

Seton Hall University

eRepository @ Seton Hall

The Bridge: A Yearbook of Judaeo-Christian
Studies, Vol. II

The Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies

1956

Book Review: 'The Iron Curtain Over America' by John Beaty

John J. Bracken

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/jcs-bridge-II>

Recommended Citation

Bracken, John J., "Book Review: 'The Iron Curtain Over America' by John Beaty" (1956). *The Bridge: A Yearbook of Judaeo-Christian Studies, Vol. II*. 18.
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/jcs-bridge-II/18>

John Beaty: THE IRON CURTAIN OVER AMERICA *

IN HIS *Orthodoxy*, G. K. Chesterton pointed out how pleasant it can be to explain the world's troubles as the result of conspiracy. For one thing, a theory of conspiracy permits us to blame all ills on others than ourselves. For another, it gives a feeling of superiority to our own elite group, which has uncovered the "truth" and is thus wiser than the duped masses. Third, such theories usually stand up well in argument, for their tight "circle" of causes and effects following so neatly on each other makes them difficult to disprove. When the world outside is disturbed, your armchair conspiracy expert can retire into a universe of innocence and smugness, immune to reality.

Thus, if a man should conclude that he was Napoleon, he would decide that his commitment to a mental hospital was a conspiracy of the Bourbons or the British. And the more his friends would argue that it was not so, the more reason he would have for considering them dupes or agents of that conspiracy. His whole world would be simplified by his mania. The stirring of every leaf would be the revelation of an ambush. Every ambiguous remark would be a signal. Every unfamiliar stranger would be an agent of the foe.

Even more than Chesterton's world of the turn of the century, our age is so complex and so full of impending tragedy that men yearn for easy explanations, preferably such as show them blameless for our ills. Hence the innumerable "Conspiracy!" schools flourishing around us. The good people are always ourselves, innocent (if naïve) red-blooded Americans. But the bad vary: Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Catholic hierarchy, the liberals, or the Jews; wittingly or not, they were, or are, supposed to be making us prey to Communism. Because the bad vary, there is political capital or publisher's royalties in raising a banner, mounting the rooftops, and analyzing *the* conspiracy.

The Iron Curtain Over America is but one of the current conspiracy tracts. The work of John Beaty of Dallas, who is a teacher at Southern Methodist University, a novelist, and the holder of a Co-

* Dallas: Wilkinson Publishing Co., 1951.

lumbia doctorate, it is, in its way, among the most successful of its kind, having passed through fourteen editions since its publication in 1951. It has uncovered a *new* secret vanguard of Communism, not simply the Jews but one particular group of Jews: the "Khazar Jews," who, according to Dr. Beaty, are not Semites, so that opposition to them is not anti-Semitism.

The Khazars, he tells us, originally a tribe from Asia, lived in south-central Russia. In the eighth or ninth century A.D., their king was converted to Judaism, leading his nobles and chiefs with him. Later conquered by the Russians to the north, the Khazars were, according to Dr. Beaty, dispersed throughout Europe and are now known as "Russian Jews" or "Judaized Khazars" or just "Khazars." Their religion, he continues, was ruled by the Babylonian Talmud, which, he quotes the Jewish historian Graetz as saying, contains "much that is frivolous," also "superstitious practices and views . . . which presume the efficacy of demoniacal medicines, of magic, incantations . . ." (p. 19).

All this is supposed to have prepared the "Khazars," centuries later, for the acceptance of Communism:

The Marxian program of drastic controls, so repugnant to the free western mind, was no obstacle to the acceptance of Marxism by many Khazar Jews, for the Babylonian Talmud under which they lived had taught them to accept authoritarian dictation on everything from their immorality to their trade practices. Since the Talmud contained over 12,000 controls, the regimentation of Marxism was acceptable—provided the Khazar politician, like the talmudic rabbi, exercised the power of the dictatorship (p. 27).

Dr. Beaty also discloses that various elements of the Khazars have nurtured through the centuries a determination to remain separated from other peoples, together with a fourfold aim: international Communism, control of Russia, Zionism, and migration to America (p. 25).

