming picture of the activities of Nazi agents in the United States, Mexico and Central America during the past five years. The book is, despite its size, surprisingly well documented, and many of the photostatic reproductions of propaganda material bear a striking resemblance to the propaganda that has been distributed by the South African "Shirt movements" in recent years. Of particular interest is Mr. Spivak's account of the way in which Nazi agents build up local "patriotic" shirt movements to act as a camouflage for their propaganda work and their naval and military espionage.

THE REVOLUTION OF NIHILISM.

by *Hermann Rauschnig*, New York, LONGMANS, GREEN, 1939, 300 p.

A challenging analysis of the Nazi movement by a former leader of the National Socialist Party and ex-president of the Danzig Senate. The author maintains that the only ideology behind Nazism is the desire of its leadership for power and world domination. Their only method is violence. The only ultimate outcome will be Nihilism and the destruction of Western civilisation. The author predicts the Soviet-Nazi rapprochement on the basis that Nazism has no ideology and no principles. Anti-Semitism, the author maintains, is utilised by the parasitic Nazis mainly as "training in revolutionary violence," and as "almost a formal introduction to a coming revolutionary upheaval." Its "destructive effects on the whole nation cannot be escaped."

HITLER'S COMMUNISM UNMASKED.

by *Anti-Defamation League, B'NAI BRITH*, Chicago, 30 p.

A competent expose of Hitler's "Jewish Communism" bogey. Revised and brought up to date, the facts and arguments in this pamphlet are particularly striking to-day when read in the light of the Nazi-Soviet pact.

THE RISING TIDE

A Commentary on Current Essays in Common Sense

● By The Rev. A. W. ("Tubby") EATON

FRIENDLY critics of this column are very anxious to know if the rising tide that I so glibly talk about is not soon likely to flood us once and for all. Is there not just the possibility of there also being a receding tide in our national life? No one knows better than myself that my metaphors must not be taken too literally. I am convinced it is true that public opinion and action are definitely rising in standard in our national life. Progress may be very slow, and sometimes we are tempted to think that the noisy, violent and destructive forces around us are having their own worth. I am convinced, however, that they are not. There is growing up in our land a strong force of liberalism, which is not sentimentalism run riot, but a sane delimitation to plan and work for a better South Africa.

Reply to a Critic.

Just in case readers think I am blind to some of the forces, let me tell you that a reader from the Cape saw fit to write to "Common Sense" saying that he sincerely appreciates this paper, but does not think that religion can bring about a better understanding between Jews and Christians. He says that hatred by the one of the other is on purely economic grounds. He then goes on to describe how Jewish women flaunt their riches in the faces of those they exploit. He accuses them of hoarding and of putting up food prices and of so justifying anti-semitism. My correspondent must know that similar charges of anti-social behaviour can be levelled against many non-Jews. Such behaviour is not the monopoly of any group. The commonsense attitude is surely not to generalise about all the members of a group, but to insist that each individual (not his group) be punished for his anti-social conduct. Actually my correspondent is quite wrong when he says that it is merely an economic problem. There can be no question that at rock bottom it is a moral problem, and his own comments hammer home the truth of this.

He also has an attack on me personally. Commenting on my tribute to Dr. Sigerist last month, he says that I missed the whole purpose of this famous doctor's message to South Africa, which he emphasises is to bring home to the people of this country that war and imperialism are the deadly enemies of mankind. He then goes on to accuse me of being an Imperialist before being a Christian. I do not know that Dr. Sigerist ever did make this statement. No one in his right mind believes that Imperialism is a deadly enemy of mankind, but what most of us are quite sure about is that Imperialism cannot save the world, and will not be the keynote of the new world. Critics like my friend from Cape Town, and there are many more in South Africa, do not seem to appreciate the fact that our religion will not allow us to align ourselves with any political theory

or practice that refuses to recognise the other man's point of view, his heritage or his particular place in the sun.

Education in the Free State.

One of the bright spots of national history during the past month is the annual report of the Free State Board of Examiners, who have many hard things to say to those who cannot get away from "the pass-examination fever." They say that if they were dictators they would put some of the teachers in concentration camps for being perpetrators of educational crimes. The Board attacks "those external examiners, supervisors, compilers of books and framers of curricula, who are responsible for the fact that so much matter, having no connection with the needs of everyday life, clogs the wheels of the educational machine, and for the fact that so much is omitted which will be really useful when the child will have passed from the life of the school into the school of life, and who, thinking more of the quantity than the quality of education, fail to lessen overwork and to allow more time for cultural needs."

This is particularly interesting to the promoters of "Common Sense" because it is one of the few pieces of sound commonsense that has come from the educational world for a long time. South Africa quite definitely needs quality in its education rather than quantity. And this is the only sane way to build up a nation with a new mind and a new spirit.

A Challenge.

And talking of a new mind and spirit, I am wondering what is going to be the result of this terrible business that has occurred at Sibasa Pundia Maria native reserve. Public opinion has been shocked at the revelation of the crudeness and brutality of these native circumcision schools. All sane students of native life and custom realise how some of these native customs are really part and parcel of the native mentality; few are convinced that this particular one is wrong. It seems to me that what is wanted is for our native schools to include as part of their curriculum education in the value and significance of this custom. There are many mission stations who do keep to the circumcision rite, teaching its true significance, and it is all done in a healthy atmosphere. The commonsense policy is to go all out for a sane educational approach. This would help to stamp out the power of the witch doctor, would keep the ancient native blood mark, and raise the sex question for the native from the mire of crudity and filth to plain healthy manliness. It seems to me that this constitutes a challenge to the educational authorities in South Africa who ought to be alert to this problem.

Jan Hofmeyr.

"Now is the time to start" were the words of the Minister of Education, Mr. J. H. Hofmeyr, when speaking at Pietermaritzburg recently. It is true he was referring to the bigger problems of building up the new world. He asked us to pledge our loyalty to South Africa. I would reply and say that it would be easier to do this if we can be assured that our national policy is going to be one that is really going to try to stamp out every evil in our midst and put sanity in its place. In fact, I think the answer to the challenge of my foregoing remarks might well be answered by saying, now is the time. There is a temptation to get used to "the beggar at the gate" and that is not good enough.

Nothing New.

Turning our attention to overseas, I have been much interested this month in a book by Mr. Thomas Hope on the great Inquisitor, Torquemada, and have discovered that it is as difficult to be original in cruelty as it is in charity. Hitler justified the harrying of the Jews on the ground that a nation, to be united and great, must be racially pure. He was anticipated by Torquemada four hundred and fifty years ago. Mr. Thomas Hope, who has just written his biography, tells us that Torquemada was far more a fanatical Spaniard than a fanatical Churchman. The Jews in Spain, many of them nominal Christians, were often rich and politically powerful. Ferdinand and Isabella were busy with the great work of driving out the Moors and making Spain a united nation. Torquemada was able to persuade the Queen, whose confessor he was, that the existence of an alien community was a national danger, and he convinced Ferdinand, who always needed money, that it would be advantageous to confiscate Jewish money. So the Inquisition was introduced into Spain, despite the opposition of the bishops and the nobility, not primarily to extirpate heresy, but to get rid of the Jews, and it is interesting for us to-day that Torquemada was frequently at loggerheads with Rome.

Torquemada was 61 before he became more than an active and intriguing Dominican friar. He was 72 when he finished his task, and the Jews were expelled from Spain. There is one thing about Torquemada that is a little pathetic: We are told that in his private life he was a kindly and considerate man, which reminds me of a line or two I heard the other day—

*"Even Hitler had a mother,
Even Adolph had a ma."*

New Italian Spirit.

Those of us who are honestly concerned about the persecution of the Jews welcome the new spirit in Italy, where Mussolini has created practically a new cabinet, the majority of whom interpret the wholehearted Italian dislike for Jewish persecution. Arnold Lunn, secretary of the Oxford Union Society, declared recently that the Italian public rejects "with contempt" the racial doctrines "imported from the north." "On paper," he said, "there is little to choose between the racialism of Germany and the racialism of Italy, but whereas millions of Germans have accepted with simple faith the sadistic nonsense of Jew-baiting Streicher, I have yet to meet

an Italian who does not reject these doctrines which have been imported from the north."

It is possible, of course, that Mussolini sees the political importance of not getting too entrenched with his Axis partner, and that he is taking off the screen by sheer diplomacy. This may or may not be true, but what is true is that Italy has no time for those who see in the Jew a menace to civilisation, and it might be wise for some in South Africa to take note of this fact.

Why Anti-Semitism?

Many have honestly tried to see what lies behind the persecution of the Jews, and it is to the credit of some of our great Church leaders that they have gone out of their way to study this problem quite dispassionately, in order that they may give an honest lead to their own people. One of the most able Anglicans, the Rev. James W. Parkes, says after much consideration:

"There is no reality behind the attacks of Hitler or Sir Oswald Mosley on Jews. Jews are merely used to attract, and distract, attention, because they are an abnormal people and to that extent mysterious; and because there is an inherited fund of hostility and mistrust on which the Jew-baiter can draw. Sir Oswald knows perfectly well that nothing would be altered in our financial system by confiscating Jewish-owned stores. But the potential antagonism of Gentiles to his propaganda can be lulled to sleep by the notion that it is only Jews who will be penalised if he is given power.

"There is another reason why a gross exaggeration of the picture is necessary. The average Englishman would revolt at the idea of hounding out of existence a pitiful group consisting of 1 per cent. of the population. Jewry must be presented as a vast world-power, a vast conspiracy against Gentile society, to fight against whom is a desperate and dangerous crusade. Hence the Jewish 'control' of finance, of the Press, of the Government; hence the 'Protocols of the Elders of Zion.' They lend an air of respectability, even nobility, to a very dirty bit of bullying.

