

# The 'British White Paper' on Palestine

*International Jewry Throws Over Its Own Zionists  
as Leaders Bid for Moslem Support*

By DR. J. S. BARNES

THE TRUTH BEHIND the scenes of British policy in Palestine has been carefully concealed from the public. For three years the British have fought in vain to coerce the Arabs in favor of Zionism. Now the policy has been reversed; and although the Arabs have rejected the compromise that has been offered them, it is the Zionists now who are in open revolt against the latest British recommendations. It is still to be seen whether they will be able to put up as heroic a fight as the Arabs.

Everybody, of course, knows the origin of the Palestine muddle. During the stress of the World War, Britain gave two incompatible promises to the Jews and to the Arabs. In order to secure Arab help against the Turks, they were promised British sympathy with pan-Arabian aspirations throughout the Arabian peninsula, except in so far as Aden and the Aden Protectorate were concerned and Syria, which was regarded as involving French interests for which Britain was not in a position to speak. Later, the Balfour Declaration promised to make of Palestine a "national home" for Jews.

Christian interests were of course forgotten, for it has long become a commonplace in England among the majority of the intellectual governing class to regard Christianity as a "superannuated superstition." On the other hand the Balfour Declaration was not meant necessarily to imply that it was the intention of Britain to give Palestine to the Jews as a national State, though it was couched in sufficiently ambiguous terms to lead the Jews into supposing that she did.

## Arabs Let Down at Peace Conference

The Zionists have always interpreted the Declaration in its more thorough-going sense; and in any case its purpose was to get the influence of world Jewry on the side of the Allies and especially to enlist, through the influence of American Jewry, the armed assistance of the U. S. A.

Both moves, as war measures, proved highly successful. Under the inspiring leadership of Colonel T. E. Laurence and of the Emir Feisal, the Arabs duly rose in revolt; while Jewry, on its part, rallied to the side of Britain. America came into the war.

At the Peace Conference, it was the Arabs who were let down, because the influence of Jewry and of their friends and allies. Laurence resigned, returned his decoration to King George and retired, disgusted and humiliated, into obscurity. Later, honor to a certain extent was satisfied by renewed assurances to the Arabs that Palestine was not to be turned over to a Jewish majority.

The Arabs indeed were at first not over-alarmed by Zionist activities. Money poured into the country. It became one of the most prosperous spots on the globe. The Jews, inspired by a high idealism and with plenty of shekels to spend, acquired land from the Arabs at exorbitant prices. They irrigated these lands, turned

what was almost desert into thriving fruit farms, harnessed the waters of Galilee to make electricity, set up numerous new industries and created in an astonishingly short time the busy, modern city of Tel Aviv, which has now over 120,000 inhabitants, a permanent symphony orchestra, art gallery and Opera House (things which no British Crown Colony has succeeded in doing in a century). There is no question but that the Zionists have done a remarkable piece of work, which no other colonizing power can match with the sole exception of Italy, who in both Lybia and in the Greek Islands has accomplished an even greater miracle during the same period.

## Jewry Looks for International State

All this prosperity was shared by the Arabs. Labor was in great demand. The Arabs increased by emigration from neighboring Arab States almost as rapidly as did the Jews. A certain balance for a time was consequently maintained.

As time went on, however, it became obvious that the Jews were determined with British acquiescence to outdistance the Arabs. Besides the official quota of Jewish emigrants, thousands more were clandestinely smuggled into the country. The influence of international Jewry in Britain was manifestly abetting the Zionist cause. Not that international Jewry, which represents the majority of Jews in Britain, France and Amer-

ica, were ever very keen Zionists. They cared for Zionism only as a sentimental and symbolic movement. They did not support it on principle. They supported it as opportunists. Being realists, they knew that Palestine was too small a place ever to become a great national Jewish State capable of attracting to its shores the mass of Jews all the world over; and for this very reason they were benevolently disposed towards Zionism, because they knew it represented no solution to the Jewish problem.

If there had been any question of Palestinian Zionism solving the Jewish problem in a national sense, the majority of Jews would never have given it any support whatever. A national solution of the Jewish problem is the very last thing these Jews desire. Their solution is the international solution. Their solution is to promote by every means in their power the anarchy of Liberalism and the consequent emasculation of Christianity, so that on the ruins of Christendom they may construct a new Jerusalem: an international order dominated by their own compact international, racial and esoteric religious organization, which is the essence of Jewish power today.

## Haifa Naval Base British Objective

So international Jewry aided and abetted Zionism only for the sake of the ideal of possessing the old Jerusalem once more as a rallying center and symbol of triumphant Jewry.

Then it was that the Arabs per-

ceived their danger. In vain they appealed to the League of Nations, which was supposed to protect the people of every mandated country against any attempt on the part of the mandatory power to disregard the will of the majority. Disappointed and disillusioned, they threatened to revolt, agitated by means of strikes and demonstration, and even initiated sporadic acts of terrorism.

