

- **Book Review of: *The Israel Test***
- **Author: George Gilder**
- **copyright 2009, published by Richard Vigilante Books**
- **296 pages, dedicated to Midge Decter**
- **reviewed by Robert Sungenis, Ph.D.**

“Israel has fewer flaws than perhaps any other nation—Israel is the pivot, the axis, the litmus, the trial.” **George Gilder** on the Jews¹

“As far as my experience goes they are also no better than other human groups, although they are protected from the worst cancers by a lack of power. Otherwise I cannot see anything ‘chosen’ about them.” **Albert Einstein** on the Jews²

“All critics of Jews should not be tagged as anti-Semites...that the Nazis are brutes does not make us angels....Criticism is not the same as hatred, and critics are not our enemies. The greatest friends of a people are not those who praise but those who honestly find fault. A people without criticism is either a dictatorship or a community so deeply embedded in smug self-satisfaction as to be on the road to decadence.” **William Zuckerman**, Jewish author.³

Perhaps the best place to start in reviewing *The Israel Test* is with the author himself. Although one might think after seeing the title, the dedication, and scanning the table of contents that Gilder is the consummate Jew, he is a purebred WASP but with a self-professed penchant for fairness, an identity that he employs quite judiciously in his book to quell any suspicion that he is biased towards Jews. He is a Harvard graduate, a Reaganite republican and die-hard supply-side capitalist, but not afraid to criticize his own party as was the case in his famous attack on Barry Goldwater’s anti-intellectualism or what he calls Reagan’s “worst, most self-indulgent and foolish moment...his speech advocating the destruction of nuclear weapons” (p. 243), for it is Gilder’s belief that “in a region full of proven enemies, an Israel without nuclear weapons would not be viable” (p. 88). Coming from a respectable line of English authors, Gilder was a speech writer for Nelson Rockefeller and Richard Nixon and one can tell quite easily in *The Israel Test* that he has a flair for prose and a pungent vocabulary to get his point across. His other works, such as *Sexual Suicide* and *Men and Marriage*, made a formidable shot across the bow of feminism; while his *Wealth and Poverty* climbed to the *New York Times* bestseller list and became a pocket encyclopedia for capitalism. At one point he purchased the conservative magazine *The American Spectator*, which he

then transformed from a political pulpit to a technology periodical, but it floundered and he was forced to sell it back to the previous owner who reversed its course. Gilder also supports Intelligent Design against the theory of evolution, which led him to found the Discovery Institute. He has many other accomplishments to his credit, including being the editor-in-chief of the *Gilder Technology Report* and is a much sought after speaker. In short, Gilder is an accomplished man of the world and his intelligence and his literary talents appear quite formidable.

Before we begin, just a short remark about the format of the book. First, the publisher, Richard Vigilante Books, totally ruined Gilder's endnotes, failing to place any numerical markers in any sentence of the book that corresponded to the detailed endnotes in the back of the book. This is particularly egregious since Gilder extracts a lot of provocative quotes from his ideological enemies and thus the reader cannot find the source of those quotes. Second, the Index is shoddy. I'll give just two examples. The very person to whom he devotes the book, Midge Decter (wife of Norman Podheretz) doesn't have an entry in the Index, though she is mentioned on page 105, and Ronald Reagan is without an entry as well, though he is mentioned several times. Third, the half-dozen blurbs on the back cover are from prominent Jews, except for Rush Limbaugh who is a dyed-in-the-wool capitalist.

The Early Gilder

Gilder is quite candid about his early experiences that laid the foundation for his now total acceptance of Jewish academic, political and technological interests. While hoping to land the position of senior editor at Phillips Exeter Academy for the voluminous writing projects he did for the school newspaper, Gilder was passed up for a Jewish student, one who he hardly knew and who had contributed "nothing notable to the paper." At the same time, he was dismayed that three other "New York Jews with high grades" were also potential candidates for senior editor, while George "struggled to eke out C's." The following summer George was tutored in Greek by a Jewish girl named Valerie Leval but whom he did not know was Jewish. One day she asked him how he liked Exeter and George blurted out: "Exeter's fine, except that there are too many New York Jews." After the girl told him she was Jewish, George's "stomach turned over like a cement mixer" which "to this day" he "recalls the moment as a supreme mortification and as a turning point. Rather than recognizing my shortcomings and inferiority and resolving to overcome them in the future, I had blamed the people who had outperformed me. I had let envy rush in and usurp understanding and admiration. I had succumbed to the lamest of all the world's excuses for failure – blame the victor...I had flunked my own Israel test. But I learned from my lesson" (pp. 245-249). This vignette is more or less the controlling theme of Gilder's book. In a way, the book is written with the strategy of a murder mystery, for Gilder doesn't reveal this primal emotive event until the very end. Without this anecdote, the book might have been just another political muscle-cruncher reminiscent of the Alan Dershowitz style of argumentation. Valerie adds a human touch to Gilder's book that allows the reader to feel his soul, although it would not surprise me if many come away from the incident judging Gilder's lifetime achievements as the result of an over scrupulous conscience.

Gilder's Dependence on Alan Dershowitz

Speaking of Alan Dershowitz, we should mention that Gilder bases a lot of his analysis of the political situation in Israel on Dershowitz's books, *The Case for Israel* and *The Case Against Israel's Enemies*, referring to them as "virtuoso tracts" that "offer over thirty chapters of evidence against the standard

propaganda” (pp. 19-20). As such, since Gilder is making a steady diet of Dershowitz’s perspective on Israel we can understand why he doesn’t often grasp the complete or even realistic picture. Gilder makes no reference to Norman Finkelstein’s critique of Dershowitz’s books either because he hasn’t read them or doesn’t take kindly to Finkelstein’s neutralizing of Dershowitz’s thesis. And since these authors are both Jewish, there is no “anti-semitic” card that can silence Finkelstein, although we must note that after Finkelstein published his critique, Dershowitz maneuvered to have Finkelstein’s professorship at DePaul University terminated, which it was. I’ve read two of Finkelstein’s books, *The Holocaust Industry* (2000) and *Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-Semitism and the Abuse of History* (2005), the second of which is totally devoted to exposing the distortion and fabrication in Dershowitz’s books. For example, while Gilder idolizes Dershowitz as “one of the world’s leading defense attorneys” (p. 21), Finkelstein opens with a quote from the famous attorney’s book, *The Best Defense*, where Dershowitz says: “Almost all criminal defendants—including most of my clients—are factually guilty of the crimes they have been charged with. The criminal lawyer’s job, for the most part, is to represent the guilty, and—if possible—to get them off.”⁴ Finkelstein is implying, of course, that Israel is Dershowitz’s “guilty client.” Finkelstein supports this innuendo by stating that *The Case for Israel* “grossly distorts the documentary record”...“and in Dershowitz’s case this description applies only on those rare occasions when he adduces any evidence at all...Dershowitz is citing absurd sources or stitching claims out of whole cloth. Leaning on his academic pedigree to wow readers and in lieu of supporting evidence, he typically clinches an argument with rhetorical flourishes like ‘This is a simple fact not subject to reasonable dispute’ (p. 7)...almost invariably signaling that the assertion in question is sheer rubbish. Regarding his lecture tour...Dershowitz reports, ‘Whenever I make a speech, the most common phrase I hear from students afterward is, ‘We didn’t know.’ One reason perhaps is that much of what he claims never happened.”⁵ Even the *Jewish Quarterly* praises Finkelstein saying that he “has raised some important and uncomfortable issues...example cited...can be breathtaking in their angry accuracy and irony.” In another instance of irony, the chapter previous to Gilder’s extolling of Dershowitz is titled “Blindness of the Experts.”

Gilder’s “Israel Test”

Dershowitz aside, Gilder believes that if we are going to be honest with ourselves as Gentiles, each of us must pass the same “Israel test” that he now passes religiously – which, in a nutshell, is for the Gentile to accept in his heart the intellectual prowess of the Jew for the betterment of society. We note here, however, that Gilder does not say we must pass “the Jew test.” It is specifically the “Israel test” because Gilder believes the nation of Israel now embodies all the intellectual characteristics he has enshrined in the Jew at large. Israel today, especially in the era of supply-side capitalist, Benjamin (Bibi) Netanyahu, has become a technological marvel, second only to the United States in dozens of categories (biotechnology, computers, Internet communication, armaments, *etc.*) and thus, Gilder espouses, the state of Israel serves as a buffer between the radical Muslim/jihadist and the modern prosperity of the West. Prior to Netanyahu, Gilder says that “Israel leaders balked the entrepreneurs and inventors who gathered there, creating a country as inhospitable to Jewish genius as any anti-Semite could contrive” (p. 106). Hence, in the prior 200 pages, Gilder tries to prove not only the superiority but the absolute necessity of the Jewish intellect. As such, Gilder argues that Israel’s survival is indispensable, which in turn demands Israel’s protection by like-minded nations. As he puts it: “On a planet where human life subsists upon the achievements of human intellect and enterprise, Jews are crucial to the future of the race...The success or

failure of Jews in a given country is the best index of its freedoms” (p. 41). The argument is a very practical one: the Jews and Israel produce many benefits for mankind, so the world should help Israel survive against its enemies. Of course, Gilder also traps himself with this kind of argumentation, for if one judges, using different criteria than Gilder’s, that Israel is not “producing” what the world needs but what it doesn’t need, the same logic would call for Israel’s demise. Gilder’s mistake is basing protection on whether a nation can produce technological goods as opposed to protection based on the intrinsic value of human life in whatever state the individual or nation chooses to live. Gilder’s logic is the same reason that our Jewish-dominated culture had no tinge of conscience in removing Terri Schivo’s feeding tube or in continuing to litter our garbage cans with aborted fetuses. These helpless humans don’t produce and actually get in the way of more important things we are destined to do. For the same reason, Gilder more or less despises the Palestinians and he uses some very pungent name-calling to get his point across, e.g., “the PLO has always been essentially a Nazi organization” (p. 23); “Oslo testifies that the Palestinian Authority is indeed an extortion racket”; “the Palestinians and their backers in the Arab world have waged jihad for decades, brought death and poverty and terror on their own land and people” (p. 222). He is against a Palestinian state (p. 208) and he devotes a whole chapter titled, “The Palestinian Economy” to prove his point that “the Palestinians had accomplished little by the time the Jews arrived in Palestine in large numbers after World War II.” Obviously, simple village life is not Gilder’s cup of tea. Unless the culture is filled with “ingenuity and genius, excellence and accomplishment” (p. 45) then it deserves to be absorbed and taken over by the more powerful and productive. Interestingly enough, this type of Darwinian approach to culture seems quite at odds with Gilder’s avid support of Intelligent Design against evolution’s “survival of the fittest.” Perhaps Gilder should take a lesson from fellow Jew, Claude Levi-Strauss, the social anthropologist who “concluded that primitive peoples were no less intelligent than ‘Western’ civilizations and that their intelligence could be revealed through their myths and other cultural keystones.”⁶

Gilder’s View of Anti-Semitism

Like the Pavlovian dog, the reader is then told that if he doesn’t pass “the Israel test,” the inevitable consequence is to earn the label of “anti-semite” – the same label Gilder pinned on himself when he spoke amiss to Valerie Leval. Gilder takes exception to Prager and Telushkin’s book *Why the Jews? The Reason for Antisemitism* (1983, 2003) since they claim that anti-semitism comes from the simple fact that “Jews are Jewish,” regardless of whether they are smart or dumb, rich or poor. It is the “specific characteristics of religious Jews that cause anti-Semitism, not the widespread human sins of racism, envy, nationalism, and ethnic hostility,” and Prager opens the book with a quote from the Jewish-leaning United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, stating, “The Jew carries the burden of God in history and for this has never been forgiven” (p. 31). Here we must interject that Prager argues from the same blindness that David Klinghoffer argues in his book *Why the Jews Rejected Jesus* (2005). For Klinghoffer, the Jews were “good religious people” who were “followers of God’s commandments.” Not once in the entire 222 pages of his book does Klinghoffer mention even one sin the Jews committed in the past or present, yet the preponderant theme in the Old Testament is that the Jews never stopped sinning against God’s commandments, and it is the very reason God rejected their nation, a prophecy that remains fulfilled to this very day (Deut 28:1-68). Unfortunately, the USCCB, at least prior to when Prager extracted the quote, has been largely Judaized by the Prager/Klinghoffer mentality. One wonders why the USCCB, with the Old Testament so easily accessible to its theologians, didn’t see the “burden” the Jews should

carry of so inciting God to wrath with their constant and horrific sins for 2000 years that even He, the epitome of mercy and patience, couldn't tolerate them any longer and thus removed the Jewish nation from the face of the earth. Likewise, why didn't the USCCB see the Jew as carrying the "burden" of denying Christ, God in the flesh, for the next 2000 years? Prager, Klinghoffer and the USCCB simply ignore these facts and wish to create the illusion that the Jew is persecuted because he is so devoted to God. The evidence from Scripture shows just the opposite. Except for a "remnant" about which the Jewish prophets speak, Israel's rejection of God began (and never really stopped) when they worshiped the golden calf, an event which would have resulted in God totally destroying them save for the appeasement of Moses that changed His mind (*cf.* Exodus 32-33; Ezek. 20:1-49; Rom 11:5-10; Acts 7:1-53). Of its forty kings, only three died with a positive epitaph, while the rest were said to "do evil in the sight of the Lord," and the people followed right along. Totally oblivious to this sordid history, Gilder says that the world is "locked in a debate over Israel's alleged vices [and] they miss the salient truth running through the long history of anti-Semitism: Israel is hated above all for its virtues" (p. 22).

Be that as it may, Gilder opposes Prager's thesis and asserts that "Jewishness" plays only a minimal role in anti-semitism. The main cause for anti-semitism, he says, is Jewish achievement. Quoting Benzion Netanyahu (the father of Benjamin Netanyahu) from the former's book *The Origins of the Inquisition in Fifteenth-Century Spain*: "The struggle against the Jews was essentially motivated by social and economic, rather than religious considerations," but adding that the Inquisition was not motivated by "hostility to Jewish religion but rage against the superior effectiveness and ascendancy of Jews outperforming established clerics as *Christians*" (emphasis his), and that the "new Christians, mostly Jewish, were taking over the Spanish church by being more learned, eloquent, devout, resourceful, and charismatic than Christian leaders." This is certainly a paradoxical twist on history. Netanyahu, on the one hand, claims that anti-semitism "was essentially motivated by social and economic, rather than religious considerations," yet on the other hand claims that the Jews were "outperforming established clerics as Christians." Apparently, it wasn't merely Jewish money-making that made Gentiles jealous but Jewish excellence in the Christian religion! It seems from Gilder's perspective that whatever the Jew touches turns to gold, literally and figuratively. The real truth is that most of these Jews, by advice from their rabbis, were converting to Christianity under false pretenses, otherwise known as the "conversos," and the result was a nation of Jewish subversives in Spain which not only did much damage to medieval Judaism but caused great havoc in the Catholic Church as well. The Spanish Inquisition was implemented to deal with this situation. Originally, the Inquisition was created by St. Dominic to counter the Albigensian heretics. Within a few years, Ferdinand and Isabella used the Inquisition to expel both the Moors and the Jews from Spain. On the other side of the issue, Popes Benedict VIII and Eugene IV used the Inquisition to protect the Church from Judaism after it had made its way into Europe after the Jews had migrated from Khazaria in southern Russia in the early second millennium. This is precisely why the Council of Florence under Eugene IV informed the Jews that "the Mosaic law...ceased and the sacraments of the New Testament began" and that "not only pagans, but also Jews and heretics and schismatics cannot become participants in eternal life."⁷ In the end, Gilder's use of Netanyahu's book is another example of the "who me?" mentality among Jews today. According to Alan Dershowitz, "Jews are not to blame for anti-Semitism....Anti-Semitism is the problem of the bigots....Nothing *we* do can profoundly affect the twisted mind of the anti-Semite."⁸ Gilder agrees, stating: "Hostility toward Jews stems not from any alleged legal violations or untoward violence but from their exceptional virtues. This is the essence of anti-Semitism" (p. 27).