"In the long run, the fight against anti-Semitism has nothing to do with the Jews. Knowledge and understanding of the realities of the Jewish question are a helpful inoculation against the propaganda of Fascism or National-Socialism. But the real defence is effective democracy. In a soil in which totalitarianism itself could not grow, it could not introduce the weed of anti-Semitism."

Another important statement is one by a famous Catholic layman, Maritain, who has just written a book called "Anti-Semitism." It is unfair to him for me to say more than this, that it is probably one of the most clearly thought-out books on the subject, and those who in South Africa are looking for a clear statement on this great problem should get this book.

Looking Forward.

Those of us who appreciate "Common Sense," and apparently there are many in this land, will be glad to know that in the New Year we contemplate a series of articles that will try and give a constructive lead for the future. We have a great task before us at the moment, that of winning the war. But that is nothing in comparison with the task that will confront us when this war is over, and "Common Sense" realises that now is the time to begin to work out a sane policy for reconstruction. It hopes to call on the best men in South Africa to contribute their views, and to set out what we think to be sane constructive plans for the future.

The Papacy and the Jews

● By the Rev. Father W. P. WHELAN, O.M.I.

(Continued from October issue)

THERE has often been adverse comment at the Papal condemnation of the Talmud, but it must be remembered that the Talmud as known today in English translations is not the same work as that condemned by the Popes. Dr. Israel Abrahams, in "Jewish Life in the Middle Ages," admits that the Talmud contained violent polemics against Christianity, and Gustav Dalman has quoted several scurrilous statements against Christ and His Mother, which were once to be found in the Talmud, but which have since been omitted. The Jewish Quarterly Review (Vol. I., new series, pp. 113-121) quotes the Bull of Pius IV. which declared: "The various officials, whose duty to investigate and search for such books (Talmud) is here re-emphasised, are not to permit general and unauthorised molestation of the Jews. Books from which all scandalous or blasphemous references to Jesus or Christianity have been obliterated may be freely kept and used anywhere, either in public or in private, provided, of course, that these books have been submitted to inspection."

The Ghetto System.

Pope Paul IV. (1555-1559) has been accused by some writers as having been rather too absolute in character and too harsh in his decrees. Yet throughout his writings there is no indication that he was actuated by any motive except the preservation of the Faith. His establishment of the Ghettos has met with adverse criticism and has been regarded by some as a manifestation of anti-Jewish feeling. It must be noted though that other Popes in the past had ordained similar measures, which had never been put into execution. Though the Ghetto system may seem harsh to us in these days, it must be remembered that in mediaeval times, people of the same industrial, commercial and social classes were accustomed to live in the same quarters, and that in fact, the Jews, too, forming often a separate community, naturally lived together around their synagogue. Pope Paul's Bull, *Cum nimis absurdum*, enacted that there should be but one synagogue in any city, and that Jews should wear a distinctive yellow head-dress. It also forbade Jews to acquire real estate, or to trade in grain or other articles for human consumption. The Levantine Jews, in retaliation against these Papal measures, boycotted the port of Ancona, and the population suffered so severely in consequence that, including the resident Jews, they made an appeal to the Pope for protection.

While a great deal could be said in favour of and against the Ghetto system in mediaeval

Europe, this much should at least be conceded: that the establishment of a Ghetto in any particular town was not to be taken as an indication of anti-Jewish feeling on the part of the ruler of that town. Dr. David Philipson, in "Old European Jewries," remarks: "In some instances it was considered a favour when the temporal or ecclesiastical ruler of the city assigned the Jews a quarter in which they would be protected." That abuses did occur is certain, but these were individual incidents in the course of a long history. A fair examination of the period will show that in spite of the wrongs committed by Christian rulers, and often, too, by Jews, a sense of justice and of charity did largely prevail.

This fact is brought out by a review of the period 1559-1590, when the Christian world was ruled successively by four Popes, three of whom were regarded as favourable and one unfavourable to the Jews. Pius IV., when he became Pope, immediately declared an amnesty to all Jews for past offences, and abolished the laws forbidding Jews to wear Christian types of clothing. He also gave them permission to trade with Christians in markets and shops, and to rent shops outside the Ghetto. It was through the instrumentality of Pope Pius, too, that Ferdinand's order of expulsion against Bohemian Jews was cancelled.

Conversion of the Jews.

Pope Pius V., though he renewed many of the vigorous laws affecting the Jews in the past, cannot be said to have been actuated by anti-Jewish feelings, for it is on record that he personally amended many of these laws later in his pontificate. His great aspiration all through seems to have been to concentrate on the conversion of the Jews—not for the sake merely of gaining their support, but precisely in order that they should share the benefits of Christianity with the rest of the world. His intentions were of the best, even if at times he did show a lack of judgment in his actions.

Gregory XIII. did a great deal for the Jews, though Broyde has a list of the unjust enactments confirmed during his pontificate. Of these, the one most often mentioned now is the decree forbidding Jewish doctors to attend Christian patients. It may, therefore, be well to mention that the main object of this law was to ensure that Christian patients should be given every facility to receive the Last Sacraments where an illness threatened to be fatal. The practical import of this Catholic attitude is not without its difficulties even to-day,

when certain doctors and nurses (usually not Jewish) place obstacles in the way of a priest's ministrations to the dying. It might also be mentioned, incidentally, that Jewish laws of the time were equally opposed to the acceptance of Christian physicians for attendance on Jewish patients.

Pope Sixtus V.

A noteworthy and possibly regrettable feature of Gregory's rule was that he allowed the Jews to lend money at interest — a permission not enjoyed by Christians.

Of all the Popes, Sixtus V. is usually looked on as the one most favourable to the Jewish people. Almost his first act as Pope was to allow them to reside wherever they wished, and to enact that they should enjoy the usual rentals, which were not, afterwards, to be raised. In commerce he allowed Jews to trade freely except in grain, wine or meat. He also allowed them to trade with Christians, though he would not remove the prohibition against the employment of Christians. Taxes were reduced, too, and greater opportunities were afforded them of improving their synagogues, schools and houses. Among other things, Christians were also forbidden to summon them to Court on their Sabbath.

Unfortunately, there were many abuses of the privileges granted by Sixtus V., so that Clement VIII., at the end of the sixteenth century, had to enforce certain restrictions. At the same time, however, he issued a Bill for the protection of Turkish Jews and also laid down laws regulating property control in the Ghettos. As a result of these latter laws, the right of possession was handed down through Jewish families for centuries, and in some instances until the abolition of the Ghetto system.

There are but few references to the Jews in Papal annals of the 17th and 18th centuries. Here and there, however, one does find interesting notes. In January, 1668, for instance, Pope Clement formally abolished the public races of Rome, in which Jews were forced to participate. General Morsini was compelled to release Jewish prisoners at Venice in 1685. Polish Jews were also defended most energetically by Pope Benedict XIV. about the middle of the 18th century.

In the 19th century, the Popes were often looked on as special intercessors on behalf of the Jews. So much so, in fact, that Voltaire, the bitter anti-Catholic, was constrained to acknowledge the beneficence and goodwill of the Papacy.

Tributes to the Papacy.

There is no need to recall to the memories of men how clearly the Popes of this century have defined their attitude to Jews. In unhappy Germany, above all, there has been no more valiant defender of the unfortunate people of Israel than Pope Pius XI. of happy memory, or the great

Cardinal Faulhaber. In these days, it may well be that the Jewish people will attach particular significance to the words of their great historian, Graetz, when he wrote: "It is remarkable that the Roman bishops, the recognised champions of Christianity, treated the Jews with the utmost toleration and liberality. The occupants of the Papal throne shielded the Jews and exhorted the clergy and princes against the use of force in converting them to Christianity." Equally worthy of note are the words of E. Rodocanachi, in "Le Saint Siege et les Juifs": "While on all sides—in Spain, in France, in Germany, even in Arabia and in the most distant lands—the Jews were rigorously persecuted, in Rome, the capital of the Christian world, they were tolerated. This tranquility, this security of body and soul, they found under the shadow of St. Peter, under the protection of him who was Christ's representative on earth. Rome knew nought of sanguinary reprisals for the horrible, strange, incredible crimes imputed to the Jews, of banishment 'en masse,' of legal spoliations, of the fury of the populace, of burnings at the stake, of the autos-da-fé, in which other countries seemed to take pride. The Jews of Rome might often have been molested; they were never persecuted."

PROPAGANDA: THE COUNTER-ATTACK

(Continued from page 4.)

great vision must be flashed across the skies of war-torn Europe, a promise of a truly better future, a Federated Europe and collective administration of the world's colonial resources. Only a bold policy will be capable of counteracting the great illusions created by master-magicians. Just as other branches of warfare, propaganda demands vision and audacity.

A final example of enlightenment work nearer home. "Lie detectors" are all right; "Truth battalions" are helpful; but much more is wanted. To speak about the misery in the Third Reich is not sufficient. To describe the moral degradation of totalitarianism is not sufficient. Here again those in charge of enlightenment must ask the powers that be: "What are you offering the masses? What are you prepared to give them?" Those who wish to co-ordinate public opinion in this country must be bold and realistic. Their appeal must be keyed to the *real* wishes and aspirations of the masses. Learn from your enemy and defeat him on his own ground.

"THE ANNALS," May, 1939.

Journal of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

This issue of the Annals contains a thorough analysis of the refugee position showing the causes, the facts, the administrative and economic difficulties, the human adjustments, and the efforts at solution, of forced migration. The contributors, of whom there are twenty-two, are distinguished experts in their special field.

Die Boer en die Jood

● Deur L. de HART LARKINS

DIÉ vryheidssin van die Boerebevolking is verewig nitgedruk in die roemryke Groot Trek. Aangevoer deur onverskrokke leiers, het hulle 'n weg gebaan deur die wildernis, van die Kaap tot in die Soutpansberge—die Pad van Suid-Afrika. Daar is geen sweem van wraak of raserny in die manifes van die groot Voortrekker, Piet Retief. 'n Diep gevoel van verantwoordelikheid kenmerk sy besadigde uiting van sy volk se griewe, en grootsheid van karakter deurskyn al sy onderhandelinge met sy medemens, hetsy beskaafd of hetsy onbeskaafd.

