

**The Protocols of Zion Toolkit.** The strongest arguments that the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* is a forgery, and why they're wrong.

Peter Myers, September 22, 2002; update October 7, 2012. My comments are shown {thus}.

In this study of the *Protocols of Zion*, I present the strongest counter-arguments of my ablest opponents (Israel Zangwill, Herman Bernstein, Norman Cohn), that it's a forgery, in their own words. I do so because, unless I can refute their strongest points, my case is not made.

This, I believe, is my strength: that I am able to do so. I have yet to see any of my opponents, e.g. Jared Israel, place a link to this page on any of their websites, although I link to Jared Israel. Reader, if you know of such a link, please inform me: [contact.html](#).

Whilst I believe the *Protocols of Zion* authentic, my view is probabilistic. Philosophically, I emphasise uncertainty - the limits of human knowledge; that we only know partial truths - whereas dogmatists want to replace one system of certainty (e.g. Christian dogma) with another (e.g. Atheistic or New Age): [perspectivism.html](#).

In keeping with this philosophy, I have no problem with my opponents' views being publicly available, and facilitate this by quoting them or linking to them; they, however, seem not to reciprocate.

The fact that I believe the *Protocols* authentic does not mean that I think it 100% "correct". For example, I disapprove of its endorsement of aristocracy; I interpret this as meaning that aristocratic control (feudalism) stood in the way of the revolutionary changes exemplified by the French and Russian Revolutions.

To the extent that the *Protocols* seems to have correctly predicted the trend of events, this implies some constancy of intent. Even if so, things have not always gone to plan; there are other forces at play. History books may be 99% accurate, but the 1% they omit makes all the difference. When "writing in" that 1%, one might give the impression that the other 99% does not count; but, of course, one is merely correcting what has been omitted or distorted.

This is Part 1 of the Toolkit. It deals with the arguments at the top level, and links to resources putting the case that the *Protocols of Zion* is a forgery, in particular a plagiarism of *Dialogues in Hell Between Machiavelli and Montesquieu*, by Maurice Joly, published in 1864. These arguments are critically examined.

Part 2 of the Protocols of Zion Toolkit deals with the Revolutionary background to Emperor Napoleon III of France, against whom Joly's *Dialogues* is pitched. The French Revolution, the Communist Revolutions of 1830, 1848 and 1871, and the Bolshevik Revolution are covered here.

**As the *Dialogues* presents it, Napoleon III is the Machiavellian**, fooling the people; **as the *Protocols* present it, the Revolutionaries are the Machiavellians**, causing chaos and turmoil, and aiming at totalitarian control and a Reign of Terror.

1. Introduction
2. The Case that the *Protocols* is a Forgery
3. Evaluating the Bernstein / Cohn Argument
4. Nesta Webster on Free Masonry, the French Revolution, and the *Protocols of Zion*
5. The *Protocols of Zion* compared to the *Tanaka Memorial*
6. Stalin accused of endorsing the *Protocols*
7. The Revolutionary background to Napoleon III
8. Napoleon III's Rule
9. Assessments of Napoleon III
10. The Push for World Government at the Peace Conference of Versailles (1919)
11. One man stops World Government.
12. The *Protocols of Zion* and the Peace Conference of Versailles
13. Douglas Reed on the ousting of Lord Northcliffe
14. More on the Ousting of Lord Northcliffe from *The Times* of London
15. Lloyd George explains why Britain made "a contract with Jewry"
16. Marranism and Universalism 17. Israel Zangwill on the *Protocols*
17. Herman Bernstein for World Government
18. One World - Utopian or Totalitarian?
19. Conclusion
20. Challenge to Jared Israel and Alexander Baron (November 28, 2002)

## 1. Introduction

My first article on the *Protocols of Zion*, titled *Hiding Behind Auschwitz*, was written in 1995, a few months after I encountered the *Protocols*. At the time, I had not read Joly's *Dialogues*, but I had read extracts of the parallel passages, plus the main arguments put by Norman Cohn.

*Hiding Behind Auschwitz* contains material which is not repeated here; the Protocols of Zion Toolkit is written in conjunction with it: [hiding.html](#).

The title of Norman Cohn's book, *Warrant For Genocide*, implies that the *Protocols of Zion* - the book itself - is responsible for Hitler's persecution of Jews.

**The implication is that anyone who believes the *Protocols* genuine is guilty of this. What then of the Russians, like Alexander Solzhenitsyn, who opposed Bolshevik rule yet found the Nazi invasion most unwelcome (not to say deadly)? Must they, too, be branded Nazis?**

Does Norman Cohn want the *Protocols* banned? Burned? Yet, one cannot understand twentieth century history without this book: it's in leading university and national libraries. **Whereas Cohn blames this book for genocide, others regard it as a dire warning to distrust the World Government our beneficiaries seem determined to bestow on us.**

The *Protocols* appears to shed light on the social revolutionary movement, and the One World forces.