Gilder then says: “All the sage observations by Prager and Telushkin miss the heart of the matter, which is Jewish intellectual and entrepreneurial superiority. As eminent Russian pro-Semite writer Maxim Gorky put it: ‘Whatever nonsense the anti-Semites may talk, they dislike the Jew only because he is obviously better, more adroit, and more capable of work than they are.’ Whether driven by culture or genes – or, like most behavior, an inextricable mix – the fact of Jewish genius is demonstrable...The source of anti-Semitism is Jewish superiority and excellence” (p. 32). Although Gilder makes it appear as if this is some new insight into the controversy about Jews, it is merely a rehashing of an old theme. The Jewish-owned *New York Times* had been pushing it already in the 1880s. In one article from February 1880, it sized up the brewing controversy in Germany as follows: “The crime of the Jews appears to be comprehended chiefly in their financial prosperity. No sin is as great as success in the eyes of the non-successful. The charge is made that of the 600,000 Israelites in the empire, hardly any engage in agriculture or mercantile pursuits; but that they control trade, rule the money markets, and are eating up the country with their avarice and usury.” In December 1880, the *Times* added: “There are not many more than 500,000 Jews in the whole empire...and have excited the animosity of the mass of the inhabitants, not only by their wealth, but by their intellectual power and moral influence, as well as by the prominent positions many of them occupy. The common people who are, as a rule, always unsuccessful, and therefore disappointed and discontented, complain that the Jews escape military duty and most of the penalties of citizenship, and yet enjoy, beyond all proportion, its emoluments and compensation...The Jews themselves are very naturally indignant at the war making on them, and say, with reason, that they have done as much as any Christians for the intellectual, moral, and financial development of Germany...”⁹

Jews and IQ Tests

Immediately after this provocative exposition, Gilder cites the outstanding performance of Jews on IQ tests. He cites *The Bell Curve* by Murray and Richard Herrnstein who show that there is a “massive superiority in IQs of Ashkenazi Jews over all other genetically identifiable groups,” and that “the Jewish mean intelligence quotient is 110, ten points over the norm.” But Gilder, since he admits that “Israelis of all races failed *on average* to outperform Americans in international tests of eighth-grade math and science skills,” is not impressed with Herrnstein’s figures as much as he is among Jews who excel. As he puts it: “What matters in human accomplishment is not the average performance but the treatment of exceptional performance and the cultivation of genius.” More significant for Gilder is that “the proportion of Jews with IQs of 140 or higher is somewhere around six times the proportion of everyone else” and “a 1954 study of IQs in New York public school system (even though the study is over 50 years old) that showed Jews with some 85 percent of IQs over 170 (twenty four out of twenty eight).” He adds that “since the 1880s, nearly half of all the world chess champions have been of Jewish heritage.” He concludes with another ‘survival of the fittest’ comment: “In the current era, Jews will always tend to be overrepresented at the pinnacles of intellectual excellence. Therefore an ideological belief that nature favors equal outcomes fosters hostility to capitalism and leads directly and inexorably to anti-Semitism” (pp. 33-34). It is this jealousy of the Jew, Gilder argues, that is “the chief source of poverty in the world,” because jealous people won’t let the Jew thrive in his intellectual and technological pursuits, thereby resigning themselves to misery. Palestine is a good example, says Gilder. If the Palestinians, and even their Arab neighbors, would recognize “the Israeli economy as the leading force for posterity in the Arab world – if only the Arab’s would see it” (p. 213) then Israel could help all of them live happy and

contented lives. Hitler's Germany is another example. Gilder says Hitler choked off the Jew out of envy. As Hitler writes in *Mein Kampf* of the Jews' penchant for such vices as "usury, stock manipulation, exploitation of the land, cunning in finance and trade," Gilder, with no hint of shame, interprets them not as "expressions of cultural inferiority of Marxist machinations but of capitalist superiority....The ultimate source of their resentment is that, under capitalism, success does not normally go to the 'best' or the naturally fittest as identified by physical strength or beauty or by the established criteria of virtue." Gilder reminds us that "even though Jews are a tiny minority of less than a tenth of 1 percent of the world's people, they comprise perhaps a quarter of the world's paramount capitalists and entrepreneurs. This was true at Hitler's times and it is true today" (pp. 68-69). Perhaps seeking to pass his Israel test with flying colors, Gilder says late in his book: "The twentieth century was shaped and animated and endowed largely by a tiny cohort of the earth's population usually called the Jews. In much of the world, they were suppressed and constricted by various dictatorial regimes, some of which they supported. But the achievements of the twentieth century are heavily attributable to the prevalence of capitalism in the West and its ability to accommodate the genius of the Jews. Without them, the world would be radically poorer and its prospects for the future would be decisively dimmed" (p. 240). Suffice it to say, the intellectual superiority of the Jew, at least as expressed in technology, science and "abstract thinking," is a constant, almost droning theme in Gilder's book. It is as if he wants to make sure you do not finish the book without being thoroughly convinced of the necessity of the Jewish mind to take over and make the world a success, which inevitably convinces you that your enlistment for Israel's survival is for your own best interests.

By this point we are forced to say that if Gilder wants to argue his case by focusing on the positive points of the Jews as a group, he must also be willing to see the negative points by the same criteria. Gilder has set the rules, and we will play by them. On the one hand, I will grant to Gilder that the Jews, at least on a *per capita* basis, excel in academics. I've been around Jews all my life and I know that Gilder speaks from experience. I've seen some smart Jews and some not so smart Jews, but a good percentage of them were in the former category. In fact, I say the following comment out of deep respect for Jews and Blacks: to deny Jews their excelling in academics would be like denying Blacks their excelling in sports. Gilder has given us sufficient data about the former. All one need do to prove the latter is watch a typical NBA, NFL or MLB game and observe that about 75% of the players are black, in the face of a black population that is just barely 10% over the US total. Having said that, let's take a closer look at these statistics to get a more rounded picture of the situation.

First, Gentiles outnumber Jews in the world by 500:1. Out of that ratio, there are only a minority of Gentile countries that have historically pursued the upper academic and financial categories that Gilder believes measures the success of a people. This ratio is further narrowed down when we take into account the few number of individuals from these countries that pursue these same categories. The United States, for example, has only 6% of the world's population. Long before the Jews began to migrate here in the early 1900s, the United States was showing itself as a Gentile powerhouse in the Industrial Revolution and beyond, but compared to the general population, the numbers of "successful" Gentiles was minimal. Similarly, out of the 10 to 15 million Jews in the world, only a small percentage of Jews enter into these upper academic and financial fields (and unfortunately for the Jews at large, the sentiments for or against the Jews are based largely on how these few upper echelon Jews behave, or what we today call "the Big Jews"). Hence, once we pare down the Gentile and Jewish participants in Gilder's favorite fields, the

statistics of “Jewish success” is not so significant. Gilder himself admits that for every Jewish “Einstein, Bohr, Pauli, von Neumann and Feynman” who excel in the highly abstract world of physics, there is a “Rutherford, Planck, Schrödinger, Heisenberg, de Broglie, von Laue, Fermi, Dirac, Tomonaga, Gödel, Turing and Shannon” among the Gentiles that matches or exceeds their intellect and contribution (p. 91).

As one astute reader of *The Bell Curve* opined: “Consider that women comprise some 50 percent of the world’s population, but fewer than 5 percent of Nobel Prize winners (one of Mr. Murray’s favorite metrics). Sweden, with only one tenth of a percent of the world’s population, has contributed approximately 5 percent of Nobel laureates. Are Swedes therefore smarter than women? The United States has 5 percent of the world’s population and 21 percent of Nobel winners. Are Americans smarter than Swedes but far less smart than Jews, who while constituting a fraction of a percent of the world’s population can boast of 30 percent of Nobel laureates since 1950? If only life were this neat. But the fact is that a significant proportion of Jewish Nobel laureates have also been U.S. citizens, and that U.S. citizens of all racial, religious, and ethnic stripes enjoy more access to top research facilities and academic resources than the citizens of other countries. The second most-represented category of Nobel laureates, not surprisingly, is European academics, who have been similarly connected to well-endowed centers of learning. We forget at our peril that it was not very long ago that basic courses in calculus and physics were not routinely offered to women. Higher math was the property of ‘male genius’—and white male genius at that. If one hypothesizes that neither ‘black’ nor ‘female’ genius exists, their emergent manifestations will be perpetually exceptionalized, held at bay, and shunted beyond the pale of the rest of the population. If we really ‘do the math’ (as Mr. Murray advises) about past Nobel winners, nothing is as vulgarly simplistic as this Trojan Horse of his, so gaudily adorned to look like revelation.”¹⁰ A competing publisher then says: “We sympathize with the overall themes of Charles Murray’s essay, but we have reservations about some of his scenarios for the evolution of Ashkenazi intelligence. Our own model of elevated Jewish intelligence posits that it is a consequence of Jews’ economic niche in medieval Europe north of the Alps (from around 800 c.e.). Before that period of rapid evolution there is no special sign of unusually high intelligence in the historical record of the Jews. Mr. Murray, following work by Maristella Botticini and Zvi Eckstein, disagrees, and looks back to antiquity for the origins of this phenomenon. There is no obvious critical test to confirm his hypothesis over ours, and we are all reduced to arguing by anecdote.”¹¹

Contrary to both Prager’s and Gilder’s thesis, Jewish social author, Maurice Hindus, stated in 1927 that neither Judaism nor the Jewish intellect is the origin and font of success: “The force that first pried the Jewish mind open to radical doctrines of a modern nature had its origin not in Jewish but in distinctly non-Jewish intellectual associations...Marx and Lassalle were steeped in Western, that is, modern Gentile culture, Gentile philosophy, Gentile science....It is only after the Jew began to ram down the gates of the ghetto and to make excursions into the intellectual temples of his Christian neighbors, only after he had laid aside the Talmud and the Shulcan Aruch for modern, western, that is Gentile, history, biology, psychology, science, that he embarked on a career of achievement in modern arts and science....The old Jewish civilization, with its rigid orthodoxy and its emphasis on Jewish superiority, compelled aloofness from worldly intellectual intercourse even as it compelled social isolation. It frowned on the perusal of modern literature, philosophy, social theory, even on the study of foreign, that is Gentile, languages.”¹²

Gilder's View of Jewish Science

Ironically, Marilyn vos Savant, a Gentile and a woman, holds the world's record for the highest IQ, and she doesn't even excel in any of the categories Gilder esteems. Her claim to fame is that she writes a weekly column for *Parade Magazine*. Beyond this, Gilder claims that "the achievements of modern science are largely the expression of Jewish genius and ingenuity" and he supports this by the fact that "26 percent of Nobel Prizes" in science were won by Jews (p. 35). But when we look a little closer at the reality, we wonder what the Nobel really represents. Does one receive a Nobel from raw genius, or is it a political prize, a paradigm preserver, and perhaps a symbol of the ability to fool people into thinking that one understands his chosen field? Let's take the field of Quantum Mechanics (QM) that Gilder vaunts so highly as a measure of raw Jewish intelligence. He writes: "The turning point came early in the twentieth century. Before quantum theory, science was chiefly an enterprise of gentile Europeans – men like Isaac Newton, James Clerk Maxwell, Lord Kelvin, Ernest Rutherford and Max Planck. With the rise of quantum theory came the ascendancy of Jews in science, led by Albert Einstein, Niels Bohr, Wolfgang Pauli and Max Born. In the post-World War II era, Richard Feynman became the paramount teacher and interpreter of quantum theory" (p. 72). The reality of QM is that it is nothing more than statistical analysis of particle behavior, but the physicists who compile the statistics haven't the vaguest notion why the particles behave as they do. It all looks good on paper because the QM scientists don't reveal the underlying ignorance behind it all. All they really know is that it works, but few, if any, can explain why it works, which is the real test of genius. As the British periodical, *New Scientist*, put it: "Over the past century it [quantum theory] has passed every single test with flying colours, with some predictions vindicated to 10 places of decimals. Not surprisingly, physicists claim quantum theory as one of their greatest triumphs. But behind their boasts lies a guilty secret: they haven't the slightest idea why the laws work, or where they come from. All their vaunted equations are just mathematical lash-ups, made out of bits and pieces from other parts of physics whose main justification is that they seem to work.¹³ Or as de Broglie saw it, QM appeared to be "...governed by statistical laws and not by any casual mechanisms, hidden or otherwise. The 'wave' of wave mechanics ceased to be a physical reality....The corpuscle, too, was turned into a mere phantom..."¹⁴ Jewish physicist, Richard Feynman, admits: "The theory of quantum electrodynamics describes Nature as absurd from the point of view of common sense. And it agrees fully with experiments. So I hope you can accept Nature as she is – absurd."¹⁵ Even Gilder himself admits this in a sort of backhanded way: "No one has fully fathomed the quantum mysteries underlying modern electronics. The modern world depends on machines whose inmost nature we do not fully understand" (p. 126). Rather than question whether their own theories about Nature are absurd (which implies that they know very little about Nature), proud scientists like Feynman put the blame on Nature. As long as they remain in this quagmire, the men of Feynman's generation will never be able to come to the truth. They will only disguise their ignorance in mathematical equations. As Heisenberg himself admitted: "The paradoxes of the dualism between wave picture and particle picture were not solved; they were hidden somehow in the mathematical scheme."¹⁶ The same is true in macro-science. As physicist J. J. Thomson once concluded: "We have Einstein's space, de Sitter's space, expanding universes, contracting universes, vibrating universes, mysterious universes. In fact the pure mathematician may create universes just by writing down an equation, and indeed if he is an individualist he can have a universe of his own."¹⁷ In many cases, the only difference between medieval superstition and modern physics is that the latter has the privilege of hiding its superstitions in complex equations that no one understands.

As for Gilder's "nuclear science" that he claims shows the "Jew as superior" and wins them "26 percent of Nobel prizes," the truth is that nuclear science is also a hit or miss endeavor. Just one cross-section of its history will tell the real story. After Paul Dirac's prediction and Carl Anderson's discovery of the positron in 1932, science concluded that matter and energy could be created and destroyed. Since this interpretation, even though it produced absurd results (*e.g.* producing an electron with infinite mass),¹⁸ helped save the reigning atomic paradigm upon which so many physics careers rested, the anomalies were all kept very quiet. The inventor of the needed fudge factor was Jewish physicist Richard Feynman, but he was honest enough to admit that it was: "The shell game that we play...called 'renormalization.' But no matter how clever the word, it is what I would call a dippy process! Having to resort to such hocus pocus....I suspect that renormalization is not mathematically legitimate."¹⁹ Asked, then, why he was awarded the Nobel Prize, Feynman replied, "We have designed a method for sweeping them under the rug."²⁰ In another place, Feynman said: "Scientists...are used to dealing with doubt and uncertainty. All scientific knowledge is uncertain....Science alone of all the subjects contains within itself the lesson of the danger of belief in the infallibility of the greatest teachers in the preceding generation....Learn from science that you must doubt the experts...Science is the belief in the ignorance of experts."²¹ Another Jewish physicist, Stephen Weinberg, put it a bit more mildly but with the same basic truth: "The techniques by which we decide on the acceptance of physical theories are extremely subjective."²² The way nuclear physicists deal with the puzzling world of the atom is that when they try to make the atom function properly and run into an anomaly, they usually patch up the problem by creating another theoretical atomic particle. So far they have about 200 such particles to account for all the anomalies, and the new Hadron collider in Europe is supposed to find yet another one, the Higgs boson, which will supposedly give them "the key to understanding the Big Bang," which is another case of begging the question since the Big Bang is about as solid scientifically as the Pillsbury doughboy. As astrophysicist Eric Lerner puts it: "This isn't science. Big Bang predictions are consistently wrong and are being fixed after the event," the editor of *New Scientist* adding: "So much so, that today's 'standard model' of cosmology has become an ugly mishmash comprising the basic Big Bang theory, inflation and a generous helping of dark matter and dark energy" which no one has ever found but they insist must exist for the Big Bang to work.²³ And "if the Big Bang hypothesis is wrong, then the foundation of modern particle physics collapses and entirely new approaches are required. Indeed, particle physics also suffers from an increasing contradiction between theory and experiment."²⁴

Modern Science: Full of Contradictions

Whereas Gilder argues that science, and particularly physics, has demonstrated the genius of the Jew, in reality Jewish scientists have made an absolute mess of science, especially in physics. There is an even greater anomaly in the theoretical world of Quantum Mechanics and General Relativity to which Gilder, seeking to make modern science a monolithic consensus of success and genius, is either oblivious to or purposely ignores. While extolling the "Jewish" origin of both theories, Gilder fails to reveal that the theories contradict one another right to the very core. Gilder includes Einstein's name in the "rise of quantum mechanics" but the truth is that he was bitterly opposed to it. Gilder also includes the Jew Niels Bohr's name in the same sentence with Einstein but Bohr and Einstein were at extreme odds in their explanations and even acceptance of Quantum Mechanics.