With the evil motives of the "Khazar Jews" thus set forth to Dr. Beaty's satisfaction, he moves on to a charge that they are essentially responsible for most of the ills twentieth-century flesh is heir to. There are no further details given on this doctrine, no restrictions upon its implications beyond the pious denial that individual Jews

are evil, and no corroboration for it except the fact that the ills are with us and the doctrine seems to explain them to Dr. Beaty. It would aid our presentation of his theory if we could quote him at greater length, but he prefaces his book with a set of intricate rules on quotations from it; and I am quite sure he would not permit longer excerpts for inclusion in a book like *The Bridge*.

Catholics must see at once that a theory which postulates an affinity for Communism on the grounds of religious discipline can be used even more easily against themselves than against Jews. Indeed, the charge by anti-Catholic bigots that Communism and Catholicism are two forms of authoritarianism and thus akin antedates Dr. Beaty's theory and may be the basis of it. For the Talmud one could substitute some old books read by Catholics, books full of unverified legend. Nor must it be forgotten how, in ages past, Christians, Protestants and Catholics alike, were so ready to see witches everywhere. As for the alleged 12,000 "controls" enjoined by the Talmud on the Khazars, certainly an imposing number could be found in the works of moral theologians of the Catholic Church. Hence Dr. Beaty's reference to the Talmud proves nothing.

Not only could an anti-Catholic case be made out of Dr. Beaty's book by substituting "Catholic" for "Khazar," but the very method of his work is reminiscent of such established experts in the anti-Catholic world as Paul Blanshard. Like Blanshard, Beaty appears to prove his case by quoting his enemies. Blanshard quotes official Catholic sources; Beaty quotes approved Jewish sources. But, on analysis, we find that they both prove only part of their cases in this way—the final conclusion of hate, the charge of conspiracy, is out of whole cloth. Thus Blanshard, from the undoubted fact that the priest in the confessional acts as counselor and judge in moral matters, blithely assumes clerical dictatorship over Catholic lay activity. And thus Beaty quotes a Jewish historian on superstition in the Talmud; but its "immorality" is based on nothing, while the flight of fancy which makes the religiously disciplined mind fertile for Communism is an obvious absurdity.

Like Dr. Beaty, I was an army intelligence officer in World War II, and half my work was counter-intelligence on the Communist problem. Since then I have been, as a lawyer for labor unions, in very frequent contact with Communism in action. Lastly, I have

been an active Democrat, a member of a party Dr. Beaty says is full of Khazars. In the first two activities, at least, I have known quite a few Jews with Communist leanings. No Jewish Communist I have ever known or heard of was at all religious. No religious Jew I have ever known or heard of was Communist. Marx himself was completely secularized, indeed opposed to all religion, and certainly not friendly toward the Jews when he declared that there could be no emancipation of Jews without the emancipation of society from Judaism, which he equated with commercialism—yet Dr. Beaty thinks he has said something relevant when he says Marx was of Jewish origin (pp. 26–27). Indeed, quite a respectable case could be made out for explaining whatever Communism there is among Jews as due to a lack of religious discipline, just as a case could be made out (as indicated in Pius XI's encyclical *Divini Redemptoris*) for explaining whatever Communism there is in Catholic countries as due in part to a failure to learn and practice social justice. Communism is not a religion, properly speaking, but it will rush in and fill the vacuum left in men who have lost religion.

However that may be, Dr. Beaty, having established to his own satisfaction a tendency of the Russian Jew to Communism because of his talmudic discipline, proceeds to enumerate the evils he alleges such Jews have done and are doing. Again like Blanshard, Dr. Beaty, having set forth his theory, does not blame each evil precisely on the Khazars. Occasionally the venom is spit only on Gentiles, like "the Truman-Acheson-Marshall clique" (p. 149). Often the blame is distributed, the rulers of Russia being divided between "renegade Russians" and "Judaized Khazars" (p. 227). Yet the general notion that we are caught in a Russian-Jewish conspiracy is constantly advanced. For this, race is sometimes blamed, only those Hitler would have called Aryans being judged capable of the American way (pp. 40–41). Sometimes the place from which people emigrate seems to poison them against us (pp. 57–59). But, in the end, the plot is detailed categorically, as in the title to Chapter III: "The Khazars Join the Democratic Party" (pp. 44–59).

The subjugation of the party of such Nordics as Andrew Jackson and Frank Hague came about through the immigration of Khazars. "Millions" of illegal immigrants were here in 1950, an unspecified number of them Khazars (p. 45). They were so numerous after

World War II that our returning heroes had few houses to live in. So numerous were the Khazars even before 1914 that they made a deal to join the Democratic minority party, thus making it the majority party. "Their price, carefully concealed from the American people . . . was the control of the foreign policy of the United States" (p. 51).