Our task is not cheap propaganda, but a deep investigation of the "social revolution" afflicting the West at present, and tracing its roots back several centuries.

This requires study of not only the French and Bolshevik Revolutions, but the Revolutions of 1848 & 1871 (Paris Commune), and the regime of Emperor Napoleon III of France, against which Maurice Joly wrote his *Dialogues in Hell Between Machiavelli and Montesquieu*, published in 1864, which has much in common with the *Protocols of Zion*.

The reference to "hell" means the spirit world: the book is cast as a discussion between the ghosts of Machiavelli and Montesquieu.

Emperor Napoleon III of France was sandwiched between two attempted Communist Revolutions. Joly, one of the revolutionaries, directed his *Dialogues* book against the Emperor.

**Karl Marx took part in both Revolutions: in the German part of the 1848 revolution, and in the 1871 Paris Commune**, in France. After the failure of the 1848 revolution, he spent more than a decade "in exile" in England, studying at the British Museum, and writing.

So, the context of Joly's *Dialogues* is the choice between Revolution and Napoleon.

Napoleon III will thus become a central figure in our study.

**The parallel passages in Joly's *Dialogues* comprise 16.45% of the *Protocols*, by word-count. This is substantial, but still less than one sixth of the total.** What Norman Cohn especially omits to mention, is the *Protocols*' extensive coverage of the world finance system, unmatched in the *Dialogues*.

**Even the parallel passages, however, are not the same: the meaning is often quite different, despite the similarity.**

My argument is that **Joly did not create these parallel passages *ex nihilo*, but modified an existing revolutionary text** (precursor of the *Protocols*), **reworking parts of it to suit his attack on Napoleon III.**

This is quite common for a writer. As I compose this very "toolkit", I am doing the same: blending many source materials in my possession, including reworking earlier articles of mine into my present purpose.

There is no short-cut in investigating the *Protocols*: a painstaking historical study is required. The method here is, partly to quote the history books, but also to focus on connections they omit.

**Much of the material presented here can be used to support either position with respect to the *Protocols*.** Much of it is background material, providing context in which to consider the issues.

My own approach is not ideological. I do not think that there is any ideal form of government. Rather, any form of government can have good instances (good rulers) and bad instances. Form does not determine content.

My basic political philosophy has nothing to do with Jews. I formulated it in my article *Living Without Utopia*, dated March 22, 1994, as follows:

"One might argue instead that **structure or form, on its own, does not guarantee quality or content.** That one might have a good Monarchy or a bad one, a good or bad Republic, a good or bad Communist society. **Revolution-borne experiments to create the perfect society**, whether Stalin's, Hitler's, or the push for Matriarchy, **are destructive and typically fail.**" [utopia.html](http://utopia.html).

This is not exactly a pessimistic view; rather, it argues that any good government, of whatever type, is unlikely to last; it will be replaced with another, which may or may not be better. This is our fate.

Even though I have an opinion on the *Protocols*, as stated, it is not an unqualified one. I am not certain of it, and **I accept that the evidence is not one-sided, but**

**that there is a case each way.** In presenting material arguing both sides, I hope to enable the reader to make an independent assessment.

Investigating this topic takes us on an odyssey into the undercurrents of modern history.

I invite quality refutations, and am prepared to add such material to this Toolkit: contact me at <mailto:myers@cyberone.com.au>.

## **2. The Case that the *Protocols* is a Forgery**

Most writers who cite parallel passages to claim that experts have proved the *Protocols* a forgery are downstream popularisers of more academic treatments they DO NOT CITE.

Philip Graves, a journalist employed by *The Times* of London in Constantinople and Jerusalem, and a non-Jew, was the first to argue, on the basis of parallel passages in Maurice Joly's book *Dialogues in Hell Between Machiavelli and Montesquieu*, that the *Protocols* was a forgery.

Journalism, however, is no substitute for scholarly analysis. The more scholarly treatments were begun by Israel Zangwill, extended by Herman Bernstein, then by Norman Cohn, all three being Jewish. Not all people brought up as "Jewish" remain so, so it must be noted that the first two were Zionist, and Cohn was favourably cited in *Who's Who In World Jewry*.

Ironically, one of the best arguments that the *Protocols* is genuine, is that one is not allowed, in public places e.g. in bookstores (other than mail-order ones), to present the case that it's genuine. What is distinctive about the Protocols Toolkit is that it presents the arguments of both sides. I have yet to encounter a proponent of the forgery case who is prepared to allow the other side to present its case too - e.g. who is prepared to place a link to this Protocols Toolkit.

### **2.1 The arguments of Israel Zangwill**

Zangwill pioneered the arguments later used by Bernstein: [zangwill.html](http://zangwill.html).