Not willing to admit that their mathematical inventions of General Relativity and Quantum Mechanics contradict physical reality, and desperately seeking a solution other than constituting the universe with 95% make-believe matter (*i.e.*, Dark Matter), a group of the Jewish scientists invented another mathematical model hoping to combine the two contradictory theories into one unified perspective, or what was dubbed as Sting Theory or “the theory of everything.”²⁵ The pioneers in this search were Leonard Susskind, Michael Green and John Schwarz. To get the ball rolling, Susskind borrowed a formula from mathematician Leonhard Euler (d. 1783) and applied it to the strong force between atoms. Then Green and Schwarz were successful in 1984 in working out a mathematical formula that at least balanced both sides of the equal sign. Their formula translated into a model of one-dimensional vibrating strings of energy that were said to compose the quarks and leptons of atoms. These vibrating strings were said to be moveable and pliable, as opposed to the rigidity of point particles. They also came in many sizes and shapes, which were defined by the amount of vibration each string possessed, which in turn determined their function. It was discovered in the late 1980s, however, that the mathematics of String Theory produced five different, yet valid, theories. Some theories were radically different from the others. Some had closed strings, others had open strings, and some even required at least 26 dimensions in order to function. The acknowledged “Einstein” of Quantum Mechanics, the Jewish physicist, Edward Witten, supposedly found a solution, proposing that each was simply a different way of looking at the results. The new perspective was called “M-theory” (for reasons no one is quite sure). Still, the bad news was that these strings needed six extra dimensions (other than the three we have already) in order to do their specific jobs. In brief, the extra dimensions were the means to overcome the barriers of Relativity theory that limits anything from traveling faster than the speed of light. The multiple dimensions of String Theory allowed matter to take a “short cut,” as it were, through dimensions that Relativity did not possess. To help justify the six dimensions, String Theory borrowed a theory from Theodore Kaluza and Oskar Klein (Jewish) who had proposed in the early 1920s that a fifth dimension existed that carried electromagnetic waves. Jewish physicist Hermann Minkowski had already added time as a fourth dimension in order to make the mysterious entity “space-time.”²⁶ String theorists reasoned that if there can be four or five dimensions, why not ten or eleven? Still, the mathematics of String Theory eventually led the extra dimensions to the same absurd infinities that hampered General Relativity. Yet, for reasons that String theorists can only rationalize by appealing to the “anthropic principle” (*i.e.*, things are the way they are because we wouldn’t be here if they were any other way), somehow we are magically left with only three spatial dimensions (length, height and width) that aren’t absorbed into infinity. Alas, String Theory doesn’t really explain anything. It is merely a mathematical model, and a desperate one at that, with no physical proof, and none in sight. It reaches a virtual dead end, and science is left without a solution to the problem of how to combine General Relativity with Quantum Mechanics.²⁷

The real solution, of course, is that both Relativity and Quantum Mechanics are failed theories of reality in themselves, and this inadequacy shows up very clearly when schemes to combine the theories must be aborted, such as String Theory. But since modern science has wedded itself to the Big Bang process, it will be forever trapped in theories that simply don’t work. The only possible explanation is that the universe was created by divine fiat, *ex nihilo*, but it is precisely that solution which modern man is unwilling to accept. It is not String Theory “branes” that collide to make universes, it is God who creates, and the first thing with which He started was Earth, in the center of it all, as Genesis 1:2 clearly states. Until science realizes this simple fact, it will be dreaming up theories that produce dead ends. As physicist

Michael Duff was wise enough to admit: “Well, the question we often ask ourselves as we work through our equations is: ‘Is this just fancy mathematics, or is it describing the real world?’...Oh yes, it’s certainly a logical possibility that we’ve all been wasting our time for the last twenty years and that the theory is completely wrong.”²⁸

The Quiet, Slow Death of Einstein’s Theories

As with all things that are based on erroneous foundations, so it is with the modern science that is dominated by Jews. The structure begins to crumble under the sheer weight of its dubious theories. This has been especially the case with Albert Einstein’s theories. Here is how his biographer describes the series of events: “They had solved individual problems, but they had done nothing to replace the all-embracing pattern of classical physics which they had first questioned, then shattered. Planck’s quantum theory, Einstein’s photons, Rutherford’s first ground plan of the nuclear atom and Bohr’s disturbing explanation of it – had each provided isolated answers to isolated problems. Yet in the process they seemed to have produced more riddles than they had solved. ‘By the spring of 1925,’ writes Martin Klein, ‘the theoretical picture had been elaborated by the work of many physicists into a tantalizingly incomplete and confused tangle of successes and failures, so that Jewish physicist Wolfgang Pauli, one of the most acute, and most outspoken, of the young theorists, wrote to a friend: ‘Physics is very muddled again at the moment; it is much too hard for me anyway, and I wish I were a movie comedian or something like that and had never heard anything about physics.’”²⁹ Max Planck’s physics teacher once advised him: “Physics is finished, young man. It’s a dead-end street,” then advised Planck to become a concert pianist instead.”³⁰

Einstein biographer Ronald Clark also traces the steps that led to the absurd conclusions of Quantum Mechanics, especially those of the Copenhagen variety. “A fundamental premise of classical physics was that events followed each other in succession on a basis which could be predicted if only one understood the laws of nature and had sufficient facts...Certain factors in the quantum theory had first cast a ray of doubt upon this comfortable assumption: the electron in the Bohr atom, jumping from one orbit to another without obvious cause, tended to increase this doubt. Was there, perhaps, no real ‘cause’ for such movements?...Might not the whole conception of causality in the universe be merely an illusion? This possibility had already gravely disturbed Einstein...and as early as January, 1920, he had voiced his doubts to Max Born. “The question of causality worries me also a lot.”³¹

After the contributions of Louis de Broglie and Erwin Schrödinger, things began to move rapidly: “What had thus occurred within a very few years was a steady merging of the particle and wave concept. The electron...appeared that it was both at the same time. Here it seemed that science had run up not only against ‘common sense,’ which was already suspect when it began to deal with events in the subatomic world, but against rational logic. For could anything really be one thing and its opposite at one and the same time?”³² Which then led to the inevitable climax: “Schrödinger’s wave mechanics...was thus credible on the grounds that reality is what you make it. This was disturbing enough to those who believed that all ignorance in science could be removed by an addition of knowledge. But more was to follow...a totally different approach was being made by Werner Heisenberg....Thus by 1927 the de Broglie-Schrödinger picture of the electron was being matched by a purely mathematical explanation of

the atom....The suggestion that a satisfactory picture of the physical world could consist not of a description of events but of their probabilities had already been made in Heisenberg's famous 'uncertainty principle.'"³³

At this point Einstein had much trouble living in the universe that his Relativity theory helped create: "While Born, Heisenberg, and Bohr accepted it without qualification, Einstein and Planck accepted it only with the strongest qualifications. Yet these two were the very men who a quarter of a century earlier had pulled into physics the very ideas which they now thought of as its Trojan horse. The break with the old world which this new concept epitomizes can be illustrated by two statements. One is by Sir Basil Schonland, who describes the new world in *The Atomist*. 'It appeared experimentally proven,' he says, 'that at the bottom of all phenomena there were to be discerned laws of chance which made it impossible to think of an ordered deterministic world; the basic laws of nature appeared to be fundamentally statistical and indeterminate, governed by the purest chance.'"³⁴

Werner Heisenberg received fame in the physics world for what has become known as the *Uncertainty Principle* – a further blow to the pride of science. This is a principle, accepted reluctantly by the entire scientific world (because they have no other choice), which states that there is no accurate way to measure size, distance and location in the sub-atomic world. As science had long been debating whether light and matter were made up of particles or waves,³⁵ Heisenberg sealed the door shut by saying that the mere act of trying to figure it out influences the result, and thus it will always be "uncertain."³⁶ To use a crude analogy, Heisenberg revealed that our ability to penetrate the atom was as limited as trying to dissect an ant with a telephone pole. The only other option for science was to bombard the ant with other ants at very high speeds and wait to see what came out (ergo, the Hadron collider). In any case, Heisenberg demonstrated that man's technology is woefully inadequate to discover precisely what makes up our world. He reduced physical science to good guesses rather than precise facts, yet science camouflages its inadequacies by appeal to such things as "statistics" (e.g., Quantum Mechanics) and "the wave/particle" theory, and "multiple histories of space-time." Where Einstein threw the macroscopic world upside down by saying that everything was in motion and therefore all measurements were "relative," so Heisenberg did the same with the microscopic world by saying that the atom was just as "relative" as the universe, and nobody was quite sure about anything anymore, big or small. We might say there was both an Atomic Uncertainty Principle and a Cosmological Uncertainty Principle hampering the advancement of science.

As noted, Einstein publicly criticized Heisenberg's *Uncertainty Principle* and Quantum Mechanics. But Quantum Mechanics, by depending on nothing more than statistical analysis, was having reasonable success in analyzing and predicting the effects of the subatomic world, and thus Einstein's opposition was more or less a losing battle. Einstein spent the rest of his career trying to meld General Relativity and Quantum Mechanics without any success (and no success has come to anyone else). In fact, his post-Relativity career was virtually fruitless. This failure suggests (and Einstein was quite cognizant of it) that one or both of the theories were wrong. Hence, we can understand why he worked so feverishly to unify the two theories since, if he could show the world that the two worked together, he would save his own theory from being obliterated.

For Einstein, one of the chief threats of Quantum Mechanics was that it would eventually nullify one of his most famous conceptions, "space-time," thereby completely overthrowing Relativity. As *Scientific American* describes it: "After all, relativity is riddled with holes – black holes. It predicts that stars can

collapse to infinitesimal points but fails to explain what happens then. Clearly the theory is incomplete.... Moreover, quantum theory turns the clock back to a pre-Einsteinian conception of space and time. It says, for example, that an eight-liter bucket can hold eight times as much as a one-liter bucket. That is true in everyday life, but relativity cautions that the eight-liter bucket can ultimately hold only four times as much – that is, the true capacity of buckets goes up in proportion to their surface area rather than their volume. This restriction is known as the holographic limit. When the contents of the buckets are dense enough, exceeding the limit triggers a collapse to a black hole. Black holes may thus signal the breakdown not only of relativity but also of quantum theory (not to mention buckets).”³⁷

With revelations like the above, most physicists are quietly burying Einstein’s theories in private ceremonies, but the public is not yet invited since it would burst – just a little too soon – the 100-year-old aura the scientific community created around him. Even his admirers are quite candid about the demise of Einstein’s theories. Brian Greene writes: “Bell’s reasoning and Aspect’s experiments show that the kind of universe Einstein envisioned may exist in the mind, but not in reality. Einstein’s was a universe in which what you do right here has immediate relevance only for things that are also right here. Physics, in his view, was purely local. But we now see that the data rule out this kind of thinking; the data rule out this kind of universe.”³⁸ Even Leopold Infeld, although authoring a book with Einstein in 1938 titled *The Evolution of Physics*, ten years later, when applying Einstein’s formulas to the structure of the universe, writes: “Einstein’s original ideas, as viewed from the perspective of our present day, are antiquated if not even wrong.”³⁹

What the public knows of Einstein’s inner turmoil, however, is only his famous quote: “God does not play dice with the world,” heard in every quarter of the civilized world. As Clark writes: “His feelings went deep, and were epitomized in the famous phrase...which he used in a letter to Max Born on December 12, 1926. ‘Quantum mechanics is certainly imposing. But an inner voice tells me that it is not yet the real thing. The theory says a lot, but does not really bring us any closer to the secret of the Old One. I, at any rate, am convinced that He does not throw dice....As Einstein put it years later to James Franck: ‘I can, if the worst comes to the worst, still realize that the Good Lord may have created a world in which there are no natural laws. In short a chaos. But that there should be statistical laws with definite solutions, *i.e.*, laws which compel the Good Lord to throw dice in each individual case, I find highly disagreeable.’”⁴⁰ Here again we see that Einstein cannot live in the world to which his theories inevitably lead. He now appeals to “the Old One,” and more specifically “the Good Lord,” as the preferred reference frame, as it were, for his critique of modern physics. Something deep inside forced him to become quasi-religious as the world he helped create got a little too crazy for even his sensibilities. In any case, Heisenberg, for one, was not moved by Einstein’s appeals to the other world. He knew that Einstein was the very one who had opened Pandora’s box. In one particular conversation with Einstein, Heisenberg let him know just how hypocritical his position was: Heisenberg: “We cannot observe electron orbits inside the atom....Since a good theory must be based on observable magnitudes, I thought it more fitting to restrict myself to these, treating them, as it were, as representatives of the electron orbits.” Einstein: “But you don’t seriously believe that none but observable magnitudes must go into physical theory?” Heisenberg: “Isn’t that precisely what you have done with relativity?” Einstein: “Possibly I did use this kind of reasoning, but it is nonsense all the same....In reality the very opposite happens. It is the theory which decides what we can observe.”⁴¹ So much for scientific experimentation.

With that interesting peek into the methodology of Einstein, the saga continues: “The distressing position in which Einstein now found himself was not unique. J. Robert Oppenheimer has pointed out how ‘many of the men who have contributed to the great changes in science have really been very unhappy over what they have been forced to do, and cites not only Planck and Einstein but Kepler and de Broglie. The process is not restricted to physics. Lord Conway...has pointed out that ‘each generation makes of the world more or less the kind of place they dream it should be, and each when its day is done is often in a mood to regret the work of its own hands and to praise the conditions that obtained when it was young.’”⁴²

So with Einstein. At times he was wryly humorous about his inability to accept the new world which his colleagues had created. Philipp Frank visited him in Berlin in 1932 and they began to talk of the new physics. Then, says Frank, ‘Einstein said, partly as a joke, something like this: “A new fashion has now arisen in physics. By means of ingeniously formulated theoretical experiments it is proved that certain physical magnitudes cannot be measured, or, to put it more precisely, that according to accepted natural laws the investigated bodies behave in such a way as to baffle all attempts at measurement. From this the conclusion is drawn that it is completely meaningless to retain these magnitudes in the language of physics. To speak about them is pure metaphysics.”’⁴³ And then Einstein was hit with the proverbial mirror to see his own reflection: “And when Frank pointed out to Einstein that he had invented the fashion in 1905, Einstein answered: ‘A good joke should not be repeated too often.’ More cogently, he explained to Infeld – the Pole who had visited him in Berlin and who was later to join him in the United States – ‘Yes, I may have started it, but I regarded these ideas as temporary, I never thought that others would take them so much more seriously than I did.’”⁴⁴

Einstein’s facile attempt at deflecting the blame away from himself is certainly disturbing. Perhaps he is trying to pass off his theory of Relativity as just an exercise in free-thinking, as is the case with his famous *gedanken* or “thought experiments.” Or perhaps, when his theories are found to lead to absurdities, he would have us call it all a joke. What kind of man would pardon himself by suggesting that men subsequent to him shouldn’t have taken the implications of his theories so seriously? Perhaps in line with his above comment to Heisenberg (“It is the theory which decides what we can observe”), Einstein’s following comment makes more sense: “When I examine myself and my methods of thought I come to the conclusion that the gift of fantasy has meant more to me than my talent for absorbing positive knowledge.”⁴⁵ Unfortunately, it is precisely these “fantasies” that have turned the world upside down. To those who are looking to get out from the quagmire into which Einstein and modern physics have put the world, his words are indeed no “joke,” especially for those of us who realize that Einstein’s *Trojan Horse* was created in 1905 precisely to escape the clear and numerous experimental results showing that ether existed and that the Earth was standing still in it. Almost all the absurdities of modern physics have their root in the “fantastic” interpretations Einstein gave to those crucial experiments.

As for his theory of Special Relativity, he commandeered the basic components of it from Henrick Lorentz and Henri Poincaré. His only major contribution to Relativity was the elimination of ether, the staple of physics for centuries (but which Einstein, in a total about-face, would eventually take back when it came time to inventing his General Relativity, as we will see momentarily). Ether was the basis, for example, for the four electromagnetic equations of James Clerk Maxwell, which are still used today. But eliminating the ether suddenly became valuable for mankind since for 25 years prior to Einstein’s famous

1905 paper (*Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper*) modern science was in a fix after fellow Jew, Albert Michelson, performed experiments in the 1880s which showed that Earth was standing still in space, just as the Catholic Church under Pope Urban VIII said 250 years prior to Galileo. As Michelson put it: “This conclusion directly contradicts the explanation...which presupposes that the Earth moves.”⁴⁶ Or as scientific historian Bernard Jaffe said it: “The data were almost unbelievable... There was only one other possible conclusion to draw — that the Earth was at rest.”⁴⁷ A contemporary of Einstein’s, physicist G. J. Whitrow, then admitted: “It is both amusing and instructive to speculate on what might have happened if such an experiment could have been performed in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries when men were debating the rival merits of the Copernican and Ptolemaic systems. The result would surely have been interpreted as conclusive evidence for the immobility of the Earth, and therefore as a triumphant vindication of the Ptolemaic system and irrefutable falsification of the Copernican hypothesis.”⁴⁸ Gilder is apparently oblivious to this side of the issue since he only refers to Michelson as one who “conducted the key experiments underlying Einstein’s theory of relativity”⁴⁹ In reality, Einstein had a choice to make: (a) accept the face-value results of Michelson’s experiments, or (b) turn physics upside down with time distortion, mass increases, shortened dimensions, twins aging at different rates, π that can change value on a different planet, *etc.*, all to keep the Earth moving. As Einstein’s noted biographer, Ronald Clark, put it: “The problem which now faced science was considerable... The first was that the Earth was standing still, which meant scuttling the whole Copernican theory and was unthinkable.”⁵⁰ Using relativity and eliminating the ether, he decided to reinvent physics and thereby save the world from having to return to the pre-Copernican universe. He did so by confiscating the famous “transformation” equation of Lorentz [$L = 1/\sqrt{1-v^2/c^2}$] which he then used to alter time, mass and length just enough so that they would account for the presumed translational velocity of the earth around the sun. How convenient.