They were able, according to Dr. Beaty, to help get America into World War I. They prevented Hitler from destroying Communism (and note this mode of backhand praise of Der Führer) by having Franklin Roosevelt recognize Russia. By "some sinister underground deal [which] must have been consummated" (p. 64), they got the same Roosevelt to toughen his policy toward Germany, forcing England into World War II and maddening Hitler into a "deal" with Russia, resulting in our own entry, so that as many "Khazar-hated Aryans" as possible would be killed (p. 74). But that is not all: they "probably" were responsible for our over-rapid demobilization after World War II. (In his preface Dr. Beaty says he himself was discharged from the army in 1946, at his own request. He does not explain if in this he was a dupe of the Khazars or a co-conspirator with them.) The Khazar-controlled Democrats sacrificed China by "orders [to Chiang] to stop the mopping up of Communist forces" (p. 115). They aided in the creation of the state of Israel, which Dr. Beaty calls "extremely leftist—to say the least," because of communal farm methods (p. 127). Then the "leftist manipulators of the State Department" (p. 145) tried to have us defeated in Korea by sending too few troops. The Democrats were also responsible for "the black hood of censorship" (p. 80)—incidentally, Dr. Beaty manages to get himself into his own drama in the role of martyr: ". . . his book *Image of Life* . . . was granted, as far as he knows, not a single comment in a book review or a book column in New York" (p. x).

To cap the climax, upon the resignation of General Hurley as ambassador to China, our government's censors succeeded in canceling an interview of the General by Colonel Beaty, then a military intelligence interviewer (p. 86). Twenty-nine pages later this situation has worsened, and General Hurley "was not even allowed to visit the War Department . . . for an interview" (p. 115). Thus the Iron Curtain over America is finally all-pervading when the

patriotic General and the patriotic Colonel are kept apart. One is left to conclude that Hurley and Beaty could not even meet for a chat over a short beer in Truman's Washington because of the lines of Khazar infantry drawn up on the White House lawn.

Enough. The list of Khazar crimes must be terminated, not because I have exhausted Dr. Beaty's supply, but because the list itself becomes exhausting. Even the unintended humor in Dr. Beaty's conceit wears thin when he speaks of the "alien minority" seeking to "own the coveted bodies of fair-haired girls and young men" of the East German Goths in Spain several hundred years ago (p. 196). His racism, thus revealed, is reminiscent of Streicher's infamous *Stürmer* of a little more than ten years ago.

But in kindling the fires of racism, Dr. Beaty is always careful not to exclude Catholics from his master race. As a former colonel, he knows it is best not to have two enemies at once. Even Catholic Slavs and Italians are part of his Indo-Germanic race, and he rejoices that they are being assimilated not only with the Irish but with the Anglo-American Catholics who, he is pleased to admit, have been here since before the Revolution. While claiming that East Germany is the home of Western Christian civilization, he is careful to have the Prussians fighting only Russians and never Poles. Hence when he cites a rather disquieting House report on the Immigration Act of 1924 as saying that "the basic strain of our population must be maintained" (p. 40), he does not mean to maintain it at the expense of Catholics, or maybe even Negroes. He means Jews. They are the people who form a nation within a nation, condemned by Dr. Beaty for refusing to be assimilated, even though he himself would object to assimilation as breaking down his own "basic strain."

On the other hand, Dr. Beaty does not limit his enemies to Democrats. Dulles he lumps with Truman, Acheson, and Hiss. Eisenhower he regards with pity and scorn because the Germans remember him in an unhappy light, and he cites an article from *Cosmopolitan* for July 1951 entitled "Truman's Plan to Make Eisenhower President," which may be intended to damn Eisenhower forever.

To vary his pattern of condemnation, Dr. Beaty sometimes singles out individual "Khazar-Jews" for special treatment. For example, Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, the first woman to hold a high position

in our defense establishment, is accused of lowering the draft age for no other reason, so it seems, than that our soldiers would be more vulnerable to Khazar propaganda. But perhaps the most vicious of Dr. Beaty's individual character assassinations is that of the late Justice Brandeis, "Harvard Jew, of Prague Stock" (p. 47)—an excellent example of the conspiracy theory at its worst. Dr. Beaty quotes the *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* as saying that Brandeis felt "that the Constitution must be given liberal construction," that he "probed the economics" of the problems presented to the Court, believing that "our individualistic philosophy could no longer furnish an adequate basis for dealing with modern economic life" (p. 48).