### **2.2 The arguments of Bernstein and Cohn**

Bernstein's book - *THE TRUTH ABOUT "THE PROTOCOLS OF ZION": A Complete Exposure* - contains an English translation of Joly's *Dialogues*.

Bernstein's book was first published in 1935. A new edition of 1971 included an introduction by Norman Cohn.

The following files are very big, and are therefore supplied in compressed form.

Herman Bernstein (1935) argues that the *Protocols of Zion* is a forgery; with an Introduction by Norman Cohn (1971) : [bernstein.zip](#).

Bernstein's Exhibit A, Maurice Joly's book *Dialogues in Hell Between Machiavelli and Montesquieu*, is excluded from the Bernstein file above, but is at [joly.zip](#).

Cohn only has an introduction in Bernstein's book. For his detailed arguments in *Warrant For Genocide* (1970), see [cohn.html](#).

### **2.3 Bernstein, Goedsche and the Devil**

Bernstein and Cohn indulge in hyperbole, exaggerating their opponents' case and thereby exposing it to ridicule.

In writing of the *Protocols*, they repeatedly beg the question by using the emotive expressions *forgery*, *plagiaris[m]*, *fantastic*, *spurious*, *notorious*, *fantasy*, *noxious fabrication*, *"needs no comment"*, *"his imagination"*, *"of course"*, and the like.

Perhaps it's understandable that they were unloosing their emotions; on the other hand, they claim academic objectivity, and emotion is a hindrance, not an aid, to it.

**Twice in his book *The Truth About the "Protocols of Zion"*, Herman Bernstein claims that the story "The Jewish Cemetery in Prague and the Council of Representatives of the Twelve Tribes of Israel", published by Goedsche, has the Devil present at the meeting.**

On p. 21 Bernstein writes,

'According to Goedsche's fantastic story, the representatives of the twelve tribes of Israel meet once in a hundred years in the Prague cemetery ... The midnight meeting, depicted by Hermann Goedsche in the style of blood-curdling fiction, is secretly attended by a converted Jew and by a "large-sized man, with the pale serious face of Germanic type." **The Devil himself, the son of "the accursed one," is also present at that midnight meeting of the representatives of the twelve tribes of Israel. And from time to time the Devil is quoted as making side remarks.**'

On p. 265 Bernstein writes,

'Here follows a translation from the Russian of the German novelette by the notorious Hermann Goedsche, who used the pseudonym of "Sir John Retcliffe." This product of "Retcliffe's fantastic imagination" tells its own story, clearly

foreshadowing the *Protocols*, with all its accompaniment of melodrama, **not even omitting the Devil himself.'**

This is incorrect.

**Bernstein implies on p. 21 that the expression "son of the accursed" means the Devil.**

But the text of the story, provided by Bernstein, reads:

{quote} {p. 272} Thirteen old men came over to the tombstone ... {p. 273} At that moment the clock struck twelve. A sharp metallic sound rang out on the grave, after which a blue flame appeared and illumined the thirteen kneeling figures.

**"I greet you, Roshe beth Aboth (heads) of the twelve tribes of Israel," announced a dull voice.**

**"We greet you, son of the accursed."**

{p. 274} {The representatives of the 12 Tribes introduce themselves, then the first speaker says:}

"And I am the representative of the unfortunate and exiles," said the man who asked the questions in a dull voice. "I am myself wandering about all over the world in order that I may unite you ... "

**The man who was the first to arrive rose and then seated himself upon the tombstone. One by one the others came over to him and whispered in his ear a seven-syllabled word, and each time he nodded in approval. After that all returned to their former places. "Brethren," said the Levite, "our fathers formed a union ... To us belong the earthly god, which was made for us with such sorrow by Aaron in the desert ... the Golden Calf which the backsliders are worshipping!"**  
{end of quote}

**Clearly, the figure addressed as "son of the accursed" is a man, a Levite, the convener of the meeting. He is not the Devil.**

On p. 283 is stated, "It seemed to the doctor that on the top of the tombstone, in the bluish flame, there appeared a monstrous golden figure of an animal."

This is a reference to the Golden Calf story (above) and the worship of money. The doctor is a gentile German scientist introduced on p. 270.

There is no other statement that the Devil was present at the meeting in the cemetery.

Added September 10, 2008: I received the following letter on this matter:

{quote} From: F (name & email withheld) Date: Fri, 5 Sep 2008 15:39:43 +0000

Regarding your "The Protocols of Zion Toolkit", first part, section "2.3 Bernstein, Goedsche and the Devil" and the question of the Devil in the cemetery scene, I agree with your argumentation on the matter: **there is no reason to suppose the dull voiced person is meant to be understood as devil.**

I feel that the mysterious character represents a completely another character, one of both Jewish and mythical origin: **Ahasverus, the Wandering Jew.**

"We greet you, son of the accursed. ... And I am the representative of the unfortunate and exiles," ... **"I am myself wandering about all over the world in order that I may unite you ... "**

Ahasverus is the cursed one, having been cursed to wander in exile until the second coming of the Jesus. Character fits the description completely. Being "son of the accursed" he might be meant to be understood within the story plot as the 19th century descendant (or follower) of the mythical Ahasverus.