En wat is die karakteristieke houding van die nageslag van daardie edele en stoere voorgeslag?

Ongelukkig het die kinders van die Voortrekkers onder die invloed gekom van 'n volk wat die hele wêreld verstorm en beskaamd laat staan na die gretigheid waarmee die kinders van Israel vervolg word met die ongeëwenaardste onmenslikheid wat die mensdom nog aanskou het sedert die Donker Eeue.

Kan 'n Afrikaner besiel met 'n ware Voortrekkersgees hom voorstel dat Piet Retief, of President Steyn, of Oom Paul Kruger soiets sou geduld het? Nooit in der ewigheid nie! Die hele geskiedenis van die Boerevolk is 'n verloëning van daardie barbaarse opvatting van die mens se plig teenoor sy medemens.

Maar wat is die onomstotelike feite aangaande Jode in Duitsland?

Daar was nagenoeg 600,000 Jode in Duitsland met die uitbreek van die Groot Oorlog, 1914-18.

100,000 het in die oorlog geveg vir Duitsland.

3,500 is gedekoreer vir dapperheid.

2,000 was offisiere in die oorlog.

12,000 het gesneuwel op die slagvelde.

Richthofen, die beroemde en dappere vliënier, was byvoorbeeld 'n Jood.

Is die vervolging, verdrukking en onteiening van die Jode die verdiende loon vir die vaderlandliewende opofferings wat hulle vir Duitsland gemaak het?

Wat is die kernorsaak van die aanhitsing teen die Jode in Suid-Afrika?

Professor Gray het tot die gevolgtrekking gekom, nadat hy noulettende navorsing na die oorsake gedoen het, dat daar gegronde ekonomiese griewe bestaan, maar dat diegene wat dit toeskryf aan Joodse manipulasie 'n valsheid verkondig en sodoende die aandag aflei van die ware oorsake wat die welvaart van die armmense in ons land verhinder.

Die ekonomiese en sosiale eeuwels waaronder miljoene armmense in die wêreld gebrek ly is te wyte aan die profytmaakstelsel wat gegrond is op loutere gierigheid waaraan al die volke en elke seksie van die publiek onderhewig is. Die Jood is hieraan niks meer of niks minder skuldig nie as die Japanner, die Duitser, die Engelsman, die Boer of die Italianer. Die stelsel gee

aan elkeen die gelyke reg om soveel rykdom op te gaar as hy maar kan en om enige werktuig vir daardie doel te gebruik, hetsy die mens, hetsy die masjien of hetsy die land.

Die monopolie van grond is een van die vernaamste oorsake van ontevredenheid in Suid-Afrika. Duisende plattelanders moes hulle plase verlaat óf omdat die grond uitgedor het deur langdurige droogtes óf omdat dit te klein geword het vir die aangroeiende families om 'n bestaan te maak. Die gevolg was dat die land in besit van minder en groter landeienaars gekom het om nie eers te praat van die landmaatskappye nie.

In hierdie verband word ook 'n groot gewag gemaak van 'n onwaarheid, naamlik, dat die Jode die plase inpalm deur onbepaalde krediet aan die plaasboere toe te staan. Van al die plase in ons land behoort ongeveer 2½% aan Jode, en wat dit betref weet ons dat die Jode van die vroegste tye af 'n pastorale en landboukundige volk was, maar daar het 'n tyd aangebreek toe hulle verbied is om land te besit met die gevolg dat hulle toevlug geneem het na die sakewêreld om 'n bestaan te maak. Baie Jode het egter weer verhuis na die land toe, sodra hulle in die vermoë was. Kan mens dit oneerlik noem? In baie dele van ons land boer, Engelse, Boere en Duitsers in dieselfde omtrek; hulle leef in vrede met mekaar en strew e almal om die belange van hulle distrik te behartig. So was dit altyd en so sou dit voortgegaan het, was dit nie vir die twisappel wat vandag tussen hulle gegooi word deur uitheemse "agente" en hulle handlangers.

'n Terugblik in die verlede sal toon dat daardie Joodse winkeliers 'n groot hulp en gerief was vir ons Boere in die verafgeleë agterveld en in die uithoeke van ons land toe goeie paaie 'n uitsondering en spoorweë byna onbekend was. Daardie winkeliers was kopers van produkte, vervoerders van die produkte na die naaste spoorweg en die markagente van die klein plaasboere. In jare van droogte en misoeste was hulle ook bankiers wat voorskotte en krediet aan hulle klandisie gegee het om hulle deur te help tot die volgende seisoen. Waar daar agtereenvolgende jare van misoeste gekom het, het baie winkeliers bankrot geraak. Dat daar onder hulle skurke was, neem nie weg nie dat hulle goed oor die weg gekom het met die Boerebevolking. Daar is nog vandag honderde Boere wat liewers hulle produkte aan die winkeliers verkoop as om dit direk na die mark te stuur, daar hulle dan aan geen waagstuk blootgestel is nie en omdat dit dikwels beter betaal. As sulke winkeliers na jare van geduld en taaie uithou vermoë welaf word dan is dit tog seker nie onregverdig nie onder die huidige ekonomiese stelsel.

Hierdie artikel het net een doel en dit is om ons mede-Afrikaners te waarsku teen die dwaallig van Jodevervolging wat ons Boerevolk in dieselfde ellende sal indompel as ander lande waar hulle daardie dwallig gevolg het. Vergruising van die Jodedom is geen uitweg uit die ekonomiese moeras nie.

Letters to the Editors

THE TALMUD AND CHRIST from Rabbi I. Kossowsky.

Sir,

As an old orthodox Rabbi who has devoted his whole life to the study of the Talmud, I consider it my duty to reply to the issues raised by the Rev. J. V. Coetzee in your September issue regarding the attitude of the Talmud to Christ and Christianity.

There is nowhere in the Talmud a clear discussion about Christianity. This may possibly be due to the fact that Christianity was very little known in Babylon during the period of the composition of the Babylonian Talmud, or in Palestine during the composition of the Jerusalem Talmud. It is also possible that passages referring to Christianity may have been deleted by the censors through whose hands the Talmud passed over a period of many hundreds of years. (To avoid any misunderstanding, I should stress that references in the Talmud to Akkum do not relate to Christians, but to idolators, as the word itself indicates—"worshippers of stars and planets.")

There is no proof that the names Yishu, Bileam, Ben Stada and Ben Pandera, refer to Christ. On the contrary, it has been shown by many scholars and historians that they may very well refer to other persons who lived at various times. The Yishu mentioned in the Talmud as a pupil of Rabbi Yehosha Ben Prachya was certainly not Christ: this rabbi lived about 200 years before Christ. The name Ben Pandera (or Panthera), was first attributed to Christ by the well known anti-Semite, Houston Chamberlain, who sought thereby to show that Christ was not a Jew but an Aryan (his father being a Roman legionary by the name of Pandera or Panthera).

As to the book Toledoth Jesjoea, it is quite ludicrous to place any reliance upon it. It is almost completely unknown among Jews, and has no serious worth. It is a collection of silly stories by an anonymous author, which circulated among the common people during the darkest periods of the Middle Ages—periods when Jews were tortured by the Inquisition and burned at the stake. What opinion could Jews at that time have had about their persecutors? Is it surprising that all kinds of fables about their persecutors were current among the people? This foolish book has not been reprinted in modern times, and there is hardly a living Jew who has read or even seen it. It is a matter of great surprise to me that your correspondent should look upon it as a work which seriously reflects the attitude of the Talmud to Christianity.

The Rev. Coetzee asks what we Jews think about Christ. It should be clearly stated at the outset that there is no uniform attitude to Christ among Jews any more than there is a uniform attitude among Christians themselves. There are among Jews, believers and free thinkers, orthodox, conservative and reform Jews, and each group may have its own attitude. As an orthodox

rabbi, I speak only in the name of orthodox Judaism to which the great majority of Jews belong.

One of the fundamentals of the Jewish faith (as formulated by Maimonides) is that the Torah, which was given to us through Moses on Mount Sinai, is immutable, and that Moses is the greatest of all prophets (whether of those who preceded or succeeded him). We cannot therefore recognise any other prophet who should be entitled either to discard or in any way to modify anything in the laws of Moses. The Talmud and the whole Talmudic literature are conceived by us as merely a commentary on the laws of Moses. We were thus unable to accept Christianity or (later) Mohammedanism as a new set of God-given laws. Despite all manner of persecution on the score of our faith, we have remained faithful to our Torah, and shall continue to do so.

Although not accepting the divinity of Christ and his new teaching, however, we acknowledge the respect due to one who conferred a great benefit to mankind in abolishing idolatry in a large portion of the world. It is in this way that Maimonides formulates his attitude to Christ and also to Mohamet in his code which is accepted as binding by all orthodox Jews.

A final word. Relations between human beings must be primarily as human beings, independent of their religious convictions and differences of opinion. In particular the time is ripe for the leaders of the Christian world to understand that they must at long last change their unjust attitude to the Jewish people, to that unhappy people which has given the Christian world its holiest possessions, and been rewarded with inhuman sufferings and persecution over many generations. It is high time that the Christian world should make peace with the much-tormented Jewish people, stretch out the hand of understanding, and establish a purely human mutual relationship. This should be the noble task of the Society of Jews and Christians for which every right thinking person, Christian or Jew, ought only to be grateful.

Yours, etc.,

I. KOSSOWSKY.

JOHANNESBURG.

WELL-WISHERS OF "COMMON SENSE."