But Special Relativity was soon found to be inadequate. As physicist Lee Smolin writes: “Special relativity was the result of 10 years of intellectual struggle, yet Einstein had convinced himself it was wrong within two years of publishing it. He rejected his own theory, even before most physicists had come to accept it, for reasons that only he cared about...”⁵¹ Simply put, Einstein failed to include the phenomenon of gravity in his Special Theory and without it the solution he proposed to Michelson’s experiments was as good as false. So Einstein had to invent another theory. He called it the General Theory because it was supposed to be more comprehensive. But two things happened on the way to the theatre. First, Einstein found that in order to give the General Theory any semblance of coherence, he needed to include the ether he had rejected in his Special Theory. In 1916 (the year after he invented GR) Einstein wrote: “...in 1905 I was of the opinion that it was no longer allowed to speak about the ether in physics. This opinion, however, was too radical, as we will see later when we discuss the general theory of relativity. It does remain allowed, as always, to introduce a medium filling all space and to assume that the electromagnetic fields (and matter as well) are its states...once again ‘empty’ space appears as endowed with physical properties, *i.e.*, no longer as physically empty, as seemed to be the case according to special relativity. One can thus say that the ether is resurrected in the general theory of relativity.”⁵² Please take notice that back in 1905, in order for Einstein to explain away the non-moving Earth found in Michelson’s 1880 experiments, Einstein eliminated the ether. Yet he now wants it back because he can’t make his General theory work without it, but he makes no mention of the fact that this recapturing of ether totally undercuts his original explanation in 1905 of Michelson’s experiments!

Second, Einstein's math also told him that the speed of light that he said was constant in the Special Theory (so that he could keep the Earth "non-constant," *i.e.*, moving) could no longer be constant in the General Theory, for gravity can make light reach any speed it desired. As Einstein himself said: "In the second place our result shows that, according to the general theory of relativity, the law of the constancy of the velocity of light *in vacuo*, which constitutes one of the two fundamental assumptions in the special theory of relativity and to which we have already frequently referred, cannot claim any unlimited validity... its results hold only so long as we are able to disregard the influences of gravitational fields on the phenomena (*e.g.*, of light)"⁵³ So much for consistency. One would think that, since Einstein found that the speed of light could no longer be constant he would have to reintroduce the non-moving Earth that he summarily dismissed in 1905, but neither Einstein nor the world of Jewish physics would ever admit the connection, for that admission would give the reins of power back to the Catholic Church, for it was the Church who predicted Michelson's astounding experimental results 250 years earlier in Galileo's 1633 trial in which Pope Urban VIII approved the Holy Offices canonical decision that it was "formally heretical" to say that the sun did not revolve around the earth.⁵⁴ If Jewish scientists and their Gentile collaborators could keep their aura and mystique over the world with their religion of *Scientism*, no one would ever have to return to the Catholic Church as the authority for mankind.

There's more. Einstein then discovered that the equations in his General Theory led to an unstable universe. Einstein's original formula kept the universe from collapsing (with a little help from the infamous fudge factor Λ that he dubbed as the "cosmological constant"), but this solution was unstable, since the adjustment would then result in an expansion of the universe, which in turn would increase the repulsive force and decrease gravity, and thus increase the expansion exponentially. Conversely, the slightest contraction would result in a premature collapse of the universe. Nobel laureate Robert Laughlin explains the problems in terms of our old friend, ether: "The closet of general relativity contains a horrible skeleton known as the cosmological constant. This is a correction to the Einstein field equations compatible with relativity and having the physical meaning of a uniform mass density of relativistic ether. Einstein originally set this constant to zero on the grounds that no such effect seemed to exist. The vacuum, as far as anyone knew, was really empty. He then gave it a small nonzero value in response to cosmological observations that seemed to indicate the opposite, and then later removed it again as the observations improved."⁵⁵ Here we see that the "cosmological constant" was not merely some innocent mathematical figure. In short, Einstein was trapped like the proverbial rat in a corner. If he kept the cosmological constant at zero, his universe would be unstable. If he gave it a non zero value, he would have to admit the existence of ether – the very substance that was initially denied by his Special Theory. Thanks to Laughlin's analysis we have been alerted to the connection. Perhaps this is the reason that in 1916, at just the time he was developing his General Theory of Relativity, Einstein suddenly had a new affection for ether possessing "physical properties." Laughlin reveals the inherent problems such theories will face: "The view of space-time as a nonsubstance with substance-like properties is neither logical nor consistent. It is instead an ideology that grew out of old battles over the validity of relativity. At its core is the belief that the symmetry of relativity is different from all other symmetries in being absolute. It cannot be violated for any reason at any length scale, no matter how small.... This belief may be correct, but it is an enormous speculative leap."⁵⁶ This is certainly the irony of ironies. In order to exist, Relativity must function as an oxymoron – it must be absolute. This is the inevitable consequence of a theory that is erroneous from the start. Laughlin tries his best to save Relativity from its self-destruction, but as we see,

he can only appeal to mystery and ignorance as his cudgel: “Despite its having become embedded in the discipline [of Relativity], the idea of absolute symmetry makes no sense. Symmetries are caused *by* things, not the cause *of* things. If relativity is *always* true, then there has to be an underlying reason. Attempts to evade this problem inevitably result in contradictions. Thus if we try to write down relativistic equations describing the spectroscopy of the vacuum, we discover that the equations are mathematical nonsense unless either relativity or gauge invariance, an equally important symmetry, is postulated to fail at extremely short distances. No workable fix to this problem has ever been discovered. String theory, originally invented for this purpose, has not succeeded. In addition to its legendary appetite for higher dimensions, it also has problems at short length scales, albeit more subtle ones, and has never been shown to evolve into the standard model at long length scales, as required for compatibility with experiment.”⁵⁷ Laughlin then enlightens us to a further anomaly and its accompanying cover up: “Thus the innocent observation that the vacuum of space is empty is not innocent at all, but is instead compelling evidence that light and gravity are linked and probably both collective in nature. Real light, like real quantum-mechanical sound, differs from its idealized Newtonian counterpart in containing energy even when it is stone cold. According to the principle of relativity, this energy should have generated mass, and this, in turn, should have generated gravity. We have no idea why it does not, so we deal with the problem the way a government might, namely by simply declaring empty space not to gravitate.”⁵⁸

As we can see, physicists were discovering that the mathematics that allowed them to toy with whatever universe their minds imagined was the same mathematics that made uncompromising demands they simply could not satisfy. In the 1920s Jewish physicist Alexander Friedmann attempted to find a solution to Einstein’s problem, but after they reworked his equations, cosmology didn’t know whether it was coming or going, literally and figuratively. De Sitter’s modifications had it expanding, while Friedmann’s had it contracting, and there was an infinity of possible outcomes between these two extremes depending on how one played with the numbers. Last but not least, General Relativity, as every Relativist must admit, invariably leads back to a “singularity.” There is no escape from this conclusion, mathematically speaking. “Singularity” is the word modern cosmologists employ in order to cover up the fact that they have not the foggiest notion what happens when, according to the logical conclusions of Einstein’s theory, all the matter and energy of the universe is sucked back up into the proverbial abyss. Whither it goes, or from whence it came, no one seems to know. Except for a few bold scientific entrepreneurs who don’t mind running the risk of appearing mentally unbalanced by suggesting that “singularities” come from “other universes and dimensions,” modern science is mute, and painfully so, not to mention the fact that these “other universes” would have the same problem of collapsing in on themselves as our universe.

All in all, Jewish physics has led cosmology to a dead end.⁵⁹ We see that Einstein, like many before him whose perspective was limited, was forced to question then reject the validity of their own theories. This was inevitable, for Relativity makes all understanding just that – relative – with no certainty and no absolutes. Einstein could not live with his own theory and at many points he found himself retracing his steps and reviving the very concepts that he had originally denied. Although the Jewish press tried (and was quite successful) in keeping Einstein at the top, towards the end of his career Einstein was rather despondent at the results of his theories. Perhaps a few statements from Einstein himself at the end of his career will help put things in proper perspective. Whether he meant it as an omen or an obituary, nevertheless, Einstein was apparently feeling the depression of over half a century of doubt about his

theories when, on his seventieth birthday he remarked in a March 28, 1949 letter to his old friend Maurice Solovine: “You imagine that I regard my life’s work with calm satisfaction. But a close look yields a completely different picture. I am not convinced of the certainty of a single concept, and I am uncertain as to whether I was both a heretic and reactionary who has, so to speak, survived himself.”⁶⁰ These thoughts had been brewing in Einstein’s mind for a few years. In a letter to J. Lee in 1945 he wrote: “A scientific person will never understand why he should believe opinions only because they are written in a certain book. Furthermore, he will never believe that the results of his own attempts are final.”⁶¹ In 1948 Einstein wrote the following words in the Foreword to a popular book on Relativity: “Moreover, the present state of our knowledge in physics is aptly characterized. The author shows how the growth of our factual knowledge, together with the striving for a unified theoretical conception comprising all empirical data, has led to the present situation which is characterized – notwithstanding all successes – by an uncertainty concerning the choice of the basic theoretical concepts.”⁶² Here we see in Einstein an introspection that he rarely revealed to his physics colleagues, many who were in intense competition with him. But they are rather disheartening words from a man who turned the world upside down with his highfalutin theories. In locating his target of derision as “the basic theoretical concepts,” Einstein is casting doubt on the whole enterprise of modern physics, admitting that his and other theories may, in fact, be totally mistaken regarding how the universe operates. Einstein’s intimate thoughts were revealed only to the best of his personal friends, the people who really knew the man behind the persona. To them Einstein’s negative assessment of his life’s work was not merely an exercise in self-deprecation. This is noted by yet another revealing comment Einstein made to Michel Besso, his closest confidant, in a 1954 letter: “I consider it quite possible that physics cannot be based on the field concept, *i.e.*, continuous structures. In that case, *nothing* remains of my entire castle in the air, gravitation theory included, [and of] the rest of modern physics.”⁶³ Two months before his death, he admitted that he could not make the mathematics of his theory of gravitation work correctly. To Solovine he writes: “I have finally managed to introduce another noteworthy improvement into the theory of the gravitational field (theory of the nonsymmetrical field). But not even these simplified equations can be verified by the facts as yet because of mathematical difficulties. Warmest greetings to you and your wife. Your[s], A. Einstein.”⁶⁴ In a November 25, 1948 letter Einstein ironically admits to Solovine: “In my scientific activity, I am always hampered by the same mathematical difficulties, which make it impossible for me to confirm or refute my general relativist field theory.” As we noted previously, the mathematics Einstein employed to help bolster his Relativity theory is the same mathematics that shows geocentrism as a viable alternative to heliocentrism, therefore Einstein could never be sure which one was the correct model. Like many, he ignored the implications of his own theory and decided to “leave this question for the time being and accept Copernicus’ point of view.”⁶⁵

Gilder also tries to mix in Robert Oppenheimer as another Jewish genius along with Einstein (p. 83) but fails to mention that the two scientists were at bitter odds. The story is as follows. As we noted, General Relativity led to the intractable problem of black holes – the theoretical vortex where gravity was so strong that not even light could escape its clutches; and without light maintaining its constant speed c , Relativity had nothing upon which to hang its hat. Because “space-time” is infinitely “curved” inward in a black hole, all matter within its vicinity, including light photons, is sucked in, eventually leading to the popular but undefined entity called a “singularity,” which, as we take away the cosmetics of language, actually translates into a total contradiction for the theory of Relativity. As physicist Andrei Linde admits: “A second trouble spot [for the Big Bang] is the flatness of space. General Relativity suggests that space

may be very curved, with a typical radius on the order of the Planck length, or 10^{-33} centimeters. We see, however, that our universe is just about flat on a scale of 10^{28} centimeters, the radius of the observable part of the universe. This result of our observation differs from theoretical expectations by more than 60 orders of magnitude.”⁶⁶ “Sixty orders of magnitude”? It is unusual for modern periodicals to divulge such gapping holes in the Big Bang universe prophesied by General Relativity. But what is also not being told to the public about “singularities” is that any object approaching the event horizon of a black hole will grow in mass without limit. Consequently, according to the physics of black holes, it is impossible for any mass to enter a black hole. Objects approaching a black hole must slow down and be refused entry, not accelerate and gain mass. This was the dead end post of modern cosmology. As *Scientific American* put it: “After all, relativity is riddled with holes – black holes...Clearly the theory is incomplete.”⁶⁷ *Time* magazine added that black holes were “mere mathematical figments” which “so far can be shown only as solutions to the complex equations of general relativity – and very troubling solutions at that.”⁶⁸ According to his colleague John Moffat: “Einstein didn’t like black holes. The real motivation for “generalizing” his gravity theory was to see if he could find, as he called them, “everywhere regular solutions” that fit the equations.”⁶⁹ Thus, it was Einstein’s quest to eliminate black holes altogether. In 1939 he published an article in *Annals of Mathematics* arguing that black holes would not be formed by the collapse of a star, but the record shows he was thoroughly unsuccessful. A few months later Robert Oppenheimer and Hartland Snyder corrected Einstein’s math, concluding that black holes do, in fact, exist in Relativity theory. This once again shows how mathematics can be shaped to provide evidence for two diametrically opposed theories.

The battle between Einstein and Oppenheimer was a *Catch-22* for Einstein’s followers, for if black holes do not exist (and they have never been proven, experimentally, to exist) then there is no ultimate proof for the existence of General Relativity (since the theory predicts they must exist); but if black holes do exist, then General Relativity brings us to a dead end in understanding gravity and the universe at large, since in these “singularities” the laws of physics totally break down. In a singularity gravity becomes a repulsive force rather than an attractive force. Thus, a trap has been set for Relativistic physics out of which there is no escape. Perhaps if these physicists would cease creating universes merely out of mathematical preferences and begin depending on verified experimental evidence, they would at least come to some semblance of truth as to how the universe is constructed. As physicist Tom van Flandern put it: “Mathematics should be used to describe the operation of models, not to build them...equations cannot be made to substitute for the concepts which underlie them. And equations are generally blind to limitations of range and physical constraints. They are too general, and simply lack the sort of specificity that true, intuitive understanding demands. Every equation has a domain of applicability – usually the range of the observations and little, if anything, more...If an equation can be extrapolated outside its domain and gives a singularity (basically, a zero divisor), that singularity does not exist in nature; instead, the model needs modification. Up to now this rule has always proved true. But advocates of “black holes” in the universe would have us believe that the equations which predict them can be relied upon far outside the domain of the observations used to derive those equations.”⁷⁰

Already in Einstein’s conversations with physicist Hendrik Lorentz in the early 1890s, it was obvious to many what the experimental results were saying. In Lorentz’s own words: “Briefly, everything occurs as if the Earth were at rest...”⁷¹ Lorentz knew the profound implications of his statement. He was very

familiar with the dizzying world created by Einstein's Relativity, which was desperately commandeered to answer the failure of the interferometers to detect any motion of the Earth. In a personal letter he wrote to Einstein in 1915, it is apparent that he was feeling the effects of the drift into which Einstein forced the human race. In a moment of seeming desperation Lorentz wishes for a divine being that could hold it all together and make it work. He writes to Einstein: "A 'world spirit' who would permeate the whole system under consideration without being tied to a particular place or 'in whom' the system would consist, and for whom it would be possible to 'feel' all events directly would obviously immediately single out one of the frames of reference over all others."⁷² This is an amazing admission from Lorentz. Despite popular opinion, he was the impetus for Relativity, since it was his "transformation" equation that was the brains behind Einstein's Special Theory.⁷³ It is obvious from the above quote that Lorentz could not live in the universe he created for himself. Consequently, he searched for a ubiquitous entity that could not only sense and coordinate all events instantaneously, but one that could also provide him with an absolute frame of reference. Why? Because Lorentz knew deep within his soul that it can work no other way. Things are an absolute mess without an absolute frame of reference from which everything else can be set and measured. As Einstein himself said: "It has, of course, been known since the days of the ancient Greeks that in order to describe the movement of a body, a second body is needed to which the movement of the first is referred."⁷⁴ But alas, once the Copernican system came into vogue, no longer was there a comforting reference point. Consequently, Isaac Newton soon discovered: "It may well be that there is no body really at rest to which the places and motions of others may be referred."⁷⁵ Even with his alternative concept of "absolute space," Newton found no solace. He writes: "It is indeed a matter of great difficulty to discover and effectually to distinguish the true motions of particular bodies from the apparent, because the parts of that immovable space in which these motions are performed do by no means come under the observations of our senses."⁷⁶ Likewise, Einstein's avid supporter, Arthur Eddington, laments: "...for there is nothing to guide him as to the planet to be selected for the standard of rest.... There is no answer, and so far as we can see no possibility of an answer.... Our common knowledge of where things are is not a miraculous revelation of unquestionable authority.... Location is not something supernaturally revealed to the mind.... It would explain for instance, why all the forces of Nature seem to have entered into a conspiracy to prevent our discovering the definite location of any object... naturally they cannot reveal it, if it does not exist.... Nature has been too subtle... she has not left anything to betray the frame which she used.... Our predecessors were wise in referring all distances to a single frame of space..."⁷⁷ There is, however, "a guide as to the planet to be selected as the standard or rest"; that Nature has not "betrayed" or formed a "conspiracy" against us; rather, her knowledge comes from a "miraculous revelation of unquestionable authority" – God through Holy Writ. Pope Pius X once wrote: "Human science gains greatly from revelation, for the latter opens out new horizons and makes known sooner other truths of the natural order, and because it opens the true road to investigation and keeps it safe from errors of application and of method. Thus does the lighthouse show many things they otherwise would not see, while it points out the rocks on which the vessel would suffer shipwreck."⁷⁸

Has Jewish "Genius" Really Advanced Mankind?