It is interesting to note how this Christian myth of medieval origins ties the end of Jewish people's exodus in with the Messianic times of the Second Coming.

For more detailed information please see Wikipedia's article: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wandering\\_Jew](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wandering_Jew)

Perhaps the original author wanted to include the character as a subtle artistic detail by borrowing the then well-known stereotype. Was there self-irony involved in it? (The fictional character of Ahasverus is of a distinctively Christian origin. The Jewish religious authorities do not recognize Jesus as a Messiah and thus do not coincide his second coming with the end of the exodus.)  
{endquote}

And a follow-up:

{quote} From: F (name & email withheld) Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2008 20:06:16 +0000

Thinking about this Ahasverus, now I'm quite sure the writer used the legendary character to add colour and perhaps self-irony to the story. I think that by no means did he meant the dull-voiced one to be understood literally as "son of the accursed", that is son of the Ahasverus. I think it's just one of those small details which show the text's author was not a bad writer at all. {endquote}



## 2.4 Cohn corrects Bernstein about Stepanov

Bernstein writes in *The Truth About the "Protocols of Zion"*:

{p. 39} This account of the history of the *Protocols* in Russia is accompanied by a facsimile affidavit made in 1927 by Philip Stepanov, one of the two friends to whom Sukhotin first showed the *Protocols* in Russia. Stepanov's tell-tale affidavit, translated from the Russian, reads as follows:

"In 1895 my neighboring estate owner in the province of Tula, retired Major Alexey Nikolayevitch Sukhotin, gave me a handwritten copy of the 'Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion.' He told me that a lady of his acquaintance (he did not mention her name), residing in Paris, had found them at the home of a friend of hers (probably of Jewish origin), and before leaving Paris, had translated them secretly, without his knowledge, and had brought one copy of that translation to Russia, and had given that copy to him, Sukhotin.

"At first I mimeographed one hundred copies of the *Protocols*, but that edition was difficult to read, and I resolved to have it

\*A copy of L. Fry's book, "*Waters Flowing Eastward*," second edition, Paris, 1933, is in the New York Public Library

{p. 40} printed somewhere, without mentioning the time, the city and the printer; I was helped in this by Arcady Ippolitovitch Kelepkovsky, who at that time was Privy Councillor with Grand Duke Sergey Alexandrovitch; he had these documents printed at the Provincial Printing Press; that was in 1897. S. A. Nilus reprinted these Protocols in full in his book, with his own commentaries.

"Philip Petrovitch Stepanov, former Procurator of the Moscow Synod Office; Chamberlain, Privy Councillor, and at the time of the publication of that edition, Chief of the district railway service of the Moscow-Kursk railway (in Orel).

"This is the signature of a member of the colony of Russian refugees at Stary and Novy Futog. (Cor. C. X. S.)

"Witnessed by me, Stary Futog, April 17, 1927.

"Chairman of the Administration of the Colony, "Prince Vladimir Galitzin." (Seal)

\*

The translation of this handwritten affidavit by Stepanov, given in L. Fry's book, contains several minor inaccuracies. The signature of Prince Vladimir Galitzin is transcribed as "Prince Dimitri Galitzin."

Thus the Russian anti-Semites themselves, anxious to vouch for the authenticity of the "*Protocols*" and their Zionist origin, by this affidavit give the lie to the Russian fabricators and disseminators of the *Protocols*, revealing that **the Russian translation of the spurious document had reached Russia two years before the first Zionist Congress was held in Basle**. This affidavit furnishes the missing link in the chain of incontrovertible evidence establishing the falsity of the *Protocols* and the sinister motives of the anti-Jewish forgers. It **also confirms the fact that officials close to the Tsar's family participated in the launching of the *Protocols* in Russia**.

{end of quote}

But in *Warrant For Genocide* (Pelican, Harmondsworth, 1970), **Cohn refutes Bernstein's claim, from Stepanov's affidavit**, that the *Protocols* was written in 1895, two years before the first Zionist Congress in 1897:

{p. 111} **As for the date, internal evidence suggests that** in saying he received the *Protocols* in 1895 and published them in 1897 **Stepanov was erring no more than is to be expected after thirty years**. There is for instance the remark, at the end of 'protocol' 16, that as part of the plan to stupify the gentiles **one of the Elders' agents, Bourgeois, is advocating a program of teaching by object lessons**. The reference is to **Leon Bourgeois**, a highly suspect figure in the