If you like this journal, and desire to promote its aims:

- (a) *Send in your subscription NOW; and*
- (b) *Recommend it to your friends.*

HELP US TO ADVANCE "COMMON SENSE."

Common Sense

: CONTENTS :

Annual General Meeting	2
Editorial	3
Nazism under the Cloak of Anti-Semitism by <i>the Hon. H. G. Lawrence</i>	4
The Talmud by <i>Rabbi Israel Abrahams, M.A.</i>	5
Peace Aims—The First Step by <i>C. H. S. Runge</i>	6
The Rising Tide by <i>the Rev. A. W. Eaton</i>	7
Book Notes	9
The Jew in the Literature of England by <i>L. Sowden</i>	10
Die Sogenaamde Nasionaal-“ sosialisme ” deur <i>Stefan Coetsee, M.A.</i>	11

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

VOL. 1. NO. 6.

DECEMBER 1939

PRICE 4d.

Common Sense

"Common Sense" is published monthly by the Society of Jews and Christians, Johannesburg.

Editorial Board:

A. W. EATON	C. H. S. RUNGE
R. F. A. HOERNLE	G. SARON
H. SONNABEND	

Subscription:

The subscription to *Common Sense* is 3/- per annum to members (or 3d. per copy); and 4/- per annum to non-members (or 4d. per copy). Post free.

Copies may be ordered from the Secretaries, P.O. Box 7791, Johannesburg, as well as from the Secretaries of Affiliated Societies in other centres of the Union.

The Editors welcome articles, comments or correspondence bearing upon the objects of the journal: to combat prejudice and racialism and to further common sense and goodwill in South Africa. Contributions should be addressed to Box 7791, Johannesburg.

Our Annual General Meeting

A REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS.

A LARGE gathering of members and sympathisers attended the Annual General Meeting of the Society of Jews and Christians held in Johannesburg in the Library Theatre on November 22nd, 1939.

The Rev. Father C. H. S. Runge, President of the Society, who was in the Chair, extended a special welcome to the Hon. Mr. H. G. Lawrence, Minister of the Interior, and Rabbi Israel Abrahams (of Capetown). He then presented the report of the Executive Committee for the period since the last general meeting, held on November 23rd, 1938.

Father Runge said that perhaps they had not done as much work in the way of meetings in the past year as they had done in the previous year, partly due to the fact that their indefatigable secretary, Dr. Sonnabend, had been overseas for some months. He paid tribute to the work of Dr. Sonnabend and of his co-secretary, the Rev. A. W. Eaton. The crisis before the war and the war itself have also greatly handicapped the work of the Society.

The Society had held a certain number of meetings. They had given a number of addresses to other

Societies, and had added to the pamphlets they had issued one by Professor J. L. Gray, "The Jew in the Economic Life of South Africa." At the beginning of the year it had been decided to publish a magazine, which they started publishing in July, called *Common Sense*. Meetings had a certain value, but a periodical would help to keep before the public the views of the Society and the principles and spirit in which the Society worked. It was hoped thus to reach the public who never came to meetings. The Society's activities had extended to other centres, and in addition to the places mentioned in the report (Capetown, Kimberley, Bloemfontein), there were societies in Pretoria and Durban.

Critics of the Society.

"The Society has, of course, been criticised," said Father Runge. "The first criticism is that it has a name which implies religious interest without being sufficiently religious. I would like to say both on behalf of myself and on behalf of other Christian members of the Society that we are here because we are Christians and because we believe that the first way in which Christians ought to act is in the spirit of Christian charity.

"The second criticism made against the Society is that it is 'pro-Semitic,' and that it is just as dangerous to be pro-Semitic as anti-Semitic. I can repudiate that charge immediately. We are not pro-Semitic, but pro-truth, righteousness and justice. If Jews need to be criticised, if Jews need to be condemned, we are just as ready to do these things as any just or righteous person ought. What we want to do is to unite Jews and Christians together, to hold truthful and righteous principles. We believe that as Jews and Christians acting together, we can throw light upon, and eventually solve, that problem which besets the world at the present time, and cannot be hidden—that 'Jewish problem.'

"We believe," concluded Father Runge, "that all races, all nations, all peoples have a contribution to make to the building up of a common life and a common humanity. We do not believe that there is any superiority of one race over another; we do not believe that it is to the advantage of any one people to shut itself up in a water-tight compartment to live its own little life, and have nothing to do with anybody else. We are called to act together to build up a whole which will be greater than all its parts added together, which will be a great building of humanity in which all will make their contribution, in which all will have their due rights."

Dr. Sonnabend then submitted the financial statement of the Society for the current year. He pointed out that the Society's work had been handicapped in a measure by lack of funds, and he hoped that many more members would donate funds to the Society. He also asked members' assistance in increasing the number of subscribers to *Common Sense*.

(Continued on page 12.)

EDITORIAL

AN APPEAL

CHRISTMAS, 1939, comes to us in a strange garb and atmosphere. The bells of Bethlehem will be co-mingled with the noise of air raid sirens, and Christmas carols will vie with bombs. It all seems to be so completely unreal, but let us be quite clear that both things are very real. Bethlehem, with its insistent note of peace, Europe with its insistent note of war are indeed realities. What faces most of us is the question, "Which shall prevail?" Will the Common Sense policy of Bethlehem, or will the madness of Europe? It is easy to say, of course, Bethlehem will prevail, but those of us who know anything about it at all realise that it can only prevail by a completely new front on the part of many men and nations. *Common Sense* makes no apology for saying that it believes that the true message of Christmas has a very real contribution to make towards the bringing in of a new era, and further we make no apology for appealing to all true South Africans at least to let the message of Christmas prevail in this our land. The past few months has seen the nation divided upon a matter of principle and we believe that the division was the result of honest convictions. Unfortunately, bitterness, dishonesty and intrigue have been allowed to take possession of our divided forces, which has brought with it the inevitable result of hatred, jealousy and suspicion. Is this spirit to prevail? Is this the spirit in which South Africa shall spend Christmas and, indeed, all its future days? *Common Sense* appeals to all who have entered this conflict in our land, and especially the Press and political platforms alike, for a cessation of "hostilities."

In doing so, we are not asking for the absorption of the one camp into the other or for a blind, pious spirit that pretends that no vital difference of opinion exists, for we realise that each camp holds its convictions with the utmost earnestness and in the interests of humanity, but *Common Sense* believes that the true South African desires that lasting and only worth-while peace that comes from God alone. And so we would take the liberty of reminding those who are responsible that this kind of peace can only come to men and women of good will. It is that this good will should be allowed to prevail in our land for which *Common Sense* appeals at this Christmas time.

LOOKING TOWARDS THE FUTURE

NOT many days ago we noticed that a learned Divine of South Africa was asked to lecture to some school boys on the future of this land. It was unfortunate that no member of the Editorial Board of *Common Sense* was present, for most of us would have liked to have listened to what he had to say, for surely one of the most popular topics and the most difficult is that which attempts to indicate what the future of South Africa is to be or, indeed, the future of mankind generally.

The present trend of international affairs does give most of us much food for thought and consequently makes us ask: But what of the future? Unfortunately for many folk, the future means the winning of the war, and we were frankly perturbed by the remarks made by the Prime Minister of Great Britain who, when asked if he were prepared to plan for after the war, said, "We haven't got time for that, our business must be to win this war first." His remarks may have been popular, but we doubt whether they were wise, for this is just one of the things about which some of us feel very strongly, namely, the importance of looking towards and planning for the years that are to be after the war is over.

It seems to us that one of the most vital pieces of work thinking men and women should be doing at this time is to plan for what is going to happen when this catastrophe is over. As we look back at 1919 we realise that the world was not ready for the peace that came, and that may be one of the reasons why the peace conference and its plans were so thoroughly unsatisfactory. Let us be quite definite that mistakes must not be made again. We realise as much as anyone that the war may go on for years, we trust that it will not; but the longer the war the more dangerous will be the years of peace if we have not already begun to prepare for them. *Common Sense* insists that now is the time to begin to hammer away at those fundamentals which are essential in any sane, civilized world, and, further, it realises that we here in this land are in the unique position of having more time than most to give towards the building up of a constructive plan for the future, and so during the coming year we intend to devote considerable space in our journal to this task.

(Continued on page 8.)

Nazism under the Cloak of Anti-Semitism

● By The Hon. H. G. LAWRENCE, Minister of the Interior

[This is the substance of the address delivered at the Annual General Meeting of the Society in Johannesburg on November 22nd, 1939.]

IT is a very great pleasure for me to be with you to-night, because I feel that I can whole-heartedly and sincerely associate myself with the aims and objects of your Society. This Society, I understand, was started some three years ago at a time when it was felt that the menace of anti-Semitism was becoming very apparent in this country of ours. This thing, which is known as anti-Semitism, is something which seems to me entirely foreign to our South African nation. It is something which has been imported into this country, or rather exported from other sources, and being a hospitable country in days gone by, we have allowed this import to come in.

We are a free nation. We have grown up in a spirit of free speech and free thought, and it was not long before the people began to realise what a real danger this doctrine of anti-Semitism was, how totally opposed to the ideals and principles which govern our nation. Unfortunately it gained a certain amount of ground. It was a shock to many of us when we began to appreciate how this imported doctrine was beginning to take hold of a people who had sprung from stocks which prided themselves on religious tolerance and freedom of speech and action.

Your Society has been founded because the original members of the Society did not approve of that new doctrine. I would like to congratulate them on the success of their Society. It is doing valuable work for South Africa, because in my opinion it is trying to face up to that problem on an impartial basis and trying to get to grips with it. It is assisting those who are trying to make South Africa a decent country to live in.

Precursor of Dictatorship.