In these circumstances Great Britain was forced to seek some fresh solution. What she particularly hankered after was the right, which the terms of her mandate specifically denied her, to make of Haifa a naval base. The establishment of an independent, national Jewish State would have given her this right; and it was precisely this bait that was used by the Jewish wire-pullers behind the scenes in Britain to obtain the favor of the British government for their schemes. In effect what they said was this: "Give us Palestine and independence. We shall always need your protection against hostile Arab neighbors. Therefore we must always be your allies; and, as allies, Haifa shall be fortified and be always at your disposal."

So the Peel Commission, in an attempt to satisfy all parties, excogitated the plan of partitioning Palestine into three areas: one Jewish which comprised Haifa and which was to receive its independence at an early date; a British area comprising Jerusalem; and an Arab area to be eventually joined to Transjordan.

The scheme was a bit too clever. It did not satisfy the Jews. It violated nature by attempting to cut up a tiny, compact and historical region, no larger than New Hampshire. Above all it exasperated the Arabs, who thereupon finally rose in open revolt—and to such good purpose that they have succeeded in keeping at bay for three years an army of 25,000 British soldiers exercising methods so drastic and so ruthless that had they been employed by any totalitarian State, the whole of the press throughout the great democracies would ever since have been echoing its disapproval in terms of violent denunciation, horror and hate.

Nevertheless it was inevitable that sooner or later the Arabs would be forced to give way. Why then has British policy suddenly been reversed just on the eve of success? The "White Paper," recently issued, is an obvious bid to conciliate Arab opinion. Whether it succeeds in doing this remains to be seen. Probably it will not. The document is too suspiciously ambiguous. What is certain, however, is that it utterly destroys the hopes of the Zionists and represents a complete *volte-face* to the policy hitherto pursued.

What is the meaning of all this? The answer can be easily given. International Jewry—for the time being anyhow—has abandoned Zionism, because international Jewry is now throwing all its weight into provoking a European conflict, into bringing about a war to crush "Fascism." They are sanguine of success; and, in these circumstances, they realize the imperative need of conciliating or at least of blanketing the Arabs and the Moslem world, which Disraeli used to call the "Achilles heel" of the British Empire.

A war with the Moslem world hostile might well jeopardize its success. Therefore, as principle does not enter into the question form, realistic international Jewry has elected to betray idealistic national Jewry for the sake of the higher stakes. The British government has accordingly been relieved of the pressure to which it has until now been subjected in favor of Zionism. It is only another example of the degree in which Christendom in the great democracies has mortgaged its autonomy.

## A LETTER FROM GENE TUNNEY

TO THE EDITOR OF SOCIAL JUSTICE:

I am in receipt of several copies of the July 17th issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE sent anonymously. My attention is called to an article published in this issue by a young journalist on my association with the Committee of Catholics Against Anti-Semitism. . .

. . . I do not blame the young journalist for his lack of information concerning my activities with reference to the Spanish war and the spread of Communism in this country. May I respectfully request that you bring to his attention a copy of the July 8th issue of America and he will find in a short article my views on Communism, its propaganda and a reference to the Spanish war. As a matter of fact I have not become a partisan to Franco's cause since his victory but have worked and subscribed to his cause from the inception of the rebellion against the godless and inhuman government popularly known as the "Loyalist government of the Spanish Republic."

With reference to my attitude toward the movement of anti-Semitism aside from my human feelings, I take my authority from the doctrine of Pope Pius XI, when he said:

"Abraham is called our Patriarch, our ancestor. Anti-Semitism is not compatible with the reality of the text; it is a movement in which we Catholics cannot share. It is not possible for Christians to take part in anti-Semitism. We are Semites spiritually."

I am definitely opposed to anti-Semitism as such. The mere fact that many Jews are in Communistic organizations

does not ipso facto make all Jews Communists. My understanding is that the Jewish religion has no more love for Communism than does the Catholic religion. The trouble with most anti-Semites is that they believe the Jews are in alliance with radical Communists to overthrow our Government. This is a grave inaccuracy and one that promotes economic and social destruction. I don't think there is any excuse for a man of training and education to be a victim of this confusion.

As a further evidence of my antipathy toward any organization of Communist influence I refer you to the back cover of your July 17th issue and its story on the American Youth Congress. It happens that I am one of a committee of six who put up the money for, and contributed with material from my files to the pamphlet on the American Youth Congress which was distributed at its opening session. This, incidentally, is the thing that brought out in the open for the world to see the definite predilection toward Communism in the American Youth Congress. A good deal more about this subject will be disclosed later on.

Finally may I say that as one who has been trained in the Catholic church by Nuns, Christian Brothers and Priests, I have the deepest respect for the position that a priest of the Catholic church holds and, accordingly, though I might not be able to see eye to eye on an important social problem with one, I should never participate in a public attack on him.