{p. 112} eyes of the French right wing since, as Prime Minister in 1895-6, he had included nine Freemasons in his cabinet. **From 1890-96 he frequently spoke in favour of a system of teaching by object lessons, and in 1897 these speeches were published in a book, *L'Education de la democratie francaise*; in 1898, as Minister of Education, he issued decrees on the subject**. A similar reference which points in the same direction is the passage in 'protocol' 10 where **the Elders recommend the election of presidents with some 'Panama' in their past**. This refers almost certainly to Emile Loubet, who was Prime Minister of France when the Panama scandal reached its climax in 1892. Though certainly not involved in the scandal itself, Loubet showed no eagerness to institute inquiries against those who were; and this made him a suspect figure. **In 1895 Loubet was elected President of the Senate**, which made him a candidate for President of the Republic, **and in 1899 he was elected President of the Republic**. The passage in the *Protocols* could have been inspired by either event.

As for **the Paris underground**, the Metro, **plans for it were announced in 1894**, but it was only **in 1897 that the municipal council granted the concession**, and it was **in 1900 that the first line was opened**. In view of the threat in

**the *Protocols* to blow up capital cities from the underground railways**, it is worth noting that in 1897 Drumont's *Libre parole* was lamenting the number of Jewish shareholders in the Metro. Again, it was **in 1896 that the Russian Minister of Finance Sergey Witte first proposed the introduction of the gold-standard in Russia**, in place of the gold-and-silver standard then in force; and in 1897 it was in fact introduced. This too figures in the *Protocols* - **in 'protocol' 19 there is the observation that the gold standard has ruined every state that has adopted it. But, above all, there is the title of the forgery itself.** One would normally expect the mysterious rulers to be called Elders of Jewry or Elders of Israel. **There must be some reason why they bear the absurd name of Elders of Zion**, and there is in fact a very plausible one. As we have seen, **the first Zionist congress at Basel was interpreted by anti-Semites as a giant stride towards**

{p. 113} **Jewish world-domination.** Countless editions of the *Protocols* have connected that document with the congress; and it does seem likely that **this event inspired if not the forgery itself, then at least its title. The year of the congress was 1897.**

All in all **it is practically certain that the *Protocols* were fabricated sometime between 1894 and 1899 and highly probable that it was in 1897 or 1898. The country was undoubtedly France**, as is shown by the **many references to French affairs.** {end quotes}

## **2.5 Gagging the debate.**

In parliamentary procedure, to "gag" a debate is to curtail it, cut it short, "guillotine" it.

### **What Cohn implicitly rules out of the debate:**

*(a) He does not examine the Jewish domination in the early USSR, except cursorily, or the association between Jews and Revolution admitted by J. L. Talmon: [talmon.html](http://talmon.html)*

In *Warrant For Genocide* he briefly addresses these questions as follows:

{p. 133} It remains true that **Jews**, in the sense of persons of Jewish descent, **provided a disproportionate part of the leadership** (though not of the total membership) of the two Marxist parties, the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. The reason is not hard to find. These were people who had broken with the traditional Jewish community and abandoned the Jewish religion but who nevertheless suffered discrimination and persecution under the tsarist autocracy; and this was

sufficient to lead them towards the parties of the Left. ... **Such Jews are usually idealists inspired by a vision of a society from which all forms of discrimination are banished.** In general they make poor politicians and they tend to be ousted soon after a successful revolution. ... **As for the Jews among the Bolshevik leaders, they too were almost all shot in the 1930s.** {endquote}

But Mensheviks such as Trotsky joined the Bolsheviks. As for the 1930s, **what about Kaganovich and Beria, and the many Jews manning the Cheka?**  
[kaganovich.html](http://kaganovich.html)

And Nahum Goldmann, Israel's "ambassador to the world", wrote in *The Jewish Paradox* (London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978):

{p. 167} **After the Revolution of 1917 there was a very intense Jewish cultural life in Russia, both in Yiddish and in Hebrew.** It should not be forgotten that Israel's present national theatre, Habima, was created in Russia. **All that intellectual activity, fed by newspapers and books in Yiddish, only disappeared when Stalin became a half-mad dictator haunted by the menace of an international Jewish conspiracy.** And a Jewish life goes on in various other Communist countries. **In Romania, for example, where there are eighty thousand Jews, there are synagogues, a Yiddish theatre and ritual foodstuffs.** The ritual slaughterers in Romania have some trouble in emigrating to Israel because the rabbis need them where they are, and the authorities persuade them that it is their duty to provide kosher meat for the Romanian Jewish community. ...

{p. 171} **Before the war, most Russian diplomats were Jews.** {endquote}

Isaac Deutscher wrote in his book *The non-Jewish Jew and other essays*, ed. Tamara Deutscher, OUP, London 1968:

{p. 71} In the Lenin era ... The Jews were allowed, and even encouraged, to publish their newspapers and their literature in Yiddish, and to develop their theatre - and the Yiddish theatre was one of the best I have known. It is now probably forgotten that the first great Hebrew theatre in history, the Habima, was founded in Russia on the initiative of the Commissar of Education, A. V. Lunacharsky. (Incidentally, the Habima soon left Russia for Palestine.) {endquote}

These reports hardly accord with Cohn's account.