In a speech made to the Society two years ago, Mr. Hofmeyr said the following, which, in the light of our present knowledge, sounds truly prophetic:

"There is a very real danger in this insidious anti-Semitic propaganda. In other countries it has been used as an instrument to destroy democracy. There are those who would like to use it in the same way in our own land . . . We must not blind ourselves to the possible danger of anti-Semitism as a precursor of dictatorship. If we really love liberty and democracy in South Africa, if we want to maintain these things we value, we must fight with all the power at our command against the things which tend to subvert liberty and democracy."

For some time past observers have watched the growth of Nazism and its corollary, anti-Semitism, in Germany, with a great deal of apprehension. Mr. Hofmeyr visualised this pernicious doctrine not only as something for internal use but for export. We now know to our cost that the menace of anti-Semitism has become a very real commodity of export by Germany.

Yours is not a political association, and I am not going to deal with politics to-night. I want to try and deal with the position as I see it, in the light of the true interests of South Africa. The great task before us at the present time is to combat this menace of anti-Semitism. It is so easy for it to spread, and it undoubtedly has spread in this country. It is so easy for the less fortunate section of the community, who suffer as a result of conditions in the world to-day, from bad housing, from low wages, disease and other difficulties to secure a scapegoat for their misery and troubles. There is no doubt that an attempt is being made in this country to make the Jew that scapegoat by those who are trying to sow that foreign doctrine in our midst.

Society's Contribution to Unity.

The country is now in a state of war, and many revelations have been made showing how very dangerous that doctrine is. What is necessary for everyone in South Africa to do in the difficult days lying ahead is to seek truth, righteousness and justice. Members of your Society and others can play their part, and have all a very real part to play in the days that lie ahead. So far, the war has pursued a very peculiar course. It has been the most curious war in history, a war in which enemy countries drop propaganda pamphlets, and other strange things take place. Let us make no mistake about it: This is not a war which will finish in a few weeks. This is not a war of conflicting political ideas, but a war which goes to the fundamentals of human nature. It is a clash between the opposing forces of goodness and decency and the forces known in the Bible as "anti-Christ." Every one of us, every man and woman, young and old, will have to play a part, not necessarily in a combatant capacity, but on the home front. In the pursuance of that cause on which we as South Africans have embarked in common with Great Britain, her allies and the Commonwealth, we are fighting for truth, righteousness and justice.

Our enemy is right here in our midst. There are people who are trying to spread those foreign ideas among our nation and attempting to impress upon the poorer element that the Jewish section is a menace, that we must split up the South African race. We are menaced every night by some of those agents in an enemy country who are trying to debauch our people with their doctrines. These lies which come from Zeesen contain poisonous references to well-known members of our community interspersed with anti-Semitism of the filthiest nature. Most of us laugh at it, but it must not be forgotten that there are many people who might easily believe these things. There is fertile soil in this country for such propaganda. Your society will be merely a unit in what I hope will be an organised force to combat this poisonous propaganda.

(Continued on page 11.)

THE TALMUD

A Contribution to Culture and Civilisation

● By Rabbi ISRAEL ABRAHAMS, M.A.

A CAPUCHIN friar, Henricus Seynnsis, once clinched an argument with the words: "Ut narrat Rabbinus Talmud" — "As says Rabbi Talmud." In his ignorance, this scholastic actually thought that the Talmud was a *man*. Although the friar was an egregious blunderer, there is none the less a germ of truth in his error. Even if the Talmud is itself not human, it has all too often been treated as such. It has been persecuted with a blind, savage fanaticism that is, as a rule, reserved for human enemies. The history of the Talmud as a book is in many respects comparable to the story of Israel as a people. The Talmud, like the Jew, has been slandered without cause, condemned without trial, senselessly mutilated, and publicly burnt. Its faults—and there is no righteous book written upon earth that teacheth good and erreth not—have been malevolently emphasised and shamefully exaggerated; its merits, on the other hand, have been distorted into vices, or else passed over in significant silence. To complete the analogy, this persecution of a book, or rather a literature, has, like the oppression of the Jew, continued with unabated ferocity right to our own age of advanced civilisation.

One-sided Criticism.

The time is ripe for a new orientation—a complete change of attitude to both the Jew and Jewish literature. Neither men nor their works are ever perfect. This truth applies to every branch of the human family—to Jew and Gentile, Aryan and Semite, European and non-European. The primary and most important task of civilisation is to discover and cultivate the good in all men, and thus to help to pool our human resources for the advancement of all mankind. Possibly mere fault-finding is an easier occupation; but it is a very invidious one. One-sided criticism has the boomerang quality of recoiling. Which people or literature is free from blemish? Who is safe from the "tu quoque" retort? The moment we start uprooting "tares" without garnering the "wheat," we are endangering our ultimate harvest yield—the harvest of the combined contributions of the best human thought and endeavour.

Latterly there has been a spate of criticism directed against Rabbinic Literature, which, quite naturally, has called forth arguments for the defence. The floodlight of publicity has been turned upon certain Rabbinic dicta as though they represented the soul teachings of the Jewish Sages. In other words, the argument has centred round alleged "tares"; but what of the neglected harvest of "wheat"? The latter is immeasurably more important.

Rabbinic Literature, including both the Talmud and the allied works called Midrash, undoubtedly forms a

distinct and important contribution to general culture and the treasury of civilised thought. Apart from its value as a unique historic document, covering vast stretches in space and time, it possesses intrinsic merit; it is rich in noble ideas and ethical teachings. It inculcates a practical philosophy of life that challenges attention even in modern times. Confirmation of this view can be found among the most competent and impartial authorities drawn from both Jewish and Christian ranks. Thus Johann Buxtorf, in the preface to his *Lexicon Chald. et Talmudicum*, says: "The Talmud contains many legal, medical, physical, ethical, political, astronomical and other excellent documents of sciences, which admirably commend the history of that nation and time; it contains also luminous decisions of antiquity; excellent sayings; deep thoughts, full of grace and sense; and numerous expressions which make the reader not only better, but also more wise and learned."

Just, in his "Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner, Secten II" (202), describes the Talmud in the following terms: "The Talmud is a great mine, in which are embedded all varieties of metals and ores. Here may be found all kinds of valuables, the finest gold and rarest gems, as also the merest dross. Much has been unearthed that has realised countless profit to the world."

Heine, with the poet's unerring instinct for romance and beauty, was inspired to sing of the Talmud in ever-memorable words:

"Beautiful old stories,
Tales of angels, fairy legends,
Stilly histories of martyrs,
Festal songs and words of wisdom;
Hyperboles, most quaint it may be,
Yet replete with strength, and fire,
And faith—how they gleam,
And glow and glitter!—"

(Romancero.)

But enough of external testimony. Kort Fischer compiled a whole book of favourable opinions expressed by Christian scholars of the 16th and 18th centuries, called "Gutmeinung ueber den Talmud der Hebräer"; and to these modern scholarship can add extensively. Let us now proceed to the internal testimony of the Text itself; let us mine some of its spiritual gold. Following are a number of quotations, arranged more or less according to subject, which may help to give some indication, however imperfect, to what extent ancient Rabbinic teaching retains interest and value for our own times.

The Brotherhood of Man.

"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Lev. XIX, 18). This is, said Rabbi Akiba, the all-embracing

(Continued on page 9.)

PEACE AIMS—The First Step

● By C. H. S. RUNGE

DESPITE superficial resemblances there are deep-set differences in the average intelligent attitude to the present war compared with that of 1914. Much clap-trap, of course, is talked, and no doubt there will be more. There are those on the Allied side who do not hesitate to beat the drum of mere patriotism, or who present the issue as a straightforward fight between liberty and democracy on one side and totalitarianism and tyranny on the other. But beneath this froth there are signs of deeper thought and truer appreciation.

It was otherwise in 1914. It was indeed customary up to a few years ago to offer a quaint fantasy of the events of those days, in which simple-minded patriots were represented as embracing with ardent blood-lust a conflict engineered by witless statesmen whose resort to the lunacy of war proved the bankruptcy of the "old diplomacy." Those old enough to remember the reality could afford to smile at the confidence of a younger generation who knew so much better. Nevertheless, it is true that in 1914 most of us conscientiously believed in the slogans. It was for us "a war to end war," "a war to make the world safe for democracy," and so on. We were out to fight the "militarism" imposed upon Germany by an ambitious megalomaniac, the Kaiser; he had wantonly torn up the "scrap of paper" and invaded Belgium, to whom we were in honour bound to keep our word; we were to save ourselves, and Europe, including Germany itself, from the consequences of his crimes. We had no thought but that when it was over and our victory achieved we should return to the same peace and prosperity which we had known in the years before, when war, except for affairs with uncivilised tribesmen on distant frontiers—the regular business of professional soldiers—would be as remote as ever from our experience.

The Mistakes of 1919.

To-day it is doubtful whether any but the most unthinking have similar views about our conflict with Germany. The outward circumstances in each case may look alike, but few are deceived into thinking their inner meaning is the same. And in consequence there is no such clear conception of what victory should mean. The aim of the Peace Treaty of 1919 was to restore the same kind of world as existed before 1914, but with liberalism and democracy definitely enthroned as the perfect system for the government of the world. No doubt great mistakes were made; and greed and jealousy competed with plain stupidity to vitiate honest endeavour. Great hopes were set on the League of Nations, and if that democratic ideal had been sustained the issue might have been different. But in fact the settlement of 1919 failed to achieve peace. A great opportunity was lost.

Some there are who would maintain that the loss was inevitable. Wars stir up all the worst passions of men, and, when the time comes for settling terms of peace, no agreement is possible which does not contain the germ of future war. This is a counsel of despair. But it is certain that the opportunity will be lost again, unless, when the present war comes to an end, the nations genuinely desire to understand each other's needs and to avoid the faults which brought disaster to the settlement of 1919. And the task of understanding must be begun long before the time comes. Most of us, no doubt, assume without question that eventually the Allied forces will be victorious and that the Allied powers will dictate the terms of peace. It is in no spirit of defeatism that we ought to bear in mind that the result may be much less simple than this. Indeed, if just that, and that only, is to be the outcome of this war, we are more than likely to find ourselves once again in an exhausted world sowing the seeds for the next encounter.