Sincerely yours,

GENE TUNNEY



# CHAPTER XI

## Counsel and Decrees of the Church Relating to the Jews

THE AUTHORS OF the General Jewish Council book indirectly, if not directly, maintained that the Jews did not play an important part in financing and developing Communism; that the "British White Paper," "The American Official Services Report," "The Sisson Documents" and other available literature, including articles from *The American Hebrew* magazine, were either non-existent or that their use was perverted in the references which Father Coughlin made to them when he pointed out that Jews were deeply implicated in Communism and in the advance of Bolshevism especially since the autumn of 1917. That was the answer the author made to Father Coughlin's invitation.

Bear in mind that *Father Coughlin did not say that all the Jews are Communists or that all Communists are Jews*. Bear in mind that he made a clear and careful distinction between atheistic Jews and religious Jews and, finally, bear in mind, that he invited the religious Jews to join with him in stamping out the Red menace of America. He also pointed out that Nazism is a defense mechanism against Communism; that Nazism is a social irregularity which no American or Christian can support; and that the Nazis themselves, taking advantage of the indifference of the good Jews towards Communism in Germany, classified all Jews in the category of Bolsheviks to the detriment of the innocent—these thoughts were clearly expressed in Father Coughlin's public addresses.

### Fr. Coughlin Proves Self Jews' Friend

Why did Father Coughlin venture upon this subject in the first place? He recognized, as does every scholar and observer, how antipathy, dislike and opposition for the Jews are growing in America as well as in other countries. He was aware of what happened to the Jews practically in every nation of the world. To prevent unjust and un-Christian persecution of the Jews from happening in this country—something which the Jews themselves were not preventing but unconsciously were inviting—the Radio Priest practically said this:

"The Jews have been persecuted in many nations abroad. There is an anti-Jewish feeling in England and in France. Already Stalin is beginning to manifest a hatred for the Jews. And all this is being brought about, not by economic aggression on the part of the Jews as some maintain, but by the unsound attitude of the Jews towards the Spanish situation as well as by the silence on the part of good Jews toward the spread of Bolshevism in which irreligious Jews are interested."

Father Coughlin could have said: "Walk the streets of London or Paris or New York and there see the number of Jews out of all proportion to the ratio of population who are interested in Marxism. Inspect the general Jewish attitude towards atheistic Russia and you will find that it is more or less favorable."

"These policies are mistaken policies because they will invite repercussions from all persons who are opposed to Bolshevism, and when these repercussions form, unfortunately, they will be inordinate and will not distinguish the good from the bad in the case of the Jews."

In other words, instead of being anti-Semitic, Father Coughlin was very pro-Semitic insofar as he attempted to contribute a suggestion by

following which the Jews of America could co-operate with all decent Americans in preventing from happening here what happened in Germany.

### Silence Will Not Cure Anti-Semitism

No one in America is blind to the course things are taking relative to the Jews. The great metropolitan papers, which refused to give notice to this phenomenon, are only aiding and abetting its progress. The silent treatment is an inefficient treatment; for you cannot cure cancer or put out a fire by saying to yourself: "Let us pretend it doesn't exist." The silent treatment which at present is being administered to the anti-Jewish wave in America is succeeding in inviting those responsible for the wave to become bolder and is resulting in increasing rather than in diminishing the spirit of anti-Semitism in our midst.

And the peaceful, silent attitude of the good Jews towards the Bolshevik-minded Jews is likewise inviting re-criminations against all Jews.

To assail Father Coughlin or any other honest person who brings this question into the open and who participates either directly or indirectly in classifying him as an anti-Semite for having done so, brings no injury to Father Coughlin in the long run. This policy wins for the Radio Priest millions of friends and supporters; for all those who participate, either directly or indirectly, in tarring him with the stick of anti-Semitism find themselves in the company of *The Nation*, *The New Masses*, *The Daily Worker* and the pro-Communists.

Of all the words misused in the American vocabulary, there is none that has suffered more than the word "anti-Semite."

Who is an anti-Semite?

What is anti-Semitism?

And, particularly, what is Semitism?

### Christian Is Forbidden to Hate Jews

Well, one way of looking at the word "Semitism" teaches us that all persons descended from Sem are Semites. This includes the Arabs as well as the Jews. For the past two years the Jews have been fighting the Arabs in Palestine. Does that make the Jews anti-Semites?

More popularly speaking, an anti-Semite is a Jew-hater. That type of anti-Semitism which expresses "hatred for the Jewish people" is forbidden to all Christians and specifically to all Catholics.