(b) Cohn does not examine Jewish promotion of World Government at the Peace Conference of Versailles (1919), or in the Baruch Plan for World Government (1946): [baruch-plan.html](http://baruch-plan.html)

For example, Nahum Goldmann wrote (op. cit.),

{p. 107} **When the United Nations Organization was founded there ought to have been an attempt at least to abolish the sovereignty of states and to constitute a sort of world power.** Remember that despite appearances the scale is beginning to tip that way. State sovereignty is only a dangerous theory, but the reality is the Common Market, the Warsaw Pact, the Organization of American States, the Organization of African Unity, and so on, proving that every state has to give up its vaunted sovereignty little by little because of the complexity of the threats that concern us all. ... {p. 109} In the same way, within a generation or two there will be **a UN with real powers.** In an organization of that kind, **minorities - not just states - will have to be represented.** {endquote}

Many more such quotes from Jewish leaders are provided below. This can hardly be accidental, yet Cohn avoids discussing it.

(c) *He does not relate the Protocols' Jewish utopia to the Balfour Declaration, (Britain's "contract with Jewry" in order to win the First World War), or why the British Government might have thought that an alliance with Zionists would get the US into the war: [l-george.html](http://l-george.html)*

(d) *He does not relate the above points to the ideas and sense of mission of the Jewish religion, i.e. to intention and program. This omission is the more striking because Cohn has written (disparagingly) about nearly every kind of modern millennialism except the Jewish kind: [zioncom.html](http://zioncom.html)*

(e) *He does not relate the above points to the Jewish tradition of **Marranism**. In particular, he does not relate Marranism to **the Letter of the Jews of Arles and the Reply of the Jews of Constantinople***

(f) *He does not examine the politics of France before, during and after the reign of Napoleon III, against which Joly pitched his Dialogues*

(g) *He does not examine the parallels between Joly's Dialogues and Jacob Venedey's earlier book Machiavel, Montesquieu, Rousseau*

(h) *He does not examine the praise of Machiavelli, and appeal to Machiavelli, by Revolutionary writers and activists, such as Rousseau and Babeuf*

(i) *After saying that the Tsar dismissed the Protocols as a forgery, Cohn does not explain why the Tsarina had a copy of the Protocols with her at the time of her death.*

The above considerations form the subject-matter of the rest of this investigation.

### 3. Evaluating the Bernstein / Cohn Argument

#### 3.1 The Arithmetic of the Parallel Passages.

**The Forgery Hypothesis rests largely on the parallels between the Protocols (c. 1897) and Maurice Joly's book of 1864, *Dialogue aux Enfers entre Montesquieu et Machiavel* (translated into English as *Dialogues in Hell Between Machiavelli and Montesquieu*. The "hell" part refers to the spirit world: i.e. this is a debate between ghosts.**

Herman Bernstein lists the parallel passages in his book (above), side by side.

Norman Cohn writes in his book *Warrant For Genocide: The Myth of the Jewish World Conspiracy and the Protocols of the Elders of Zion* (Pelican, Harmondsworth, 1970),

{p. 82} In all, **over 160 passages in the *Protocols*, totalling two fifths of the entire text, are clearly based on passages in Joly; in nine of the chapters the borrowings amount to more than half of the text, in some they amount to three quarters, in one (Protocol VII) to almost the entire text.** Moreover with less than a dozen exceptions the order of the borrowed passages remains the same as it was in Joly, as though the adaptor had worked through the Dialogue mechanically, page by page copying straight into his 'protocols' as he proceeded. Even the arrangement in chapters is much the same - the twenty-four chapters of the *Protocols* corresponding roughly with the twenty-five of the Dialogue. Only towards the end, where the prophecy of the Messianic Age predominates, does the adaptor allow himself any real independence of his model. It is in fact as clear a case of plagiarism - and of faking - as one could well desire. {endquote}

Cohn's arithmetic is incorrect. **The word-count of the parallel-passages from the *Protocols*, as listed by Bernstein (at [bernstein.zip](#)), is 4,361, while the word-count of the *Protocols* is 26, 496.** That is, the **parallel passages comprise 16.45% of the *Protocols***; this is substantial, but still **less than one sixth** of the total. What Cohn especially omits to mention, is the *Protocols*' extensive coverage of the world finance system.

**Even the parallel passages, however, are not the same: the meaning is often quite different, despite the similarity.**

There are also parallels between Joly's book and Jacob Venedy's book of 1850, titled *Machiavel, Montesquieu, Rousseau* (i.e. *Machiavelli, Montesquieu and Rousseau*).