"Justice to Both Sides."

There is hope, however, in the attitude of mind in which, it appears, the people of England and France have entered this war. If reports be true, there has been none of the excitement and exhilaration of 1914; there prevails instead a sense of dire necessity and a grim determination. Men believe that their cause is just, and that they are right to go to war; but there is no inclination to put the whole blame for it upon the enemy. If this temper holds, war guilt will not again be attributed solely to one side. For the fact that a situation has again arisen in which war is the only remedy no nation is free from blame. That does not absolve us from the duty of opposing Germany by force or arms, nor alter the fact that the Allied cause is just and the German, unjust. But it may lead us to hold more clearly the truth that peace will only be achieved by justice to both sides. Our first war aim should be that the peace, when it comes, should not be dictated, but that there should be a settlement which will genuinely take account of the needs of all and can be agreed to whole-heartedly by both sides. No doubt the present temper of the rulers of Germany makes such an ideal seem remote. The course of the war will, we trust, eliminate these rulers, if their minds cannot be changed. But in the meanwhile it is our task to see that we do not ourselves lose the ideal. We ought to be trying to put ourselves in imagination in the shoes of those who are now our enemies, to consider what, if we were they, we should desire and should think it right to strive for. Only so shall we find a way to co-operate with them in a world in which we all have a right to live.

The details of such co-operation cannot be summed up in a few phrases. There are plenty of differences

(Continued on page 9.)

THE RISING TIDE

A Commentary on Current Essays in Common Sense

● By The Rev. A. W. ("Tubby") EATON

I WISH it were possible for all our readers to "listen in" at an Editorial Board meeting of *Common Sense*. I believe you would be both amused and interested—for we discuss you, "Mr. and Mrs. Reader," until you would hardly recognise yourselves. We talk about your intellectual ability or otherwise and your moods, prejudices, and what not—and then we set to to produce the month's journal—especially for your needs. By now you will have made up your minds how far we either know you or appreciate your needs. One of the things that we talked about was the suggestion "that after all we have no need to educate sane, Christian opinion in South Africa on the Jewish problems"—and believe it or not—we were all agreed with the suggestion. But I, personally, was brought down with a real bump about 24 hours later, for I found myself talking to an English Christian minister of some repute who began to go off the deep end about

Jews in Johannesburg.

So far as I could judge from his remarks, "The Jews in Johannesburg control everything—they have killed the small Christian trader—they make slaves of their assistants—they run the Government of the City, Province, and of the Country, and so on—" Now, to me, the difficulty about all this is, not whether it is true or not, but the fact that a Christian Minister should ever talk like this. Does the fact that he is a minister justify our accepting his remarks "ad hoc," or is it an indication that even "sane Christian opinion *does* need educating"? Frankly, I believe the man to be both ignorant and foolish, but apparently there are more like him in South Africa, and it only makes me feel that the policy of *Common Sense* should be to take nobody for granted—and to set the lead in giving a sane common sense answer to some of the very dangerous sentiments. Just by way of an aside—if the Jews *do* control South Africa, can anyone tell me why they give themselves such a bad time?

But Why Should We Bother?

There is an old saying—I am not absolutely convinced of its truth—that "Familiarity breeds contempt." We are all familiar with the word "persecution," and we nearly always connect it with Jews. Is this the reason why we don't bother very much about it? For it is a fact that we tend to become so familiar with the persecuted Jews question that there is a very real tendency to take it for granted and do nothing about it. But anyone with a spark of humanity in them ought to be feeling the sting of what is being inflicted on an already horse-whipped people. Take, for instance, the report of the Polish Minister of Public Welfare, which says:

"The situation of the population in Warsaw was simply desperate. There was no food supply and no coal, and there were no windows left. The cold weather was approaching, disease was rampant, and there was an absolute lack of medical supplies. The Germans did not allow either the International Red Cross or the Hoover Relief Committee to enter Poland. They had, however, suggested that both these organisations should deliver the necessary supplies of food, clothes, and medicines to Germany, leaving the distribution of these relief goods to the German authorities. The purpose of such a suggestion was too evident to need comment, M. Stanczyk added.

"The Germans discriminated against the Jewish population in every way, and would do the same with the supplies from international committees. Even now, when the Germans in Warsaw distributed bread to the population under military supervision, they excluded Jews from their waiting queues."

Maybe you think the Polish Minister was biased. Well, I don't blame him if he is, but I don't think he is a liar.

Government White Paper on Persecution.

Another illuminating document is the British Government's White Paper on Persecution. Now don't get cynical because I am going to use a "White Paper" as evidence. I agree that such "papers" can be nothing more or less than callous and dishonest propaganda sheets, but the cumulative and varied evidence in this paper justifies its having been printed. And I can assure you that if you are suffering under the delusion that "after all, why should we bother?" it will shake your complacency, and pretty badly. So I hope you will try and get hold of a copy.

A Warning to South Africa.

Father Coughlin, of U.S.A., has become almost a household name in the States—and even elsewhere—and, if I may say so, is an example to South Africans. Only a few years ago Father Coughlin began to dabble in politics, at first in a purely domestic way. An opportunist of the first order, he soon jumped into the national racket with a broadcasting system of his own and the backing of all who opposed the New Deal. When he was badly beaten he said he would retire to the Cloisters never to appear on the political scene again. A very large number of Catholics rejoiced, but his retirement was but for a few days. Beaten on the New Deal Programme, he has thrown himself into the leadership of the anti-Semitic group, and now pours forth what can only be described as the most un-Christian attack on Jewry. To counterblast this iniquitous campaign, many

American Catholics and Protestants have formed themselves into a solid opposition block, and who check "this turbulent priest" at every step. They take every lie Coughlin creates, and then publish the true facts, quite regardless as to whether it reflects badly on the Jews or not. Their chief organ is one called *Equality*. I say this ought to be a warning to South Africa. There are imitators of Father Coughlin in this land. *Common Sense* will, I hope, become their strongest enemy.

On Our Own Doorstep.

All good South Africans will welcome the courage of Mr. Havenga, ex-Minister of Finance, who refuses to let his political convictions give rise to dishonesty and disloyalty. Speaking at Trompsberg on the Jewish question, he said: "I am definitely opposed to any form of persecution or any restriction of the rights and privileges of Jews who have obtained citizenship here. They are citizens in an equal sense with you or I and have the same rights as you or I."

When we remember that this was said at a Nationalist meeting, one cannot but admire him, for we realise that it will not make his position easy. However, I expect that Mr. Havenga does not forget that it was his Jewish friend and co-soldier, Jo Segal, who fought side by side with him all through the Campaign and cared for him after having been twice wounded at the Battle of Velkop.

Administrator Pienaar.

We take this opportunity of complimenting the Administrator on his common sense manner of tackling the Kruger Day incident. Most of our readers know that some of the Transvaal teachers thought they could legislate for South Africa and anticipated any move made by the Province to declare October 10th as a public holiday, by "passing the law" for themselves. Administrator Pienaar told the teachers that he would have no flouting of the law by any teachers, and went on to say:

"I therefore stand second to none in my admiration for him. But let me assure you that if there was one thing which the President could not condone it was disobedience and illegal behaviour. We burghers of the South African Republic regarded an ordinary circular as law, and if the youth of the Transvaal to-day wish to honour the memory of the President they will have to abandon anything which has a semblance of disobedience or resistance against authority."

To which we say, in no uncertain tone, "Hear, hear!"

A Wise Move.

The Acting Minister of Native Affairs, Major P. van der Byl, has eased the minds of more than one South African by announcing that the Government has decided to defer the proposed transfer of Native Education to the Native Affairs Department. Let us hope that the deferment is a permanent one, for there was no measure proposed by the late Government that was likely to give so much offence to South Africa than this one. It was disliked by the Natives, the Native Affairs Department, practically every Churchman of standing, and all the

elected Native Representatives. Thank God, common sense has had the opportunity to prevail once again, and so save South Africa from a lot of quite unnecessary trouble.

And Yet Another.

This time from our guest speaker at the Annual Meeting of the Jews and Christians Society, Mr. H. G. Lawrence, who, from his Department, has set up a National Nutrition Council. Mr. Lawrence, a very fit man himself, does not approve of South Africa's trend towards becoming a C.3 nation. His new Council have got to do more than inspect children's teeth and make intriguing statistics. It has got to get down to practical ways and means of seeing that all South Africans are fed and clothed properly.

Good News for Schoolboys.

Many of the scholars of South Africa will wholeheartedly agree with the Headmaster of St. John's College, in his advocacy of the abolition of examinations, though it ought to be emphasised the scholars and the Headmaster have entirely different grounds for not writing them. I personally am tempted to agree with the Headmaster that far too long have we tied ourselves to the examination theory, and at great cost. Only those who have the burden of reading examination papers can really judge the merits or otherwise of the Headmaster's proposition, and as one responsible for a little, I say the sooner we begin to teach, without the matric bogey in the way, the better. Don't ask me what to put in its place, because frankly I don't know. All I know is that the true purpose of education is being entirely missed by our present method.

Enough!!

I have wandered far and wide along the Rising Tide, and it is time to get out of the boat and on to the shore, where Christmas waits with its glorious message of Hope and its amazing spirit of real friendliness. I take the opportunity of wishing all our readers a very happy Christmas, with the hope that the "Common Sense" policy of Bethlehem will soon come to the World.

EDITORIAL.

(Continued from page 3.)

We have approached men and women from all walks of life to make their contribution, and we believe that out of it will come an awakening of responsibility for us here in South Africa.