On reading this summary, any Catholic engaged in the social apostolate would be moved to praise. Not Dr. Beaty. To him it indicates that Brandeis fostered a philosophy of law which sponsored the movement to have courts assume judicial power over fields of government proper to the legislative authority, and thus to thwart the people's will. But let us contrast Dr. Beaty's wild theory with Justice Brandeis's own words, as he vainly pleads with six of his fellows (all Gentiles) in a famous dissent which is now the law: "The conditions developed in industry may be such that those engaged in it cannot continue their struggle [over the legality of a strike] without danger to the community. But it is not for judges to determine whether such conditions exist, nor is it their function to set the limits of permissible contest and to declare the duties which the new situation demands. This is the function of the legislature" (*Duplex Printing Press Co. v. Deering*, 254 US 443, 448). Thus Dr. Beaty has accused Brandeis of doing the opposite of what the record discloses. It is therefore not surprising that, in his next breath, he makes Brandeis the Zionist tool who caused Wilson to ask for a declaration of war against Germany in World War I. Dr. Beaty appears not to have heard about the U-boats which threatened Atlantic shipping: to the true conspiracy theoretician, facts which contradict his theory are ruled out of existence.

There are other "conclusions" in this book as much at variance with reality as those about Brandeis, but I must be content with some choice examples which reveal its main thesis. In unearthing that main thesis, however, a contradiction at once appears. Dr.

Beaty would seem to hold that race is the essential of American politics, religion, and culture. But he is altogether vague about the race of the Khazars and pinpoints their evils as the result of their religion. The wellspring of his antagonism would seem, then, to be the religious distinctiveness of the Jews. Like Blanshard, Dr. Beaty is at pains to divide good Jews from bad Jews so that he can rebut charges of bigotry; but in practice all Jews are bad. He makes no claim that Mrs. Rosenberg, Frankfurter, or Brandeis are Khazars; but they are Jews and they are bad. Their Jewishness is their crime. So it is their "talmudic discipline," rather than their blood, that adds a marked tendency to Communism to their other enormities.

It might thus be easy to accuse Dr. Beaty of being a religious bigot and to dismiss his book as the printed venom of that species. But there are flaws in such a theory. He is not a man of true religious concern, so far as one may judge from his *Iron Curtain*. His quotations from Scripture all seem afterthoughts at chapter ends. On the other hand, his background as a soldier, writer, and traveling scholar suggests the same type of unsuccessful dilettante as does Blanshard's. Both could have seized upon the theories which have brought them their brand of success merely as means to achieve that success. Hatred of Jews and Catholics may be inferred to be not so much their emotion as their business. If emotion be involved at all, it seems to be in the use of professionally held hates to escape their own apparent frustrations.

The theory about the Khazars, then, is not necessarily to be set down as religious bigotry. If it were, that is, if religious ideas seriously mattered to Dr. Beaty, we might hope to argue him into an admission, however reluctant, that the Jews, as a religious body, could be an aid in the spiritual war against godless Communism. Indeed, the very courage and cohesiveness of the Jewish community, in Israel and elsewhere, is a proof of the religious basis of culture and a denial of the Marxist claim that all human activity is basically economic. By lumping his half-mythical Khazars with the Jews of the Dispersion, Dr. Beaty implicitly confesses that faith, not race, makes a people or a nation or a civilization. But he no more admits this than Marx would. He bases our individuality on race, as Marx does on economic supply and demand. Frankly and parenthetically, Marx's theory is less repulsive.

But both Marx's and Beaty's theories are disproved by the very existence of "the Jews" as a separate or separable people. It is faith that has preserved and will preserve them as a group. Hence the state of Israel is a refutation of materialism, whether of breeding or of economics; and it is as ideologically embarrassing to the Soviet Union as it is at times politically embarrassing to our government. If Dr. Beaty were somewhat more objective, he might realize that communal farm methods no more make Israel "Communistic" than does common property make the religious orders "Communitic." This is not to say that a spiritual zeal animates all Israelis; but it is to say that even a faith as spent and as this-worldly as that of so many of them is still strong enough a force to bind them together.