Second, we need to look at Gilder's premise from a more spiritual and human perspective to determine its merit or demerit. For all of Gilder's touting of capitalism, technology, entrepreneurship, and intellectual genius as the standard by which the success and viability of a people should be measured, the truth is, none of these advances have made the world a safer place to live in, nor have any of them brought man to

higher levels of wisdom and understanding. For every digital device; for every enhanced microchip; for every speedier jet plane; for every sophisticated atom smasher, there has resulted more atheism, more murder, and more sexual deviance than at any time in history. If anything these technological advances have stunted man's development, since the tendency is now to rely on one's own Tower of Babel to measure human worth to the virtual exclusion of the development of the inner man. Let's just take one example among the myriads of inventions modern man has given us – the Internet. Is this really an advancement? Perhaps on a purely technological basis it would be hard to argue otherwise. But on the level of man's inner nature that still remains as undeveloped as when Cain killed Abel, the Internet merely allows us now to sin faster and more efficiently than we ever did before. For example, statistics show that 25% of all Internet "searches" are pornographic, as are 35% of all downloads. Of all Internet users, 43% view porn. 89% of all youths are solicited for sex in chat rooms. By 11 years of age, a child has his first exposure to Internet porn; while 80% of 15-17 years olds are exposed to hard-core sex. 20% of men admit to accessing porn at work. People engage in adulterous relationships on the Internet and many a marriage has been broken up by it. There are more gory statistics available.⁷⁹ This is an epidemic if there ever was one.

Let's take another example – abortion and contraception. Few would argue that technology has vastly increased the opportunities for woman to inhibit pregnancy. But while Gilder is complaining in his book about the hordes of Muslims that are populating the globe, the Jewish people, by and large, are practically aborting and contracepting themselves out of existence, and all because they have access to the latest "technological advances" provided to them by Jewish scientists and doctors. Gilder even cites one company in Israel, ALZA, run by Martin Gerstel (who Gilder introduces by pointing out that the "genius" Gerstel got an "eight hundred on his math SAT" and was a "number-one MBA from Stanford Business School") the inventor of a birth control device to replace the infamous Dalkon Shield IUD (p. 152). Gilder even admits to the prevalence of "secular Israelis with their abortion culture and their gay-rights marches" (p. 184). Conversely, the Muslims don't believe in either contraception or abortion. But their huge population increases in Europe are seen as a threat to Western society.⁸⁰ The reason the Jewish population hasn't increased appreciably since the turn of the twentieth century has less to do with the holocaust in Germany and more to do with the holocaust occurring inside the death camps of Jewish wombs. The Jews are so worried about their Arab neighbors having 'weapons of mass destruction' but the Jews themselves have weapons of self-destruction. David Wemhoff recently showed in a recent issue of *Culture Wars* how deeply involved the Jewish culture is in abortion and how they have spread this societal disease all over the world.⁸¹ Is this what we want from "technology"? Are these the contributions the Jews are so proud of? We haven't even covered the Jewish involvement in genetic engineering, cloning, eugenics, mind altering drugs, artificial insemination, or the promoting of homosexuality, divorce, adultery, gambling, insider trading, cultural revolution, and many other societal ills.⁸² Among Israel's Muslim neighbors these ills are practically non-existent, and it is the very reason these Middle East countries decry the decadence of the West of which Israel has become a card-carrying member.

The Real Truth about Capitalism

As for the capitalism that Gilder espouses so confidently as the cure-all for the ills of the world, these are little more than the dying gasps of a man after cardiac arrest. How much more economic upheaval, corruption, greed and scandal do the capitalists need to realize that their system is on a self-destruct

course? How many Savings & Loans debacles, Enrons, Worldcoms, Ivan Boesky's, Bernie Madoffs, deceptive collateralized debt obligations and credit default swaps are needed to see that the capitalist system is a racket of smoke and mirrors? The national debt has increased more in the past 12 months than in the previous 235 years. All told, our national debt is actually closer to 50 trillion dollars, not the 11 trillion we hear, if we include all the entitlement programs of Lyndon Johnson's "Great Society." Our annual deficit for the 2008-2009 fiscal year was about two trillion, which is four times the largest previous annual deficit. More than 50% of our national debt is not owned by Americans or US companies. This is a house of cards just waiting for the first puff of wind to blow it all down. Although Gilder claims "Capitalism by nature is a positive-sum game in which every transaction theoretically can yield two or more winners" (p. 195), in reality it merely gives the illusion of wealth. And like all dreams, we soon wake up and find out that it wasn't real, which in the face of the current economic collapse, is happening as we speak. And how could it not be an illusion? We have at the root of the system the Federal Reserve Bank, which is neither a bank nor federal, that literally creates money out of thin air, and then sends the bill for this illusion to the American taxpayer and his future progeny. The Fed was created at Jekyll Island off the Georgia coast in 1910 by the seven richest men in the world, many of whom were Jews and whose main architect was Jewish banker, Paul Warburg.⁸³ It was ram-rodged through Congress during a holiday break under the complicit eye of President Woodrow Wilson in 1913, who afterward lamented that he had mistakenly sold the American public down the drain. During the same year the Federal Income Tax was established, obviously so that the American public would be held responsible for paying back the money that the international bankers would now create at will and lend to their government. In addition to the Federal Reserve there is the "fractional reserve system" which is now used by every bank in the USA. It only further creates the illusion of wealth. For every dollar created by the Federal Reserve that is lent to banks, the receiving banks likewise create nine more dollars out of thin air. They then lend this created money to even more banks or financial institutions who also create nine dollars for every dollar they borrow. By the time the Fed's dollar gets to you it has been proportionately inflated over a dozen times. Each time millions of more "dollars" enter the system, creating the illusion of wealth. It's feasible for a while, as long as there is no wind or tremors to knock the house of cards to the ground. If you really want to know how the "capitalist" money system of this country is run, read G. Edward Griffin's book: *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*. It was published almost two decades ago yet still retains a less than 3500 ranking on Amazon, it is that good. You will quickly see that the "capitalist" system that Gilder is pushing is nothing but a shell game of greed and exploitation whose end game is disaster.

In the inevitable tension between altruism and greed created by the capitalist system and the drive of the entrepreneur, Gilder tries his best to dispel the image that the Jew is motivated by money. He writes, speaking for the Jew, "if you fixate on money for yourself, it will elude you. You will mostly find poverty. Pursue innovation in a market system where others determine your success by committing their wealth in exchange for your product, and you will make money. Then, in the usual entrepreneurial cycle, most of the time you will reinvest it, and make more of it, until you find yourself in an 'embarrassment of riches,' richly embarrassed, accused of greed by nonprofit poseurs" (p. 138). There is certainly a lot of truth to this scenario. In another place Gilder says, "A powerful motive of Zionism was to escape the Jewish archetypes of Europe—the image of shylocks and middlemen. Internalizing this most persistent and destructive of anti-Semitic slanders, Israelis long saw banks as a necessary evil. They wanted to stay as far away as possible from such industries as money lending, banking, trading, factoring and arbitrage"

(p. 166). But what percentage this ideal image applies to the typical Jew of history in light of exorbitant usury rates, stock manipulation and the Talmud's teaching to cheat the Gentile is a question that Gilder doesn't answer. Was the *Merchant of Venice* just an entertaining play or did Shakespeare, who had a knack for exposing every human vice like no one before him, pinpoint a perennial problem with the Jew? The raw fact of human nature is, if money is the major incentive then greed will be the major sin. No one has figured out how to divorce the inevitable connection, including the Jew who Gilder says was more or less forced into banking and finance.

The Jekyll and Hyde of Jewish Intellect

Third, in light of Gilder's thesis, just what kind of men does he believe the "Jewish intellect" creates for the world? Behind the facts and figures, what shining examples of human virtue and wisdom do the Jews really offer? Do we look to Sigmund Freud, Alfred Adler, or Eric Fromm? In the late 1800s psychology was developed by the Jewish doctor, William James, on the heels of the evolutionary dogma of Darwin that was already seeking to replace Scripture as man's ultimate guide through life. James wanted an alternative to explain the origin of man's anti-social behavior so as to replace the Christian doctrine that Original Sin and concupiscence were the cause. It then morphed into Freud's idea that aberrant behavior was the result of an overactive "superego" obtained from one's parents and an "id" that was merely a hormonal surge acting on repressed memories.⁸⁴ Carl Jung was the only exception to this pervasive Jewish science, but there was a reason he was let in the door. At the *International Psychoanalytic Association* meeting, Freud stated to his colleagues: "Most of you are Jews, and therefore you are incompetent to win friends for the new teaching...It is absolutely essential that I should form ties in the world of general science."⁸⁵ I was a psychology minor in college. The day I dropped out of the program was when the professor gave us the results of a comprehensive study of the three major psychologies: Freudian psychoanalysis, Skinner's behavioral system, and the Humanist-Existential (e.g., from the Jewish doctor, Abraham Maslow and his "self-authenticated" person). All of these were given 100 patients to apply their respective psychologies. A control group of 100 more was added but these patients were given no psychological treatment. The results were that each psychology, including the group that received no treatment, had a 70% success rate. So much for Jewish genius. As E. Michael Jones noted about Maslow, he "took Kurt Lewin's research into group dynamics and turned it into a weapon against unsuspecting goyim. In April 1962, Maslow lectured to nuns at Sacred Heart, a Catholic women's college in Massachusetts. Maslow noted in his diary that the talk had been very 'successful,' which he found troubling. 'They shouldn't applaud me,' he wrote, 'they should attack. If they were fully aware of what I was doing, they would.'" Likewise, the Jewish icon, Joyce Brothers, "led a hoard of female Jewish advice columnists, who popularized and spread the tenets of Jewish psychology in the mass media, contributing to the decline in sexual morals and the rise of feminism." Are these the Jewish intellects that have made the world a better place to live? The truth is, everything these secular Jews do is to undermine Christianity and the Catholic Church, and in the process they corrupt everything they touch.

Or should we turn to Albert Einstein? If there is anyone who can serve as the poster boy for Gilder's esteeming of Jewish intellect and technology, it is Albert Einstein. As Gilder sees him, "Einstein's greatest attainments, general relativity and the equivalence of energy and mass ($E = MC^2$), were expressions above all of his monotheistic faith, more intense than any rabbi's..." (p. 79). This is the image of Einstein that the Jews want the world to keep, but the reality is far more sinister. Einstein was no

“monotheist” and he certainly didn’t have the faith of a rabbi. For all practical purposes, Einstein was an avowed atheist. In one of many such evidences, Einstein stated: “The word God is for me nothing more than the expression and product of human weaknesses, the Bible a collection of honorable but still primitive legends which are nevertheless pretty childish.”⁸⁶ Einstein’s personal life was a shambles, even though the Israeli government thought so highly of him that they wanted to make him the prime minister. He abandoned his out of wedlock child Lieserl to an orphanage. He consigned his son Eduard to a sanatorium so that he could be relieved of the financial responsibility. He first committed adultery against his wife Mileva Maric, then abandoned her after she converted to Catholicism, but only after he had beaten her up a few times. Of his numerous affairs, he struck up one with his cousin, Elsa Löwenthal, and convinced her to divorce her husband, Max Löwenthal. Once in the door with Elsa, he took an interest in her 20 year old daughter, Ilse, and was in a debate with himself whether he should marry Elsa or Ilse, the former finally winning out but under the condition that she allow Einstein “to have women on the side, but only one at a time.”⁸⁷ As we noted earlier, Einstein stole the Relativity concept in his Special Theory from Lorentz and Poincaré, without giving any of these predecessors credit in his famous 1905 paper. In General Relativity, Einstein did little more than work backwards from Newton’s inverse square law to come up with his famous tensor equation, plagiarizing the work of others along the way. He invented it for the same reason he invented Special Relativity – to keep the Earth moving and keep the Catholic Church from having authority in the world.⁸⁸ As for $E = mc^2$, Einstein was not the inventor. It was used in about a dozen or more ways long before Einstein claimed it for himself.⁸⁹ The real truth about Einstein had previously been hidden from the public and it is only now being revealed by some determined historians. See, for example, the 2800-page book by Christopher Jon Bjerknes.⁹⁰

Modern science’s rejection of God and revelation are not in a vacuum. As we see with Einstein, its materialistic conclusions concerning the origins and function of the cosmos invariably affect the kind of lives they lead, and their biographies are often a sordid tale of pride and immorality. After forcefully releasing themselves from the motherly hand of the Catholic Church, scientists subsequently made themselves into icons of intellect and stamina that were bigger than life; “men of renown” who took on an almost god-like quality, similar to the “giants” who lived just prior to the Great Flood, and who also became the epitome of corruption and were eventually destroyed (Genesis 6:4-5). Interestingly enough, one scientist writing about Albert Einstein inscribed the words: “THERE WERE GIANTS IN THE EARTH IN THOSE DAYS” in the opening pages of his book to introduce him to the reader.⁹¹ The reality is, although these scientists are consistently revered in textbooks as the titans of humanity, history often tells quite a different story. In addition to the problems and anomalies in current science, the moral integrity of those who vied for its advancement was often at odds with convention, even by today’s standards.

If Gilder believes that science shows the “genius” of the Jew, who else should we go to? To the Jewish astronomer Carl Sagan who says that if there was a God who really wanted us to know he existed “he should have put a giant crucifix in orbit around the earth,”⁹² or who said that “We are the local embodiment of a Cosmos grown to self-awareness. We have begun to contemplate our origins. We are star-stuff pondering the stars! Our ancestors worshipped the Sun, and they were not that foolish. It makes sense to revere the Sun and the stars, for we are their children?”⁹³ Or should we go to the Jewish paleontologist, Stephen Gould, who insists that the Catholic magisterium has no say in the origins of life and that we all evolved from apes?⁹⁴ The real truth is that, since Gould acts like an animal (which is the

case when men pretend God doesn't exist) then God will allow Gould to believe he is descended from an animal. Gould reflects this very fact when he states that we have become "large reasoning animals" and we owe this to "our lucky stars."⁹⁵ Ironically, like pigs wallowing in the mud or dogs eating their own vomit, modern man seems all too comfortable with such demotion and degradation. He'll accept any harebrain idea as long as it allows him to escape bowing down to an Almighty Being.