Some may think that such a policy on the part of this journal is sheer arrogance, but it is not intended to be so. We do it fearlessly, for we are convinced that the problem before mankind is not that of winning this war, but of bringing in a new order which is governed by common sense, justice and goodwill.

NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS

NATIONAL SOCIALISM AND THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

by *Nathaniel Micklem*. OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS.
8/6.

This book, written by a leading English Non-Conformist, casts a lurid light on the principles and methods of Nazism. While still professing to accept "positive Christianity," the Nazi leaders in their bitter opposition to Judaism have shorn this religion of any connection with the Old Testament, and even denied that Jesus was a Jew by race. Dr. Micklem has brought to light many secret documents, which show that the ultimate aim of the Nazis is to crush out Christianity and substitute for it the religion of Blood, Soil and Race. Their methods are to denounce Catholicism as political, to take all education out of the hands of Christian bodies, to close all Government careers to definite Christians, and in many cases to allow rioting against Church authorities to go unpunished. One document almost justifies the murder of the undesirable. Christian as well as Jew must look on National Socialism as his deadliest enemy.
H. E. SYMONDS, C.R.

THE JEW IN THE LITERATURE OF ENGLAND.

(Continued from page 10.)

noble their pioneering spirit in other fields, were, as touching the Jew, content to be guided by the mob and its most vulgar tastes. And even when enlightenment came, there were still authors (and I daresay there are now) who found the old prejudices more picturesque than the new toleration, if not more profitable. Smollett was not the only author who, under the influence of newer thought, sought to make amends for his sins. Dickens did it, too, rather clumsily, and so did Maria Edgeworth. That was, however, a stage in the development towards a true perspective of the Jew, a development which had its first full flowering in the works of Zangwill, of which Mr. Modder rightly remarks: "It is owing to 'Children of the Ghetto', 'Dreamers of the Ghetto', and 'The King of Schnorrers' that the Jew in English literature is no longer treated as a conventional type, either very good (rarely) or very bad (more often). The Jew has become a human being—a living type which Jewish writers and (by contagion) non-Jewish writers attempt to delineate with sincerity and passion."

Not unnaturally, perhaps inevitably, it is the Jewish writers who have given the truest portrayal of Jews and Jewish life. "Some of these writers," as Mr. Modder sums up, "cry out against the materialism of the group, others show the persistence of the Jewish spiritual values among those who lack all material things. Some believe in the saving power of an orthodox Judaism, and others feel strongly that Zionism offers the way out for Israel in modern life. All of them, however, hope to find some solution that will bring about a better understanding between Jews and the rest of the world."

PEACE AIMS.

(Continued from page 6.)

among ourselves about social, political, economic problems. It is unlikely that the outcome of the war will leave untouched the capitalist structure of the Western nations, though the entry of Russia upon the scene undoubtedly complicates all the issues, and may cause many to defend against Communism features of Capitalism which are really indefensible. But plainly our first duty, if we are to discuss peace aims, is to give up talking glibly about the blessings of democracy, and to acknowledge frankly that our boasted democracy fails to provide either liberty or decent living for large numbers of our own people. We must recognise that we are not out to defend or to restore something that exists, but to achieve something better. If we believe the cause of the Allies is just, it is because we believe the Allies are fighting not merely for themselves but for humanity as a whole. Can we humbly and sincerely maintain this position? Only so is there hope that out of the present turmoil the world may achieve a genuine peace.

THE TALMUD.

(Continued from page 5.)

principle of the Divine Law. But Ben Azzai said: "There is another passage in Scripture still more embracing; it is the passage (Gen. V, 2): This is the book of the generations of man, He made him in the likeness of God" (Siphra to Lev. XIX, 18). (This means, the human family has one Heavenly Father and one common ancestor.)

"God showed Himself even more complaisant to Moses: In respect of persons of any consequences before me, whether an Israelite or a Gentile, a man or a woman, a bondman or a bondwoman? If somebody hath fulfilled a commandment the reward is close at hand; for it is written (Ps. XXXVI, 7): Thy righteousness is like the great mountains (Yalk. Shim. I, 76)."

"How do we know that a Gentile who takes up the Torah is equal to a high priest? In Lev. XVIII, 5, it is written: 'Ye shall therefore keep my statutes and my judgments, which if a man do, he shall live by them.' It does not say: Priests and Levites and Israelites, but *man*." (Bab. Kam., 38a.)

"The revelation was openly bestowed in the desert: for if it had been bestowed in the Land of Israel, the Israelites might have said: 'The other peoples have no share in it.' That is why it was bestowed in the desert, in no man's land, openly; it belongs to the whole world, everybody is at liberty to acquire it." (Mech. Jeth. to Ex. XIX, 2.)

R. Johanan taught that when the Temple stood the altar made atonement for all the nations. (Suc. 55b.)

"Whoever rejects idolatry is called a Jew." (Meg., 13a.)

"Our Rabbis taught: We support the poor of the heathen along with the poor of Israel, and visit the sick of the heathen along with the sick of Israel, and bury the poor of the heathen along with the dead of Israel, on account of equity." (Git., 61a.)

[Further quotations selected by Rabbi Abrahams in order to illustrate the teachings of the Talmud will be published in subsequent issues.]

The Jew in the Literature of England

● By L. SOWDEN

IT is a curiosity of English literature that the Jew is generally represented as a villain of the most obnoxious character, while the Jewess is idealised and portrayed as a creature of intelligence and charm. That has been the fashion ever since Marlowe created his monstrous Barabas and the faithful and beautiful Abigail, down to the days of Scott and his heroic Rebecca, and even to Disraeli and the lofty-minded Eva.

To probe into the psychological roots of this strangely contradictory attitude would probably require a treatise of some length, which Mr. Montagu F. Modder, no doubt, and rightly, regards beyond the scope of his comprehensive survey, but for which he offers several valuable suggestions. One of these is the habitual chivalry of the English people (which was always generously accorded to beautiful women, Jew or Gentile, but never extended to witches or mothers-in-law), and another is the habit of authors to copy one another, a failing which was shared no less by Scott than by Shakespeare.

"The Jew in the Literature of England" is the most ambitious essay on the subject ever attempted. Mr. Modder seems to have left nothing out, having ransacked almost every corner of English literature for the merest reference to the despised or holy race. His work is exhaustive, and has the merit, of prime importance in a work of this sort, of detachment. Yet the service that Mr. Modder has performed lies not so much in having assembled numerous Jewish characters of fiction, poetry and drama, and demonstrating that the Jewish population of English literature is much larger than is generally supposed, as in certain principles of the methods of authors that he has revealed. Most arresting of these, though the author does not stress it, is the one quoted, namely, that however odious the Jew may appear, his daughter is invariably a person of rare qualities, a woman eminently desirable to the Gentiles. It is altogether an odd commentary on popular intelligence, and damning to the tribe of authors in general. Manifestly, one of these creations is false, the repulsive Jew or the superlatively attractive daughter. The two cannot always be of the same kin, and to make them appear so is an error of which not even the greatest have been free—not even Shakespeare.

I have always been more resentful of Jessica than of Shylock, for where as in the latter, Shakespeare's grasp of human values triumphed over the demands of what we call to-day "box-office," in the character of Jessica he was merely writing down to the tastes of the meanest of the groundlings. In Shylock he created one of his greatest characters, in Jessica one of his most

despicable. It may be that Shakespeare was merely following the fashion set by Marlowe, for Marlowe's Barabas was doing excellent business; and it may be that he was insufficiently acquainted with Jews to know better.

On the first assumption, it should be pointed out that if Shakespeare did much better in his Shylock than Marlowe in his Barabas, he did much worse in his Jessica than the other in his Abigail. Jessica is "thieving, deceitful and rebellious," Abigail "faithful, obedient . . . fully compliant to the wishes of her father even to her sorrow and against her will." Truly, if Marlowe, as is often stated, was Shakespeare's master, he was not unworthy of his pupil.

The other assumption raises the question whether Marlowe and Shakespeare knew anything about the contemporary Jew. Here, I think, Mr. Modder assumes too lightly that they could not have had first-hand knowledge of Jews, for recent research has shown that 300 years after the expulsion there was a considerable number of Jews in England, many of them engaged in literary and scholastic occupations.

There is, however, one explanation of both Marlowe's and Shakespeare's concept of the Jews, which Mr. Modder touches on only in a general way, but which is applicable to almost every writer who has introduced a Jewish theme. No artist, however great his genius, can be expected to rise above the prejudices of his time. He is not really concerned with them, except in so far as they provide artistic material. He uses them or not as it suits his artistic purpose, and as they change in relation to any one subject or type of character, so his work will change.

This brings us to the principal theme of Mr. Modder's work, which is, that the presentation of the Jew in literature has changed or developed with the gradual growth of toleration. "It will be seen, as the story unfolds itself," he writes, "that invariably the poet, the novelist, and the dramatist reflect the attitude of contemporary society in their presentation of the Jewish character, and that the portrayal changes with the economic and social changes of each decade." This thesis finds eloquent illustration in "the first pleasant words . . . expressed in literature for the Jews in England." They were used by Smollett, elsewhere not particularly sympathetic, in his story, "The Adventures of Count Fathom," of 1753. The date is significant, for it was in 1754 that the Whig Government introduced its Jewish Naturalization Bill, and Smollett was a Whig himself. Here the politician was showing the way to the writer, as unusual a position for the politician as it is uncomplimentary to the writer.

Indeed, the whole picture that Mr. Modder presents is not favourable to the line of writers, who, however

(Continued on page 9.)

"THE JEW IN THE LITERATURE OF ENGLAND,"
by Montagu F. Modder. Philadelphia, the Jewish
Publication Society of America. With notes, biblio-
graphy and index. Pp. 435.

Die Sogenaamde Nasionaal - "sosialisme"

● Deur STEFAN COETSEE, M.A.