The following quote is from

[http://www.vegan.swinternet.co.uk/articles/conspiracies/protocols\\_proof.html](http://www.vegan.swinternet.co.uk/articles/conspiracies/protocols_proof.html)

{quote} **the passages quoted as being plagiarised from the Geneva Dialogues for the *Protocols* are remarkably similar to those in a book published in 1850, called, similarly, 'Machiavelli, Montesquieu and Rousseau' by Jacob Venedy. And Venedy was a Jew and a Freemason! He was a revolutionary and also a close associate of the Jew Karl Marx (real name Mordecai,) and Maurice Joly, the true author of the Geneva Dialogues!** {endquote}

Venedy's book is in some libraries - I have seen it - but there's no English translation, and it's written in the old Gothic German script, which few can read.

It would be very helpful if someone who can read this script, could locate a copy of the book and translate it into English. Then we could examine the passages said to be in parallel with Joly's *Dialogues*. Please write me at <mailto:myers@cyberone.com.au>.

A bookshop selling Venedey's book at

<http://dogbert.abebooks.com/abe/BookSearch?an=jacob+venedey>

described it as follows:

{quote} VENEDEY, Jacob. *Machiavel, Montesquieu, Rousseau ... Erster Theil [- Zweiter Theil]*. Berlin, Franz Duncker, 1850. First edition of this important study. **The German intellectual and revolutionary Venedey (1805-1871) continued his struggle after the failure of the revolution of 1848.** The purpose of this triple biography was to advance political thinking in Germany by explaining the doctrines of the three greatest modern theorists of the state. **The three authors are depicted as the embodiment of the theories they advanced: Machiavelli as the representative of absolutism, Montesquieu for constitutional monarchy and Rousseau as the advocate of the democratic republic.** For Venedey, Montesquieu, as a leading advocate of constitutional monarchy was decidedly not radical enough to erect a system of government of definitive theoretical and practical value. In all three cases political theory is mixed with biographical detail. {endquote}



**Karl Marx also wrote on Machiavelli and Montesquieu**, in his newspaper *Rheinische Zeitung* No. 125, May 5, 1842, Supplement.

Karl Marx, *Debates on Freedom of the Press and Publication of the Proceedings of the Assembly of the Estates*. In *Karl Marx Frederick Engels Collected Works*, Volume 1, Progress Publishers, Moscow 1975:

{p. 161} **Montesquieu has already taught us that despotism is more convenient to apply than legality and Machiavelli asserts that for princes the bad has better consequences than the good.** Therefore, if we do not want to confirm the old *Jesuitical maxim* that a good end - and we doubt even the goodness of the end - justifies bad means, we have above all to investigate whether censorship is by its essence a good means. {endquote}

### 3.2 Other Cases of Parallel Passages

In the Bible, the Book of Genesis contains parallel passages giving rival accounts of Creation, the Flood, and many other events: [bible.html](http://bible.html).

There are many parallel passages between the Gospels of Mark, Matthew and Luke. These three are called the *synoptic* Gospels; the Gospel of John stands apart, having a more Platonic outlook. Most scholars think that there was an earlier document called Q, used by the authors of Mark, Matthew and Luke.

No one accuses these authors of plagiarism.

John Dominic Crossan writes in his book *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography*, (HarperSanFrancisco, 1994):

{p. x} **If you read the four gospels** vertically and consecutively, from start to finish and one after another, you get a generally persuasive impression of unity, harmony, and agreement. But if you read them **horizontally and comparatively, focusing on this or that unit and comparing it across two, three, or four versions, it is disagreement rather than agreement that strikes you most forcibly.** And those divergences stem not from the random vagaries of memory and recall but from the coherent and consistent theologies of the individual texts. The gospels are, in other words, interpretations. Hence, of course, despite there being only one Jesus, there can be more than one gospel, more than one interpretation.

That core problem is compounded by another one. Those four gospels do not represent all the early gospels available or even a random sample within them but are instead a calculated collection known as the canonical gospels. This becomes



clear in studying other gospels either discerned as sources inside the official four or else discovered as documents outside them.

**An example of a source hidden inside the four canonical gospels is the reconstructed document known as Q, from the German word Quelle, meaning "source," which is now imbedded within both Luke and Matthew.** Those two authors also use Mark as a regular source, so Q is discernible wherever they agree with one another but lack a Markan parallel. Since, like Mark, that document has its own generic integrity and theological

{p. xi} consistency apart from its use as a Quelle or source for others, I refer to it in this book as the Q Gospel.