Since most people are not familiar with the intricacies of research and discovery, the doctrines concerning the mechanical workings of the universe are inevitably left to what modern society has come to know as "the scientist." Today, those with credentials in theology, or even philosophy, are invariably ignored when the crucial decisions are made regarding what will be taught in the universities. The sad truth is, however, an inordinate number of scientists are employed for their own selfish interests, and never consider, let alone seek, an authority above themselves. Statistics reveal just how bad it has become. *Scientific American* carried an article a few years ago on the work of James H. Leuba, a statistician who both in 1914 and 1933 surveyed the religious beliefs of American biological and physical scientists of their views on two fundamental beliefs in Christianity: (1) the worship of God and (2) the existence of an afterlife. This study was important to Leuba since, as he said, "scientists enjoy great influence in the modern world, even in matters religious."⁹⁶ At first glance, Leuba's results seem somewhat reassuring. Among a general cross section of scientists, he found that 40% believed in God. But then he concentrated on the more elite scientists, those whose names are in the newspapers, who write the major books and articles, and who have the most influence on what the public believes, many of whom are Jewish. He found that an astonishing "80 percent of top natural scientists rejected both cardinal beliefs of traditional Christianity." *Scientific American* then did its own study and found even worse results. Using the 1,800 members of the 1998 *National Academy of Sciences* as its measure of who comprised the "elite scientists" of the day, the editors found that: "Disbelief among NAS members responding to our survey exceeded 90 percent...NAS biologists are the most skeptical, with 95 percent of our respondents evincing atheism and agnosticism. Mathematicians in the NAS are more accepting: one in every six of them [17%] expressed belief in a personal God."⁹⁷ Commenting further, the article shows that atheism is encouraged in academic circles, and those who have any Christian beliefs are quietly suppressed: "University of Washington sociologist Rodney Stark...points out, 'There's been 200 years of marketing that if you want to be a scientific person you've got to keep your mind free of the fetters of religion.'... 'higher education on the whole winnows out the idea of God or people who hold it. In research universities, 'the religious people keep their mouths shut,' Stark says. 'And the irreligious people discriminate. There's a reward system to being irreligious in the upper echelons.'"⁹⁸ The reasons for this rampant atheism are then discovered: "Legendary evolutionary biologist Ernst Mayr, an NAS member since 1954, made a study of disbelief among his Harvard University colleagues in the academy. "It turned out we were all atheists," he recalls. "I found that there were two sources." One Mayr typified as, "Oh, I became an atheist very early. I just couldn't believe all that supernatural stuff." But others told him, "I just couldn't believe that there could be a God with all this evil in the world." Mayr adds, "Most atheists combine the two. This combination makes it impossible to believe in God."⁹⁹ How ironic is it that atheistic men are using religious and moral principles to judge whether God exists. With the audacity of a woman of the night, they dare blame God for the evil in the world.¹⁰⁰ Scripture has quite a different scenario, of course. It solemnly testifies that God blames man for the evil in the world. As Genesis 6:5-6 laments before the Great Flood: "The Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And the Lord was sorry that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved

him to his heart.” Jesus says that at the end of the world it will be just as it was in Noah’s day (Matt. 24:36-38).

Or shall we allow Gilder to take us to the Jewish philosophers like Karl Marx who said that “religion is the opiate of the people,” or to Spinoza’s pantheism or Mendelssohn’s nihilism or Buber’s Jewish messianism? Or shall we go to Betty Friedan’s *The Feminine Mystique* or Bella Abzug and Gloria Steinem who have destroyed the traditional role of wife and mother? Or how about the Jewish artists and architects who have given us a steady diet of modern art that revolts the senses? Or shall we go to the Jewish comics, which comprise 80% of US professional comedians, such as the raunchy Sarah Silverman or the sex-crazed Woody Allen and Howard Stern? As one Jewish writer observed: “Psychoanalysis and stand-up comedy offer a distinct way of looking at the world. Both present the abnormal as normal, the neurotic as necessary, the outsider as the true insider. No wonder Jews invented both.”¹⁰¹ Or as Rabbi Daniel Lapin says it: “Some of the most notoriously foul-mouthed and obscene-minded entertainers are Jewish and earn no reproof for their public aggrandizement of filth.”¹⁰² Or shall we go to the pornography of Al Goldstein; the trashy novels of Philip Roth; to Brian Epstein’s Beatles or Bob Dylan; to the plethora of Hollywood producers that give us a steady diet of movies and situation comedies that poke fun at marriage and promote contraception, abortion, adultery and sexual deviance?¹⁰³ Or should we go to the ACLU and Abe Foxman, the former having seen to it, says Jewish author Benjamin Ginsberg, that “religious symbols and forms of expression that Jews find threatening have been almost completely eliminated from schools and other public institutions. Suits brought by the ACLU, an organization whose leadership is predominantly Jewish, secured federal court decisions banning officially sanctioned prayers in the public schools and crèches and other religious displays in parks and public buildings,”¹⁰⁴ and the latter who calls the New Testament “anti-semitic”? Or should we go to the media and find as the *Los Angeles Jewish Times* said in 1999: “Yes, Virginia, Jews Do Control the Media”? Or should we go to Jewish icon, Adam Lambert, the runner-up on American Idol’s 2008 season, who in contrast to the Christian winner, Chris Allen, recently put on a disgusting sexual parade of homosexuality on the AMA awards show?¹⁰⁵ The point to be made here is that the humanist Jew has poisoned every area of our culture. Gilder can’t see any of it because he lacks a properly tuned moral compass. The moral ineptitude of the humanist Jew at large is ignored and only his “technological achievements” his “raw genius” his “capitalistic enterprise” and his “entrepreneurial spirit” is enshrined as the model which the world is not only to follow but to bow down to. The only time Gilder even mentions religion or the sacred as having any value is on the last page when he says: “...ultimately our loyalty to Israel arises not from a cold calculus of survival, but from a sense of the holy. What Americans must fathom with both heart and mind is that this instinct is true – and vital to our survival – that if we would live, we must defend this Holy Land” (p. 255). Gilder is tugging at our heart strings, hoping that we get nostalgic about Israel’s ancient history so that we are compelled to join a modern Crusade to save Jerusalem from the Muslims, only this time the clarion call is capitalism and Jewish genius.

The Quest for the ‘Greater Israel’

This leads us to notice that Gilder is not merely pleading for Israel’s survival or trying to seek equality with the Palestinians or Arabs at large. The cost for Israel’s “genius” comes at a price. Not only does the price, according to Gilder, involve a basic inequality of living standards that is inevitable in capitalism between ‘the haves and the have nots,’ but in order to accomplish this economical symbiosis Israel needs

more land. As Gilder puts it: “Although historians and journalists generally describe Jabotinsky and the elder Netanyahus, Nathan and Benzion, as extremists and reactionaries, the subsequent history of Israel vindicates their ‘Greater Israel’ vision over the more adaptive posture of David Ben-Gurion, Golda Meir, and their followers. The prevailing notion of a diminutive Israel, with its constant offers to give up yet more land for peace...has won the Israelis no gratitude or support whatsoever in the international community and has achieved precious little peace” (p. 212). “Greater Israel” is the land to the east of the Jordan River and occupied by Arab countries (Syria, Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia), whereas Israel now occupies most of the land to the west of the river. The idea was seeded by the first Israeli prime minister, David ben Gurion. Prior to 1948, Palestine was a sovereign state. Arabs had occupied the land for the previous 1,300 years. But through financing from powerful Jewish banking families in Europe, Jews began migrating from Europe to Palestine (e.g., Rothschilds, Warburgs, Kahns, Schiffs). The British, who controlled Palestine, had promised the Zionists a homeland, but after World War II the Zionists plotted to remove the British from Palestine, which they eventually did in 1947. I pause to note here that on page 179 Gilder excuses this Israeli aggression because, as he puts it, the British were “proposing to limit the numbers of Jewish immigrants to Palestine to seventy-five thousand over five years” in face of the fact that the land wasn’t Israel’s in the first place. Gilder then has the audacity to further exonerate the Israeli Irgun army under Menachem Begin because in “the bombing of the British Army Headquarters at the King David Hotel [it] was preceded by three phone calls warning the occupants to evacuate.” Gilder then justifies the killing of these 91 people by glibly quoting in the very next paragraph from Shaul Olmert, the oldest son of former prime minister Ehud Olmert, stating that “In Israel you keep coming up with ways that will allow you to survive and allow you to grow. That is why Israelis are so innovative. We have to be entrepreneurs to survive.” Gilder seems to have the same type of callousness about Israel’s atrocities when he reports on the massacres at Sabra and Shatila in Lebanon in 1982. He blames the world’s view of the incident on Jewish writer Thomas Friedman (whom he calls a “useful idiot”) who reported it “in the *New York Times* which won him the Pulitzer Prize and durably sullied the reputation of the Israel Defense Forces” which led many people to compare Israel to “the Nazis in Europe.” Gilder minimizes “Israel’s offenses in Lebanon, producing perhaps a few thousand civilian casualties, [because it] occurred in the middle of a civil war that produced perhaps a half-million deaths.” He says “It is invidious and ultimately suicidal for journalists from free nations to focus on a few sensational disputed incidents in the middle of a fifteen-year bloodbath” (pp. 229-230). In essence, without one source citation to back up his anecdotal accounting, Gilder is arguing that Ariel Sharon’s killing of 3000 civilians was justified because the civilians were already in a fight with someone else, and this is said in the face of how brutal Sharon was to these defenseless people. Not only were they killed, but the Jewish newspaper *Ha’aretz* reported that they were “mutilated or disemboweled before or after they were killed.” So outrageously demonic were these attacks that a special commission was formed to investigate the incident, headed by Yitzhak Kahan, president of Israel’s Supreme Court. Siding with Sharon, they whitewashed his crime by saying he was only “indirectly” responsible for the massacre because he “hired” the Phalange militia who did the actual killing. The United Nations General Assembly called them what they actually were – “acts of genocide.”

These were not isolated incidents in Israel’s quest for dominance in the region. In the book *The Israeli Holocaust Against the Palestinians*, Jewish writer Moshe Lieberman reports on similar occurrences: On April 9, 1948, Begin, with the Irgun assassination gang, led a massacre of 260 Arab civilians at Deir Yassin. On Sept 17, 1948, 33 year old Yitzhak Shamir and his Stern gang assassinated Swedish peace mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte. On October 14, 1953, 25-year old Ariel Sharon ordered an attack on

the Palestinian settlement, Qibya, destroying 42 homes and 60 civilians. On July 14, 1954, the Israeli Army intelligence squad known then by the name of Modin, under Prime Minister Moshe Sharett, firebombed a civilian post office in Egypt. In 1956, the Israeli army under David Ben-Gurion attacked the settlement Kafr Qasim and committed 47 cold-blooded murders. In 1966, the same army under prime minister Levi Eshkol attacked the settlement village of Sammu and killed 18 people and wounded 100. In 1967, just prior to the six-day war, the Israeli air force under Levi Eshkol, made an unprovoked attack against the USS Liberty killing 34 soldiers and wounding 170, destroying the ship's radio towers and lifeboats in hopes that there would be no survivors. In 1969, the same army bombed a civilian school building named Bahdr al Baker killing 75 and wounding 100 innocent children. In March 1970, under Golda Meir, the Israeli army invaded Lebanon killing scores of innocent civilians. On Sept. 8, 1972, the same army arbitrarily decided to bomb Syrian and Lebanese civilians killing hundreds of innocent people. In 1974, the same army under Yitzhak Rabin attacked civilian aircraft and desecrated Christian shrines including the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, and stole the diamond crown of the statue of the Blessed Virgin Mary. From 1975 to 1980, the Israeli secret service, the Mossad, conducted a bloody campaign of murder against Palestinian scientists, journalists and other important people. In October 1982, the Mossad bombed the houses, offices and cars of three legitimately elected mayors of the West Bank cities, Nablus, Ramallah and Al Beireh. In February 1989 Yitzhak Shamir bombed the Beka Valley killing 15 children and an unspecified number of their parents. On April 14, 1989, the Israeli police and armed Jewish settlers attacked a disarmed Palestinian village, Nahalin, killing 8 and wounding 50. Through March 6-16, 2002, the Israeli army slaughtered over 200 Palestinians. On March 30, 2002, Sharon's army arbitrarily executed five Palestinian bank guards. On April 8, 2002, Sharon's army bombed the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem. The next day, April 9, the same army massacred Palestinian civilians living in Jenin, which, incidentally, is the date of the Israeli holiday, Holocaust Remembrance Day.

After forcing out the British in 1947, the Zionists then started a revolution and began to overthrow the Palestinians, with David ben Gurion as their leader. The Jews were ruthless in their removal of the Palestinians, sometimes machine-gunning whole villages so that Jews could move into the land. From 1948 to the present, all that remains now are Palestinian refugee camps. In the book *Jewish History, Jewish Religion: The Weight of Three Thousand Years*,¹⁰⁶ Jewish author Israel Shahak reveals the elaborate plans of the state of Israel. David ben Gurion, the first prime minister of Israel in 1948, stated these plans very clearly in a meeting of the Knesset. At that time, Egypt had confiscated the Suez Canal from Great Britain. Israel then went to war with Egypt. On the third day of the war, ben Gurion announced to the Knesset that the major reason he started the war was "for the restoration of the kingdom of David and Solomon to its biblical borders." The members of the Knesset rose to their feet, applauded, and began singing the Israeli national anthem. If ben Gurion's dream is realized, the dimensions of Israel's land grab would extend in the south to include all of the Sinai peninsula and of northern Egypt. In the east it would include Jordan and Kuwait, then traveling up the Euphrates River into Iraq, Syria, Turkey, and Lebanon. Perhaps because he has Greater Israel in his crosshairs, Gilder concludes that "The 'Arab-Israeli conflict' is almost everywhere understood (wrongly in my view) as an impossibly embittered dispute over absurdly small patches of geography" (p. 139). Gilder has no sympathy for Israelis such as Dov Frohman (Intel executive) and Bernard Avishai (author of *The Hebrew Republic*) who "have absorbed the Peace Now mantra and message that Israel has become an aggressive and even imperialist power." For them, "Israel took land from the Palestinian Arabs in the wars of 1948 and 1967 and 'Now it is time to relinquish it for peace'" (pp. 186-187).

How Israel should eventually acquire this land, Gilder gives no clues. Rather, he severely criticizes Jimmy Carter for even suggesting that Israel return to its “pre-1967 borders,” even though Carter was only reiterating “UN resolution 242 in 1967 and UN resolution 338 in 1973, and accepted at Camp David in 1978 and in Oslo in 1993 by both Arabs and Israelis” (p. 226). For Gilder, both sides got it all wrong. The “vulnerability” of the pre-1967 borders “resulted in attacks from three neighboring Arab states in 1967,” and should never have been accepted in the first place. Thus, Gilder has no guilt for thumbing his nose at the UN or Menachem Begin or anyone else from the “Peace Now” movement. Benjamin Netanyahu is his man because Bibi, in his book *A Durable Peace*, says that Israel’s acquisition of a large buffer area is an absolute necessity to make it harder for Arab missiles to enter the heart of Israel. Gilder believes that “both the history of invasion and the present commitment of the Arabs to the death of Israel vindicate Israel’s absolute and unilateral right to decide what land it must keep and what it may cede to the Palestinians, under what pre-conditions. Israel has no prior obligation to cede a single square inch of land except to advance its own security.” One wonders, however, why Gilder set his sights on “Greater Israel” if his only concern is buffer zones. The answer to this may be in the next sentence: “If the right answer for Israel is to rule for a thousand years the territories on which reside enemies committed to its destruction, then no true principle of democracy compels them to do otherwise” (pp. 226-228).

The fact remains that Israel has no constitutional borders and has refused to make any such commitment to the Palestinians, to the Arabs or to the world at large. In his September 24, 2009 speech to the United Nations, Netanyahu said: “In 1947, this body voted to establish two states for two peoples – a Jewish state and an Arab state. The Jews accepted that resolution. The Arabs rejected it. We ask the Palestinians to finally do what they have refused to do for 62 years: Say yes to a Jewish state. Just as we are asked to recognize a nation-state for the Palestinian people, the Palestinians must be asked to recognize the nation state of the Jewish people. The Jewish people are not foreign conquerors in the Land of Israel. This is the land of our forefathers.”¹⁰⁷ How are the Palestinians and the world to know what the Jewish state is if Israel refuses to draw its borders? Without borders, Israel is just asking for trouble. As noted, in place of this, Gilder, who is against a Palestinian state (p. 208), envisions nothing less than the “Greater Israel” and “rule for a thousand years,” which are reminiscent of the glory of King Solomon. This is why Gilder praises “Sarah Palin, who displays an Israeli flag in her office in Juneau” and “the evangelical preacher John Hagee” (p. 208) since both are Protestant Dispensationalists who believe (but quite mistakenly) that God has unkept promises of land for modern Israel.¹⁰⁸ It is why Gilder cites Jacob’s wrestling with the angel (Genesis 32) as the beginning of the Israeli nation and says, quoting Robert Aumann (Jewish Nobel laureate in economics): “Israel is not sixty years old. It is sixty times sixty years old” (p. 201). It is also why Gilder wants to create “a new twenty-first-century Judeo-Christian alliance in economics, culture, military capabilities, and even religion” (p. 210, my emphasis). This belief (mistaken as it is), that Israel today can borrow from its prestige in the Old Testament and retain, to its own degree of satisfaction, the theocratic privileges it once possessed seems to be the real motivator, while buffer zones only stall for more time to accomplish the long term goal. Likewise, Gilder says Netanyahu “is at once the most profoundly Zionist...of all Israeli leaders” and “comes from the most Zionist of families.” Bibi’s father, Benzion, was “Zionist leader, Ze’ev Jabotinsky’s...assistant in the United States,” and “who envisaged Israel ‘on both sides of the Jordan’” (pp. 210-211). As David ben Gurion did in his 1962 *Look* interview when he stated that the goal of Israel was to have all nations look to it as the harbinger of truth and wisdom,¹⁰⁹ so Gilder says: “It is the case for Israel as the leader of human civilization, technological progress and scientific advance. It is the case for Israel as a military spearhead of the culture of freedom

and faith...In a dangerous world, faced with an array of perils, the Israel test asks whether the world can suppress envy and recognize its dependence on the outstanding performance of relatively few men and women” (p. 42). This kind of self-aggrandizement, of course, will only lead to an inevitable clash of civilizations: the Jews and Israel against the Muslims and Arabs. Gilder thus wrote his book in order to make sure that America and its Christians remain on the side of Israel. As he put it: “The Israel test forces a remorseless realism...Either the world, principally the United States, supports Israel, or Israel, one way or another, will be destroyed” (p. 15).