DIE Nasionaal-sosialisme, hoewel dit tenvolle nasionalisties is, is definitief nie sosialisties nie, daar dit indruis op die grondbeginsels van Sosialisme nl. produksie vir gebruik en nie vir winste nie.

Onder die Nasionaal-sosialistiese bewind behou die groot-kapitaliste, die Thyssens, Krupps en Hugenbergs, hulle posisies in die beheer van hulle verskillende ondernemings, hoewel die Staat tot 'n sekere mate ingryp op hulle profyte, maar dit is ook ten voordele van die kapitalistiese stelsel as 'n geheel. Dit is dus 'n kwessie van saamwerking tussen die groot monopolie-kapitaliste en die Nazi-hierargie ten voordele van albei. Die produksie van die land en die uitbuiting van die volk geskied vir die "glorie van die vaderland," wat beteken dat dit in werklikheid geskied tot die voordeel van die monopolie-kapitaliste en die Nazi-leiers. Daarom is hulle dan ook so kop-in-een-mus. Daar is weliswaar van die kapitaliste wat hunker na die ou stelsel van demokratiese kapitalisme waar hulle meer vryheid geniet het in die uitgee van hulle winste en waar die Staat nie soveel ingegryp het op hulle persoonlike vryheid nie, as onder Nazisme (wat in werklikheid Staatskapitalisme is) die geval is. Staatskapitalisme is 'n stelsel waaronder die staat meer en meer ingryp in die beheer van die nywerheid en waar die kapitaliste 'n seker profyt deur die Staat gewaarborg word op hulle beleggings.

ONEGTE "SOSIALISME."

Dit mag skyn of hierdie Staatskapitalisme 'n stap in die rigting van Sosialisme is, maar dit is nie noodwendig die geval nie. Dit is eintlik die gevolg van die moeilikhede waarnatoe kapitalisme lei en waar dit uiteindelik tot die toestand geraak, waar dit moeilik vir die kapitaliste is om hierdie groot profyte te handhaaf, dan is hulle maar god-dank bly om die beheer van hulle bedrywe aan die Staat oor te handig op waarborg van 'n gestadige diwidend van sê 5 persent, soos b.v. die geval is met die London Passenger Transport Board. Ek weet daar is selfs sogenaamde Sosia-liste wat dink dat dit Sosialisme is, maar dit is

ver van die geval. Ons kan alleen praat van Sosialisme, waar produksie geskied ten behoewe van die gehele volk en dit is nie Sosialisme waar produksie geskied ten behoewe van die oorlogsplanne van die Nazi-staat, met of sonder waarborg van die winste vir die kapitaliste en met of sonder hulle effektiewe beheer oor die bedrywe wat hulle in naam of in werklikheid besit.

In Duitsland en in Italië kan ons dus definitief bevestig dat daar geen Sosialisme in swang is nie. Deur die naam Nasionaal-sosialisme te gebruik, maak die Nazis geen verskil aan die werklike toedrag van sake nie. Solank as die Nazis aan bewind is en hulle met hulle oorlogsplanne voortgaan, terwyl die groot monopolie-kapitaliste voortgaan met die beheer oor die nywerheid en hulle winste kry met of sonder die hulp van die Staat, kan daar geen Sosialisme wees nie. Dit is nie die klein boere en winkeliers wat 'n land noodwendig 'n kapitalistiese land maak nie. Dit is die groot finansiële en industriële kapitaliste met hulle beheer oor die masjienerie van produksie en distribusie en die gepaardgaande uitmorgeling en uitbuiting van die volk om hulle profyte te handhaaf.

NAZISM UNDER THE CLOAK OF ANTI-SEMITISM.

(Continued from page 4.)

Many people in the country consistently listen in to the Zeesen propaganda and due to the reiteration of those statements begin to think that there is truth in them. We are now in a position to realise, as a result of threats coming across the air to South Africa and documents obtained from persons interned, that there was a very definite Nazi plot in the country to use anti-Semitism to split South Africa. I have no complaint against the German people, but I have a complaint against any Government that seeks to abuse the decencies of public life and the hospitality of a friendly country in order to spread the pernicious doctrines of anti-Semitism.

I would appeal to-night, not only to members of your society, but to all people of goodwill in our country, to use every endeavour to fight this menace, to do all they can to maintain truth, righteousness and justice. We have embarked on a crusade, we are going forward with a feeling of the fundamental verities of human life and decent behaviour to one another. We in South Africa will do our part to see that they shall prevail.

OUR ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING.

(Continued from page 2.)

The Rev. A. W. Eaton then spoke briefly on the journal *Common Sense*. He said that the Society did not aim at being propagandist; what they were trying to do was to put across to South Africa a journal which was unbiassed and was full of common sense. They would not keep to the subject of Jews and Christians, but would cover wider issues in South Africa. He believed in *Common Sense* very much, and he asked all to look upon themselves as agents for *Common Sense* and to see that it reached the public.

Rabbi M. C. Weiler, in seconding the adoption of the report and balance sheet, said that the Society was doing much to promote goodwill. Even if anti-Semitism should disappear, there would be the need for a Society of Jews and Christians. How much more necessary was it at the present time when there was so much suffering all over the world!

The report and balance sheet were unanimously adopted.

Election of President.

Upon the proposal of Mr. M. Kentridge, M.P., Father C. H. S. Runge was again nominated as President for the ensuing year and unanimously re-elected.

Election of Vice-Presidents.

The following gentlemen were elected as Vice-Presidents:

The Rt. Rev. G. H. Clayton (Bishop of Johannesburg).
The Rev. A. S. Clegg.
Adv. M. Franks, K.C.
Chief Rabbi Dr. J. L. Landau.
Prof. R. F. A. Hoernlé.
The Rev. Dr. Bruce Gardiner.

Election of Council.

The following were elected members of the Council (in addition to the President and vice-Presidents):

Mr. Leslie Blackwell, K.C., M.P.; Mr. H. Britten; The Rev. A. W. Eaton; Prof. S. H. Frankel; Dr. H. Gluckman, M.P.; Prof. J. L. Gray; Sen. the Hon. C. Hartog; Rabbi W. Hirsch; Mr. A. S. Holland; Sen. the Hon. J. D. Rheinallt Jones; Mr. M. Kentridge, M.P.; Mrs. N. Levine; Mr. Cecil Lyons; Prof. I. D. MacCrone; Mrs. S. G. Millin; Mrs. A. Pratt Nickels; The Rt. Rev. W. Parker (Bishop of Pretoria); Mr. S. Raphaely; Mr. G. Saron; The Rev. Dr. A. T. Shrock; Dr. H. O. Simon; Adv. Bertha Solomon, M.P.; Dr. H. Sonnabend; The Rev. Dr. J. Dexter Taylor; Mrs. J. Ramsay Thomson; Mr. W. J. de Vries; Rabbi M. C. Weiler; Adv. H. J. B. Vieyra; Mr. Keith G. Fleming; Mr. W. S. McEwan; Mr. Felix Landau; Mr. C. D. Keet; Mr. Brian Bunting; Mr. D. Scholsberg; Mr. I. H. Harris; Mrs. J. Hellman; Mrs. M. Franks; Mrs. B. Mitchell-Hunter; Mr. D. Mierowsky.

The business of the meeting having been concluded, an address was delivered by the Hon. Mr. H. W. Lawrence (the substance of which is given on page 4.)

Rabbi Israel Abrahams conveyed to the meeting greetings and congratulations from the Society of Jews and Christians in Capetown.

"To my mind," said Rabbi Abrahams, "there are only two roads; either it is the road of brotherliness that leads to progress, which is the way to civilisation. If it had not existed in the past, civilisation would not have reached the stage that it has to-day. I think for a moment what we as Jewish people would have been if we had not received genius from other people. Even King David would not have been a Jew if we had been racialists. We would never have had a temple. I suggest that Christianity would not have become a religion if racialism had existed in former times. What irretrievable injury it can do to the future progress of mankind if we choose the wrong road of unbrotherliness that leads back to barbarism."

He said they must have light. Mr. Lawrence had spoken of the chaotic times through which they were passing. Whatever the future would bring, he felt sure that in the end a better and braver world would be born. There was only one way to achieve that. "Let us learn from the Creator. In the beginning there was chaos. When He wanted a world He created light. We want light—the light of truth—and let it radiate to every corner of the world."

Professor Hoernlé then proposed a vote of thanks to the speakers. He said it was the duty of the Society to work for the best possible human relationships among people who clung to their own religions. There were other sorts of friction besides the religious within the white population which stood in the way of better understanding, but that was precisely why the high task of human endeavour had to be undertaken. South Africa had to make its small contribution; namely, the task of making that country a home for all the various peoples in it without demanding of any one section that it should give up its specific character or specific religion. They wanted, he said, an intensive, not a narrow, exclusive South Africanism.

He said that the Afrikaner population, especially in the North, which 50 or 60 years ago were dominant in every sense, masters of the earth, had lost that position to the British. "They are now struggling to recover it, in itself a legitimate effort, but an effort in which we must hope for their success if they are going to fit themselves normally, happily and contentedly into a united South African nation, in which different groups can maintain their several conditions, and yet co-operate with each other in the spirit of friendship, justice and mutual goodwill, and just as we in this society are trying to help them assimilate, so I think we ought to carry that spirit into the world to people who are more inclined to reject the proffered hand than to grasp it." He said that he would like to appeal to those personally, particularly those in the economic walks of life, whether Jews or non-Jews, to help where they can the effort of the Afrikaner people for economic reconstruction, not to hold aloof, less still to look with hostility upon that which the Afrikakner was trying to do.

Collection Number: AD2533

Collection Name: South African Institute of Race Relations, Collection of publications, 1932-1979

PUBLISHER:

Publisher: Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

Location: Johannesburg

©2017

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

This collection forms part of the archive of the South African Institute of Race Relations (SAIRR), held at the Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.