But besides "hatred" there are various other types of anti-Semitism according to many Jews. To discuss the Jewish problem; to submit documentary evidence relating to the participation of Jews in the birth and development of Bolshevism; to insist that the Christian social order be incorporated in the scheme of our life—these, according to some Jews, also constitute a brand of anti-Semitism. According to Catholic doctrine such discussions do not make an anti-Semite of anyone. Otherwise, as will be presently shown, there would be many sinful Catholics and anti-Semites in the world, including priests, bishops and cardinals.

In a Decree of the Holy Office dated March 25, 1928—a Decree often misquoted as to purpose, intent and date—the Catholic Church gives valuable information and direction to her chil-

dren regarding the two extremist groups of Jew-friends and Jew-haters. This decree, issued by the Sacred Congregation, the "official guardian of faith and morals," reminds us of the "blindness" of the Jewish people in having followed a false leadership for the past 2,000 years.

### Catholic Church States Its Attitude

The Congregation of the Holy Office points out that the Jewish people were "at one time the chosen people of God." They were chosen originally, under God-given leadership to be the "bearers of Divine Revelation." They were, says the Holy Office, "bearers of Divine Revelation up to the time of Jesus Christ."

Now it is the contention of Christianity, and particularly of the Catholic Church, that since the time of Jesus Christ the Jewish people are no longer the chosen people because they have refused to follow the leadership of Jesus Christ. Thus the Church admonishes Catholics to pray for and to work for the conversion of the Jewish people, according to the Decree referred to "in spite of, yes indeed on account of, their subsequent blindness."

The fact is the Jews as a whole have rejected Jesus Christ Whom we accept as God and Who is the Leader of all peoples. By following another leadership, the Jews find themselves in difficulties everywhere. To any other person, or nation, or race that refuses to follow the leadership of Christ, the same observation can be made, namely, that difficulties will beset them.

Father Coughlin publicly has encouraged the Jews to follow the Christian concept of life. It is very evident from his words and well-known to all Christians that it is not the Jewish people but rather the irreligious, atheistic and naturalistic elements amongst them—and particularly their leadership—which Father Coughlin deplors.

In this conjunction, may I advise all my readers—including Jews—to open the Bible at the *Book of Deuteronomy* and read the twenty-eighth chapter wherein it is plainly stated in the inspired words of God—words accepted both by religious Jews and religious Gentiles as such—that wonderful benedictions will descend upon the Jews if they remain faithful to the Revelations made manifest to them by God and that astounding punishments will be suffered if they reject His leadership. Please read that chapter of the Old Testament which should be dear both to Jews and to Christians.

### False Leadership Seeks Material Ends

Since the time of Christ, the Jewish people in large numbers rejected these Revelations and persisted in following blindly a leadership which

is anything but the leadership of Jesus Christ. They rejected the one Messiah Who was promised to them, Whose circumstances of birth, life and death were predicted clearly in the Revelations made to the Jews—so clearly that when the Wise Men came from the East, the Jewish leaders at the time of Christ's birth knew exactly where He was to be born.

Instead of following the leadership of this Messiah, some Jews maintained that He is not the Messiah but that another is to be expected. In America, the majority of Jews, unfortunately, have considered that the Jewish race—and not God is the Messiah. As a result of this, the leadership which many Jews followed is remarkable for its attempt to achieve material aims rather than spiritual; and financial economic power rather than religious.

It is the Christian concept that salvation for the Jews and for all other races is contingent upon their accepting Jesus Christ as the Leader. Any leadership which aims at acquiring only supremacy in fields of finance, radio, press, cinema, government, education or material science is a false leadership and a failure unless the Christian social and personal philosophy of life is accepted; unless all these objectives are subordinated to God and to eternal life.

That some Jews have risen to great material power is a fact. That many Jews have remained in poverty and have experienced the fulfillment of the twenty-eighth chapter of *Deuteronomy* is likewise a fact. But why call those persons anti-Semites who pray and work for the liberation of the Jewish people from the yoke of false leadership which has been responsible for the last nineteen hundred years and more for the sufferings which have fallen upon the shoulders of the Jewish race practically in every nation in the world?

### Church Decree Abolished 'Friends of Israel'

It is said that in every age and among every people with varying degrees of intensity the great bulk of the Jewish people have suffered because of "their subsequent blindness." Nevertheless, the Christian Church condemns Jew-haters and excessive Jew-lovers when Jew-loving, if I may use such a harsh phrase, has resulted in a compromise with Judaistic doctrine.

Against the extreme Jew-lovers, as so described, the Holy Office speaks in its Decree of March 25, 1928—a Decree entitled "Concerning the Abolition of the Society Commonly Called 'Friends of Israel'." It is well-understood herein that the Church has condemned the methods of the extremist "Friends of Israel" as "abhorrent to the sense of the Church, to the mind of the Holy Fathers, and to the very sacred Liturgy itself." But, on the other hand, the Church, in this same Decree, takes occasion to remind her children that she always has con-