Conclusion

In the end, Gilder’s book is like Sisyphus pushing the rock up the mountain only to have it fall down each time before he reaches the peak. The more Gilder promotes “the Israel test” and makes it the benchmark for the world’s relationship to the Jews, the more he contributes to the notion of Jewish tribalism, the very idiosyncrasy of Jewish culture of which the Gentile world has become quite leery. Gilder believes he is protecting the Jews when in actuality he is only making the world more unsafe for them than it already is. The place to begin is for the Jews to admit their own sins, both past and present, which will then allow them to see why God rejected their nation in the first place. Coming to grips with their infamous Old Testament history and their continuation of the same sins in both the Christian and modern eras is the only solution on the road to improvement. In short, because of their past notoriety, the Jews now need to be on their best behavior if they want to survive. No more King David Hotels; no more USS Libertys; no more Sabra and Shatilas; no more Bernie Madoffs; no more thumbing their nose at UN resolutions; no more Talmudic exploiting of the Gentile; no more promotion of abortion, homosexuality and pornography; and no more false accusations of anti-semitism. In stark contrast to what Gilder is proposing, the Jews need to stop thinking of themselves as superior to the rest of the world and begin assuming a posture of humility. Since they are outnumbered 500:1 and compete with intellects that are just as smart as they claim to be, the Jews really need to come to grips with their true place in the world. Gilder’s wish to have Israel build bigger barns so that “the swords must continue to be there—they cannot be beaten into plowshares” (p. 206) is a recipe for disaster. As Jesus said, these actions will only corrupt their souls and incite others with bigger swords to kill them (*cf.* Luke 12:16-21; Matt. 26:52). If, as Gilder says, “American Jews [are] the richest people on earth” (p. 39), then let them travel down the road to humility by donating some of their vast wealth and know-how to needy Gentile individuals and countries instead of giving it only to Jewish organizations. If, as Gilder says, the Jews have “genius” and “virtue” above others, then let them be servants not slave masters; philanthropists, not philanderers. They can start with the Palestinians, at least after they have established constitutional borders and cease to take any more land that isn’t theirs. These actions will begin to diffuse the inherent tribalism of the Jews and show the world that they want to be team players. They can then begin to forge respectful relationships with their regional neighbors. If after a sustained effort at such humility there remain threats and violence against Israel, the world should unite against any such aggressor and protect Israel with all its might. This recipe is Israel’s only hope for survival. Conversely, the more the Jews flout themselves as better than the rest of the world, the more God and man will reject them. As such, Gilder’s book is a failure.

¹ *The Israel Test*, p. 43.

² Written in 1954 to the philosopher Eric Gutkind, which recently sold for \$404,000 at an auction in London (New York Times, May 17, 2008, Dennis Overbye).

- ³ Goldstein, David. *Jewish Panorama*. Catholic Campaigners for Christ, Astor Post Office, Boston, MA, 1940, p.119.
- ⁴ *Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-Semitism and the Abuse of History* (2005), p. 87.
- ⁵ *Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-Semitism and the Abuse of History* (2005), pp. 90-91.
- ⁶ <http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-me-claude-levi-strauss4-2009nov04,0,890035.story>
- ⁷ Denzinger, Paragraphs 712, 714
- ⁸ Norman Finkelstein's, *Beyond Chutzpah*, p. 81, emphasis is Dershowitz's.
- ⁹ Taken from *The First Holocaust: Jewish Fund Raising Campaigns with Holocaust Claims During and After World War One*, Don Heddesheimer, Theses and Dissertation Press, second edition, April 2005
- ¹⁰ Robert Pollack and Patricia Williams, Columbia University, New York City, <https://www.commentarymagazine.com/printarticle.cfm/jews--iqan-exchange-10916>
- ¹¹ Gregory Cochran, Henry Harpending, University of Utah, *ibid.* See also: Stephen Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man*, W. W. Norton & Company, 1996; Carol Tavris, *Mismeasure of Women: Why Women are not the Better Sex, the Inferior Sex, or the Opposite Sex*, Touchstone, 1993; Ned Block and Gerald Dworkin, eds., *The IQ Controversy*, Pantheon Books, 1976; David Owen, *None of the Above*, Houghton Mifflin, 1985.
- ¹² Hindus, Maurice. *The Jews as Radical*. The Menorah Journal, v. XIII, no. 4, August 1927, pp. 369-370.
- ¹³ Robert Matthews, *New Scientist*, Jan. 30, 1999, p. 24.
- ¹⁴ Ronald Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, p. 412.
- ¹⁵ Richard P. Feynman, *The Strange Theory of Light and Matter*, 1988, p. 10.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 40.
- ¹⁷ *Einstein: Life and Times*, p. 301. Misner, Thorne and Wheeler list seven distinct universes that can come from changing the mathematical variables of General Relativity (*Gravitation*, p. 747), let alone the numerous variations of other models, e.g., Steady State and Plasma universes.
- ¹⁸ The mathematics of the so-called "Standard Model" of the atom has the unfortunate anomaly of producing an electron with infinite rest mass. Since by other means science has determined the rest mass to be 0.511 MeV, it requires a "renormalization" of the Standard Model's mathematics, namely, the 0.511 value is added in by hand, and no one is the wiser. This procedure is justified on the basis that "positive infinity divided by negative infinity" is an indeterminate value, and thus 0.511 is just as good as any other figure to add in (see D. L. Hotson "Dirac's Equation and the Sea of Negative Energy" *Infinite Energy*, Issue 43, 2002, p. 3).
- ¹⁹ Feynman in *The Strange Theory of Light and Matter*, 1985, p. 128.
- ²⁰ James Gleick, *Genius: The Life and Science of Richard Feynman*, 1992, p. 378. Feynman's remark was not said in jest. Gleick prefaces it with: "He did make a serious remark – and repeated it all day – that reflected his inner feeling about renormalization. The problem had been to eliminate infinities in calculations, he said, and 'We have designed a method for sweeping them under the rug.'" Concerning physics' newest brainchild, String Theory, Feynman states: "I am an old man now, and these are new ideas, and they look crazy to me, and they look like they're on the wrong track...I do feel very strongly that this is nonsense" (P. C. W. Davies and J. Brown, *Superstrings – A Theory of Everything*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998, pp. 193-194).
- ²¹ Richard Feynman, *The Meaning of it All: Thoughts of a Citizen Scientist*, 1998, p. 26; Feynman, *The Pleasure of Finding Things Out*, 1999, p. 188; *ibid.*, p. 187.
- ²² As quoted in an interview with John Horgan and cited in John Horgan, *The End of Science*, 1996, p.74. In the interview Horgan notes: "Weinberg retorted, in effect, that he does not see why we should be interested in a God who seems so little interested in us, however good he is at geometry" (*ibid.*, p. 77). At the 2006 Salk Institute forum, Weinberg stated: "Anything that we scientists can do to weaken the hold of religion should be done and may in the end be our greatest contribution to civilization" (*New York Times*, Nov. 21, 2006)
- ²³ Marcus Chown in "The End of the Beginning," *New Scientist*, July 2, 2005, p. 30.
- ²⁴ See Eric J. Lerner, *The Big Bang Never Happened*, New York, Random House, 1991, p. 4; T. Van Flandern, "The Top 30 Problems with the Big Bang," *Apeiron* 9, 2, April 2002; Eric Lerner in "An Open Letter to the Scientific Community," *New Scientist*, May 22, 2004, p. 20, as he represents thirty-three other signers to the document; William C. Mitchell, *Bye, Bye Big Bang: Hello Reality*, 2002). Fred Hoyle, et al., *A Different Approach to Cosmology*, 2000. Tom van Flandern, *Dark Matter, Missing Planets and New Comets*, 1993; "The Big Bang Brouhaha," *Nature*, 356:731, 1992.
- ²⁵ See Brian Greene, *The Elegant Universe: Superstrings, Hidden Dimensions, and the Quest for the Ultimate Theory*, 1999; Brian Greene, *The Fabric of the Cosmos: Space, Time and the Texture of Reality*, 2004.

²⁶ Charles Lane Poor divests Minkowski's "fourth dimension" of its mystique quite easily. He writes: "To most people, the very words, four dimensions, are enough; everything at once becomes incomprehensible and absurd. Yet there is no reason for this too prevalent idea: in the broad sense of the words, there is nothing new or startling in the four dimensional idea. It is a matter of common, every-day knowledge that, in order to describe fully an event, we must tell not only where the event took place, but when" (*Gravitation versus Relativity*, p. 37).

²⁷ Imaginations certainly run wild in the "objective" world of modern science. Leonard Susskind has recently advocated that String Theory predicts as many as 10^{500} different universes, each with its own set of physical properties. Out of the 10^{500} possible universes, Susskind admits he has no reason why our single universe, with its unique biological life, came into existence, but he insists, nevertheless, "that it cannot be due to Intelligent Design" (Leonard Susskind, *The Cosmic Landscape: String Theory and the Illusion of Intelligent Design*, 2005).

²⁸ "A Conversation with Brian Greene," Nova television series, Public Broadcasting Service, October 2004.

²⁹ *Einstein: The Life and Times*, pp. 405-406. His teacher once told Max Planck: "Physics is finished, young man. It's a dead-end street," then advised Planck to become a concert pianist (Nick Herbert, *Quantum Reality*, p. 31).

³⁰ Nick Herbert, *Quantum Reality*, p. 31. Max Planck is noted for saying that "Science proceeds funeral by funeral," which is possibly an interpolation from his more complete remark: "A new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents die and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it." A similar statement comes from Mark Twain: "When even the brightest mind in our world has been trained up from childhood in a superstition of any kind, it will never be possible for that mind, in its maturity, to examine sincerely, dispassionately, and conscientiously any evidence or any circumstance which shall seem to cast a doubt upon the validity of that superstition. I doubt if I could do it myself" (attributed, not verified).

³¹ *Einstein: The Life and Times*, pp. 406-407.

³² *Einstein: The Life and Times*, p. 410.

³³ *Einstein: The Life and Times*, pp. 410-411. Schrödinger further complicated the picture since his energy-momentum relationship ($E = \rho^2/2m$) was thoroughly anti-Relativistic. Paul Dirac tried to bridge this gap with his alternative to $E = mc^2$, namely, $E^2 = m^2c^4$. Schrödinger writes: "Surely you realize the whole idea of quantum jumps is bound to end in nonsense...if the jump is sudden, Einstein's idea of light quanta will admittedly lead us to the right wave number, but then we must ask ourselves how precisely the electron behaves during the jump. Why does it not emit a continuous spectrum, as electromagnetic theory demands? And what law governs its motion during the jump? In other words, the whole idea of quantum jumps is sheer fantasy." Niels Bohr retorts: "What you say is absolutely correct. But it does not prove that there are no quantum jumps. It only proves that we cannot describe them, that the representational concepts with which we describe events in daily life and experiments in classical physics are inadequate when it comes to describing quantum jumps" (as recorded by Werner Heisenberg in *Physics and Beyond*, 1971, pp. 73-74).

³⁴ *Einstein: The Life and Times*, pp. 412-413.

³⁵ The perplexity of the issue was brought out no better than the summation voiced in 1927 by Sir William Bragg, director of the Royal Institution: "On Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays we teach the wave theory and on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays the corpuscular theory" (*Einstein: The Life and Times*, p. 420). Forty years later, when one would assume that science had a better grasp on the quantum world, Richard Feynman, one of its more prominent spokesmen, wrote: "I think I can safely say that nobody understands quantum mechanics" (1967 paper: "The Character of Physical Laws"). Niels Bohr once quipped: "But, but, but...if anybody says he can think about quantum theory without getting giddy it merely shows that he hasn't understood the first thing about it" (Otto Frisch, citing Bohr, in *Niels Bohr, A Centenary Volume*, editors, A. P. French and P. J. Kennedy, 1985, p. 136). Heisenberg adds: "Let us consider an atom moving in a closed box which is divided by a wall into two equal parts. The wall may have a very small hole so that the atom can go through. Then the atom can, according to classical logic, be either in the left half of the box or in the right half. There is no third possibility: *tertium non datur*. In quantum theory, however, we have to admit – if we use the word 'atom' and 'box' at all – that there are other possibilities which are in a strange way mixtures of the two former possibilities. This is necessary for explaining the results of our experiments" (Werner Heisenberg, *Physics and Philosophy: The Revolution in Modern Science*, 1966, pp. 181-182).

³⁶ In seeking to determine the position and velocity of a subatomic particle, one must shine light on the particle, but light has a limited capability due to its wavelength (the length between the crests of its wave) and its size (one quantum). If one wants to measure the position of one particle in relation to another particle, he would employ light of a very short wavelength in order to penetrate between the particles. But in choosing a short wavelength, one

⁵⁴ “Che il sole sia centro del mondo et immobile di moto locale, è propositione assurda e falsa in filosofia, e formalmente heretica, per essere espressamente contraria alla Sacra Scrittura.” (Translation: “The proposition that the sun is the center of the world and does not move from its place is absurd and false philosophically and formally heretical, because it is expressly contrary to the Holy Scripture”): “Che la terra non sia centro del mondo nè imobile, ma che si muova etiandio di moto diurno, è parimente propositione assurda e falsa nella filosofia, e considerate in teologia ad minus erronea in Fide.” (Translation: “The proposition that the Earth is not the center of the world and immovable but that it moves, and also with a diurnal motion, is equally absurd and false philosophically and theologically considered at least erroneous in faith”). As cited in *Galileo E L’Inquisizione*, Antonio Favaro, 1907, p. 143.

⁵⁵ Robert B. Laughlin, *A Different Universe*, p. 123.

⁵⁶ Robert B. Laughlin, *A Different Universe*, pp. 123-124.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 124-125.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 125. Laughlin adds: “The desire to explain away the gravity paradox microscopically is also the motivation for the invention of supersymmetry, a mathematical construction that assigns a special complementary partner to every known elementary particle. Were a superpartner ever discovered in nature, the hope for a reductionist explanation for the emptiness of space might be rekindled, but this has not happened, at least not yet” (*ibid.*).

⁵⁹ Other well-known and accomplished physicists, many of them having received their own Nobel Prizes, rejected Einstein’s Relativity theories in the early going, and more came on board as time progressed. Respected scientists such as Adler, Appell, Aspden, Assis, Barter, Beckmann, Bergson, Bouasse, Bragg, Brown, Brillouin, Callahan, Cauchy, Champeney, Cullwic, Darboux, Denisov, Dingle, Dingler, Dudley, Duport, Essen, Galeczki, Gehrcke, Graneau, Guillaume, Gut, Hatch, Heaviside, Henderson, Ives, Kantor, Kanarev, Kastler, Kraus, Lallemand, Larmour, LeCornu, Lenard, LeRoux, Levi-Civita, Lodge, Lorentz, Lovejoy, Lynch, Mach, MacMillan, Mackaye, Magie, McCausland, Michelson, Miller, Mohorovičić, Montague, Moon, More, Moulton, Nordenson, O’Rahilly, Painlevé, Phipps, Picard, Planck, Poincaré, Poor, Radakov, Ricci, Rutherford, Sagnac, Seeliger, Selleri, Soddy, Stark, Theimer, Turner, van der Kamp, van der Waals, Weinmann, Weyland, et al., discovered the same anomalies, and many of them wrote major critiques against Einstein between the 1920s and 1960s. The Jewish press ignored most of them or sought ways to silence them.