In putting together as bedfellows the "Khazar Zionists" and the Communists, Dr. Beaty has lived up to still another mark of the conspiracy method, namely, to pick two pet hates and allege that they are conspiring against you jointly. Whenever the justified opposition to Communism is joined by another hatred—be it of the Catholic Church, Jews, Democrats, Negroes, or the British—then the mania has set in. Then the clear and present danger is parodied into "twenty years of treason" or "the plot of the Khazars," and all real problems are befogged in hate—hate made all the more detestable in this case by the author's conscious effort to enlist Catholics on the side of wrong.

I wonder whether Dr. Beaty is unaware that anti-Semitism hardly ever stops at hatred of Jews, but from there leads all too easily to hatred of the Old, and then the New, Testament, to rejection of Christ and the Church. For he is at pains to tell us that his "anti-Khazarism" does not reflect on the Bible and the Israel of old. He wants us to believe that as the Jews of old, through the house and family of David, brought Redemption into the world, so the Jews, through the conversion of the house and nation of Bulan, the Khazar king, brought Communism into the world. To the Catholic, salvation is of the Jews. To Dr. Beaty, damnation is of them also. Dr. Beaty's Christianity is not that of the One for whom it is named, as Hitler's swastika, according to Pius XI, was a cross that was not the cross of Christ.

Of the continued existence of the Khazars, Dr. Beaty offers no proof. Even the conversion to Judaism of any number of them

other than the nobility he leaves uncertain; and he gives us no evidence of the converted gentry's steadfastness in that faith through the succeeding centuries. It is all bald assertion. He makes no claim of mutual exclusiveness between Khazar and non-Khazar Jews, so that the Khazars must by now be assimilated into the general Jewish body. To single them out as a conspiracy party is about as realistic as claiming that the Normans are ruining modern England or that the "Milesian party" is subverting Ireland. Of the theory that modern Jews coming from eastern Europe are descendants of the Khazars, D. M. Dunlop, in his *History of the Jewish Khazars* (Princeton University Press, 1954), says, with the scholarly caution so completely wanting in Dr. Beaty's book, that it "retains the character of a mere assumption" and goes "much beyond what our imperfect records allow" (pp. 261, 263).

Professor Dunlop also notes that the Khazars, prior to their king's conversion to Judaism, held back the Arabs from an attempted invasion of Europe by a route north of the Black Sea. He concludes that this military feat was scarcely less important to Christendom than the victory over the Arabs by Charles Martel at Tours in 732 (pp. ix, x). Hence those who Dr. Beaty says would destroy us to-day are descendants of those who saved us yesterday. But if good and evil may be descended from the same stock, then history is made by free will, and Dr. Beaty's theory of evil races is chased back into its sewer.

Thus the Khazars are a new dodge in an old game, that of baiting Jews, just as race is a new front for the attack on religion. It is therefore one of Dr. Beaty's crimes that he attacks a religion in the name of defense of religion, and seeks to create a spiritual civil war while the Communists camp at the gates. His attack on Jews is, in this sense, an attack on them where they are least vulnerable: in their spiritual discipline. This is not to say that I, as a Christian, find Jewish theology invulnerable. But it is vulnerable only theologically. And Dr. Beaty's book is anything but theological.

Jewish errors, whether in politics or in social or international relations, are, of course, open to a critical review, as are the errors of all men, of all groups. But Dr. Beaty gives us no such review. The very force of his attack forestalls any such review, obligating all men of good will to close ranks and defend the rights of Jews.

Those rights include the right to be Jewish in our society and the right to a good name. Dr. Beaty, who claims to be defending Western civilization, should certainly see that these rights and others are demanded by elementary justice. But logic and Dr. Beaty are friends only when the conclusion fits his predetermined desires. Otherwise, logic has nothing to do with the case, and, ultimately, hate or bigotry or monomania have everything to do with it.

To return to the Chesterton thesis with which I began, the conspiracy theorist transmutes any set of facts into his own proofs, until he thinks all the world is leagued against him, and the more one seeks to argue with him, the more reason he finds for linking his opponents to the plot. The devils who goad him are thus not subject to eviction by such a brief as this. That kind is not driven out but by prayer and fasting.

JOHN J. BRACKEN