⁶⁰ *Letters to Solovine*, translated by Wade Baskin from the French *Lettres à Maurice Solovine*, 1987, p. 111. Einstein’s wording in the original German of the sentence “Da ist kein einzeiger Begriff...” more likely refers to “not a single concept,” since *einzeiger* is closer to the meaning of “one” or “single,” whereas *einfach* would be the more common word for “simple.” In the same set of letters Einstein reveals his doubts about General Relativity.

⁶¹ Alice Calaprice, *The Expanded Quotable Einstein*, p. 14.

⁶² Lincoln Barnett, *The Universe and Dr. Einstein*, revised edition, 1950, p. 10.

⁶³ Abraham Pais, *Subtle is the Lord: The Science and the Life of Albert Einstein*, 1982, 2005, p. 467. Pais argues Einstein’s self-assessment was “unreasonably harsh,” which shows Pais knows how damaging the quote is to Einstein’s reputation. Still, Pais admits to other such sentiments from Einstein, such as the letter to Born in 1940: “Our respective hobby-horses have irretrievably run off in different directions....Even I cannot adhere to [mine] with absolute confidence” (*ibid.*).

⁶⁴ *Letters to Solovine*, trans., by Wade Baskin from the French *Lettres à Maurice Solovine*, 1987, pp. 159, written Feb. 27, 1955, Einstein’s death coming on April 18, 1955.

⁶⁵ Albert Einstein and Leopold Infeld, *The Evolution of Physics*, 1966, pp. 154-155.

⁶⁶ Andre Linde, “The Self-Reproducing Inflationary Universe,” *Magnificent Cosmos*, *Scientific American*, 1998, p. 99. Linde adds another remarkable observation: “A similar discrepancy between theory and observation concerns the size of the universe, a third problem. Cosmological examinations show that our part of the universe contains at least 10^{88} elementary particles. But why is the universe so big? If one takes a universe of a typical initial size given by the Planck length and a typical initial density equal to the Planck density, then, using the standard Big Bang theory, one can calculate how many elementary particles such a universe might encompass. The answer is rather unexpected: the entire universe should only be large enough to accommodate just one elementary particle – or at most 10 of them. It would be unable to house even a single reader of *Scientific American*, who consists of about 10^{29} elementary particles. Obviously, something is wrong with this theory” (*ibid.*).

⁶⁷ George Musser, “Was Einstein Right?” *Scientific American*, Sept. 2004, p. 89. Hawking adds: “Thus, general relativity brings about its own downfall by predicting singularities” (*Black Holes and Baby Universes*, p. 92).

⁶⁸ *Time*, “Those Baffling Black Holes,” September 4, 1978, pp. 56-62.

⁶⁹ Tim Folger, "Einstein's Grand Quest for a Unified Theory," *Discover*, September 2004, p. 64.

⁷⁰ Tom van Flandern, *Dark Matter, Missing Planets and New Comets*, 1993, p. xxi.

⁷¹ Lorentz's 1886 paper, "On the Influence of the Earth's Motion on Luminiferous Phenomena," quoted in Miller's *Albert Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity*, p. 20.

⁷² Henrick Lorentz to Albert Einstein, January 1915, Robert Schulmann, A. J. Kox, Michael Janssen and József Illy, editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein, Correspondence 1914-1918*, 1998, Document 43.

⁷³ The basic formula undergirding all of Lorentzian and Einsteinian Relativity is $L = \sqrt{1-v^2/c^2}$ (where L = length, v = velocity and c = the speed of light), which Lorentz created in order to answer the Michelson-Morley experiment. Einstein admitted: "The term relativity refers to time and space....This led the Dutch professor, Lorentz, and myself to develop the special theory of relativity" (Lorentz, *The Einstein Theory of Relativity*, New York, Brentano, 1920, pp. 11-12). Abraham Pais notes of his interview with Einstein: "As he told me more than once, without Lorentz he would never have been able to make the discovery of special relativity" (Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, 1982, p. 13). In 1912, Einstein admitted: "To fill this gap, I introduced the principle of the constancy of the velocity of light, which I borrowed from H. A. Lorentz's theory of the stationary luminiferous ether..." ("Relativity and Gravitation: Reply to a Comment by M. Abraham," translated by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Vol. 4. Doc. 8, 1996, p. 131). In 1935, Einstein admitted again: "...the Lorentz transformation, the real basis of the special relativity theory, in itself has nothing to do with the Maxwell theory." ("Elementary Derivation of the Equivalence of Mass and Energy," Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society, Series 2, Vol. 41, 1935, p. 230). The difference between Einstein's version and Lorentz's version is explained by the latter as: "The experimental results could be accounted for by transforming the co-ordinates in a certain manner from one system of co-ordinates to another. A transformation of time was also necessary. So I introduced the conception of local time, which is different for different systems of reference which are in motion relative to each other. But I never thought that this had anything to do with real time. This real time for me was still represented by the old classical notion of an absolute time, which is independent of any reference to special frames of co-ordinates. There existed for me only this one true time. I considered my time transformation only as a heuristic working hypothesis. So the theory of relativity is really solely Einstein's work. And there can be no doubt that he would have conceived it even if the work of all his predecessors in the theory of this field had not been done at all. His work is, in this respect, independent of the previous theories" ("Conference on the Michelson-Morley Experiment," *The Astrophysical Journal*, Vol. 68, No. 5, Dec. 1928, p. 350). Historian Edmund Whittaker, however, believes that Lorentz and Poincaré were the creators of Relativity (*A History of the Theories of Ether and Electricity*, vol. 1-2, 1953, pp. 27-77).

⁷⁴ Article written by Einstein at the request of the *London Times*, November 28, 1919, as cited in Einstein's *Ideas and Opinions*, Wings Books, Crown Publishers, 1954, p. 229.

⁷⁵ Isaac Newton, *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica*, Bk. 1 (1689); translated by Andrew Motte (1729), revised by Florian Cajori, 1934, Definition VII, p. 8. Newton continues in Definition VIII with: "And therefore as it is possible, that in the remote regions of the fixed stars, or perhaps far beyond them, there may be some body absolutely at rest; but impossible to know from the position of bodies to one another in our regions, whether any of these do keep the same position to that remote body; it follows that absolute rest cannot be determined from the position of bodies in our regions" All of Newton's hand-wringing is superfluous if the Earth is fixed in space.

⁷⁶ Isaac Newton, *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica*, Bk. 1 (1689), Definition XIV, p. 12.

⁷⁷ Arthur Eddington, *The Nature of the Physical World*, 1929, pp. 15, 17, 18, 27, 25, in order of ellipses.

⁷⁸ Pope Pius X, encyclical of March 12, 1904, *Iucunda Sane*, 35.

⁷⁹ <http://internet-filter-review.toptenreviews.com/internet-pornography-statistics.html>

⁸⁰ <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ysBJ5G4m67s>

⁸¹ See *The Jewish Roots and the Catholic Failure on Abortion* that you can view on our website (http://www.catholicintl.com/articles/Abortion_is_from_the_Jews_Wemhoff.pdf).

⁸² According to the *Jews and the Public Square Project*, researchers discovered the following percentages of support of those surveyed for the following assertions: Homosexuality is Wrong: Non-Jews 48%; Jews 23%; Jewish leaders 7%; Do you support "abortion rights?": Non Jews 56%; Jews 88%; Jewish leaders 96%. "Jews take a less critical view," noted the surveys' researchers, "of homosexuality, abortion, birth control and pornography than do Gentiles" (Paulson, Michael. *The Spiritual Life, Jews See Us as Secular, Survey Says*. Boston Globe, July 15, 2000, p. B2)

⁸³ Professor E.R.A. Seligman, head of the Economics Department of Columbia University, wrote in the preface of one of Warburg's essays on central banking: "The Federal Reserve Act is the work of Mr. (Paul) Warburg more than any other man in the country."

(<http://www.modernhistoryproject.org/mhp/ArticleDisplay.php?Article=FinalWarn02-2>)

- ⁸⁴<http://www.historycooperative.org/cgi-bin/justtop.cgi?act=justtop&url=http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/jah/88.3/heinze.html>.
- ⁸⁵ Grollman, Earl A. [Foreward by Nathan W. Ackerman, M. D.] *Judaism in Sigmund Freud's World*. Appleton-Century, New York; by Special Arrangement with Bloch Publishing Company, 1965, p. 101.
- ⁸⁶ Written in 1954 to the philosopher Eric Gutkind, which recently sold for \$404,000 at an auction in London (New York Times, May 17, 2008, Dennis Overbye).
- ⁸⁷ See my article in *Culture Wars* "Did Einstein have Syphilis" The Link between Science and Biography," January, 2006, or *Galileo Was Wrong: The Church Was Right*, Volume 2, pp. 39-48.
- ⁸⁸ His biographer, Ronald Clark says: "As Einstein wrestled with the cosmological implications of the General Theory, the first of these alternatives, the Earth-centered universe of the Middle Ages, was effectively ruled out" (p. 267).
- ⁸⁹ See my book, *Galileo Was Wrong: The Church Was Right*, volumes 1, fifth edition, appendix 2: "The Origin of the Equation $E=mc^2$," pp. 529-532.
- ⁹⁰ <http://www.jewishracism.com/SaintEinstein.pdf>. Note these comments at amazon.com: <http://www.amazon.com/Albert-Einstein-Incorrigible-Christopher-Bjerknes/product-reviews/0971962987>
- ⁹¹ Donald W. Rogers, *Einstein's Other Theory*, New Jersey, 2005.
- ⁹² *The Varieties of Scientific Experience: A Personal View of the Search for God*, Carl Sagan and Any Druyan, 2006, p. 167). Interestingly enough, Sagan once said: "We are unreconstructed geocentrists hiding behind a Copernican veneer" (Carl Sagan, *A Universe Not Made For Us*, p. 39.)
- ⁹³ Carl Sagan, *Cosmos*, 1980, p. 243. As the rock icon Joni Mitchell sang: "I came upon a child of God / He was walking along the road / And I asked him, where are you going / And this he told me... / We are stardust, billion year old carbon. / We are golden. / And we've got to get ourselves back to the garden" (Woodstock, 1969). The Vatican's liberal-minded astronomer, Fr. George V. Coyne, S.J., said much the same in a recent interview: "There is no other way...to have the abundance of carbon necessary to make a toenail than through the thermonuclear processes in stars. We are all literally born of stardust" (*The Catholic Review*, 8-18-2005, p. A32). Suffice it to say, stellar "thermonuclear process" is an unproven science, and is now facing considerable contradictions from Plasma cosmology.
- ⁹⁴ Stephen Gould, *Rocks of Ages*, 1999.
- ⁹⁵ Stephen Gould, *Wonderful Life*, 1989, p. 318.
- ⁹⁶ "Scientists and Religion in America," Edward J. Larson & Larry Witham, *Scientific American*, Sept. 1999, p. 89.
- ⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 90.
- ⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 91.
- ⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 91.
- ¹⁰⁰ Proverbs 30:20: "Such is the way of an adulterous woman: she eats, wipes her mouth, and says, 'I have done no wrong.'"
- ¹⁰¹ Jewish author, Irv Saposnik, 1998. (http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0411/is_3_47/ai_n27546357/?tag=content;col1). A short list of Jewish comics with which most are familiar is: Sid Caesar, Alan King, Morey Amsterdam, Jack Carter, Buddy Hackett, Sam Levenson, Jackie Mason, Jan Murray, Joey Bishop, Milton Berle, Eddie Cantor, George Burns, Georgie Jessel, Jack Benny, Lenny Bruce, Mel Brooks, Bobby Slayton, Jerry Sadowitz, Jerry Sienfeld, *et al.*
- ¹⁰² Lapin, Rabbi Daniel. *America's Real War*. Multnomah Publishers, Sisters, Oregon, 1999; *Why Jews Should Pray for a Christian America*. American Enterprise, v. 10, no. 2, March 1999, 70, p. 293.
- ¹⁰³ Having virtual control of the U.S. media, the Jews spread their philosophy far and wide. The three major television networks, which started to promote anti-Christian morality beginning around the late 1960s, were begun by Jews (NBC: David Sarnoff; ABC: Leonard Goldenson; CBS: William Paley). Jews own the four largest Hollywood film studios. The *Encyclopedia Judaica*, under "Motion Pictures," says that, with the exception of *United Artists*, "all the large Hollywood companies were founded and controlled by Jews." The largest of these is MCA, known in the industry as "The Octopus," which is run by Lou Wasserman, long recognized as the "king of Hollywood." According to author Neal Gabler, "the Jews invented Hollywood" in order to promote their culture and their dominance over society (*An Empire of Their Own*, 1988). The number of pro-Israel/pro-Zionist media outlets in America is staggering. The Sulzbergers also own the *NY Times News Service*, which provides already-written columns to 650 newspaper and magazine customers across the nation, in addition to owning the Boston Globe, the Santa Barbara News-Press and a half-dozen other newspapers, as well as eight radio stations nationwide. In addition to the *Washington Post*, Meyer-Graham owns *Newsweek*, the *International Herald Tribune*, the *Los*

Angeles/Washington Post News Service, three other newspapers and six radio stations across the U.S. The \$7 billion Jewish dynasty of Edgar Bronfman, whose father Sam made his millions in liquor-smuggling during Prohibition, owns AOL-Time Warner, which includes *America On-Line*, *Time magazine*, Warner Brothers, HBO, CNN and Paramount Pictures. Jewish executive Jeff Bezos runs AOL, while the Jewish group of Sergey Brin, Larry Page and Andreas Bechtolsheim own the Internet phenomenon, Google. Jewish liberal activists, Ivan Seidenburg of *Verizon* and Brian Roberts of *Comcast* work closely with the Anti-Defamation League and other heads of the liberal Jewish media. Bronfman's *Seagrams* company in Canada (alcohol manufacturers) owns *Universal Studios*. Edgar Bronfman is also the head of the World Jewish Congress, one of the most powerful Zionist groups in the world. Other high-profile newspapers also have Jewish owners bent on pro-Israel politics. *US News and World Report* and *The New York Daily News* are owned by Mortimer Zuckerman. *Commentary* is owned by the American Jewish Committee, with editor Norman Podheretz who also financed Fr. Richard Neuhouse's *First Things* pro-Zionist articles. The *New Republic* is owned by Martin Peretz, *et al.* The *New York Post* and the *Weekly Standard* are owned by Rupert Murdoch, who is part Jewish. Jewish neo-con, Bill Kristol, is the editor of the *Weekly Standard*. Some are not owned by Jews but are edited by them. The *Wall Street Journal* is edited by Peter Kann. The Newhouse family, which has assets of \$7 billion and is known as the "second wealthiest Jewish American family" (S. Birmingham, *The Rest of Us*, 1984), has a stranglehold on 26 newspapers in 22 cities over 9 states. Newhouse also owns such prestigious magazines as *Parade*, *Allure*, *Glamour*, *Vanity Fair*, *Vogue*, *The New Yorker*, *GQ*, *Mademoiselle* and seven others. Sumner Redstone (formerly "Rothstein") owns *Viacom*, a huge global media arm controlling *Paramount Studios*, *Blockbuster Video*, *Simon and Schuster*, *Nickelodean* and *MTV*. Prior to this Redstone owned *Columbia Pictures* and *Twentieth Century Fox*. Last but not least is Walter Annenberg who owns *TV Guide*.

¹⁰⁴ Benjamin Ginsberg, *The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State*, University of Chicago Press, 1993. p. 2

¹⁰⁵ http://www.jewishjournal.com/hollywoodjew/item/adam_lambert_the_jewish_american_idol_20090429/

¹⁰⁶ Pluto Press, July 2002, rev. ed.

¹⁰⁷ <http://www.nowpublic.com/world/benjamin-netanyahu-un-speech-full-text-transcript-sep-24-2009>

¹⁰⁸ God fulfilled all his promises of land to Israel in the Old Covenant (*cf.* Joshua 21:43-45; 1Kings 8:56; Nehemiah 9:7-8. The Old Covenant has since been superseded by the New Covenant and the only "land" to which Jews can look forward is the New Heaven and New Earth, if they accept Jesus Christ as Abraham did (*cf.* Hebrews 11:8-19, 39-40; John 8:56).

¹⁰⁹ In the *Look* magazine issue of January 16, 1962, ben Gurion stated: "All continents will become unified in a world alliance, at whose disposal will be an international police force. All armies will be abolished, and there will be no more war. In Jerusalem, the United Nations (a truly United Nations) will build a shrine of the prophets to serve the federated union of all continents. This will be the seat of the Supreme Court of mankind, to settle all controversies among the federated continents, as prophesied by Isaiah."