**An example of a document discovered outside the four canonical gospels is the Gospel of Thomas, which was found at Nag Hammadi, in Upper Egypt, in the winter of 1945 and is, in the view of many scholars, completely independent of the canonical gospels - Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. It is also most strikingly different from them, especially in its format, and is, in fact, much closer to that of the Q Gospel than to any of the canonical foursome. It identifies itself, at the end, as a gospel but it is in fact a collection of the sayings of Jesus given without any compositional order and lacking descriptions of deeds or miracles, crucifixion or resurrection stories ...** {end quote from Crossan} [downing.html](#).

To study the debate about Q among New Testament scholars, refer to <http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&ie=ISO-8859-1&q=Burton+Mack+Jesus+Q>

Here are some samples:

(i) Bruce Griffin, WAS JESUS A PHILOSOPHICAL CYNIC? <http://www-oxford.op.org/allen/html/acts.htm>

"Burton Mack, a professor of Claremont School of Theology ... published *The Lost Gospel: the Book of Q and Christian Origins* in 1993. Mack defended Q as the most reliable source for the reconstruction of the historical Jesus. Q in turn was believed to have gone through three different revisions or redactions before it was used as a source for Matthew and Luke. Mack here was relying on the brilliantly argued work of John Kloppenborg who believed that Q originally consisted of a collection of wisdom sayings ..."

(ii) The Search for a No-Frills Jesus, by CHARLOTTE ALLEN, *Atlantic Monthly*, December 1996 <http://www.theatlantic.com/issues/96dec/jesus/jesus.htm>

(iii) David Seeley, JESUS' DEATH IN Q {This article first appeared in New Testament Studies 38 (1992) 222-34 ...] <http://www.bham.ac.uk/theology/synoptic-l/jdeath.htm>

(iv) Mark Goodacre, The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem <http://www.ntgateway.com/Q/>

My argument, then, is that both the *Protocols* and Joly use a document like Q, unknown to us. This document would have circulated amongst leaders of some of the secret societies operating in Europe.

### 3.3 Differences between *Dialogues* & *Protocols*

#### 3.3.1 Who are the Machiavellians?

In Joly, the conspirator is the monarch; in the *Protocols*, the conspirators are those trying to overthrow him.

**In the *Dialogues*, Napoleon III is the Machiavellian**, preventing the people, led by the Revolutionaries of 1848, from installing a People's Democracy along the lines of the French Revolution.

**In the *Protocols*, the shadowy leaders lurking behind the Revolutionaries are the Machiavellians.** They are tricking the people into trusting their leadership, but when in power they will institute the Red Terror.

In the *Dialogues*, **Napoleon (the Machiavellian) is resisting the Revolutionaries; in the *Protocols*, the Machiavellians are sponsoring these Marxists**, anarchists, and utopian activists.

3.3.2 Joly is written "**after the event**", i.e. to satirise Napoleon's existing regime; the *Protocols* is written "in advance", **anticipating** a regime yet to come.

3.3.3 Joly's despot is **one** man; the *Protocols*' conspiracy has **many** participants.

3.3.4 Joly's despotism is **localised** to one country and one time; the *Protocols*' despotism **extends widely**, over many countries, regimes and decades.

3.3.5 The *Protocols*' conspirators envisages themselves running a **World Government**, and instituting a **new type of regime, unknown to past history**.

Compare this with Trotsky on World Federation:

'We are of course talking about **a European socialist federation as a component of a future world federation** ... ' (Dmitri Volkogonov, *Trotsky: The Eternal*

*Revolutionary*, tr. & ed. Harold Shukman, Harper Collins Publishers, London 1996, p. 209).

3.3.6 Joly's despotism is achieved without violence: "violence plays no role" (p. 174); "I who have taken as final policy, not violence, but self-effacement" (p. 226); at p. 236 the despot says "sometimes of duplicity, sometimes of violence", but Napoleon III had no concentration camps or gulag, no death squads, no mass graves of victims executed by a bullet to the back of the head, no glorifying of violence.

By comparison, Protocol 1 says that the best results are obtained by violence & terrorization; also, "we must keep to the program of violence and make-believe"; Protocol 3 advocates "the violence of a bold despotism".

This is much closer to Trotsky's violence of the Kronstadt massacre: [kronstadt.html](#) and his orders to use relatives as hostages, with the threat of executing them: [worst.html](#).

3.3.7 Napoleon (Joly's despot) is *for* religion; whereas the *Protocols* says its conspirators are *against* religion.

### 3.4 Timing & Future-orientation (Teleology)

Cohn admits that the *Protocols* was ignored until World War I and the Bolshevik Revolution, 20 or so years after it was written.

Cohn wrote in *Warrant For Genocide: The Myth of the Jewish World Conspiracy and the Protocols of the Elders of Zion* (Pelican, Harmondsworth, 1970):

"The myth of the Jewish world-conspiracy would have remained the monopoly of right-wing Russians and a few cranks in western Europe, and **the Protocols would never have emerged from obscurity at all, if it had not been for the First World War and the Russian Revolution and their aftermath.**" (pp. 14-15)

"The success of the *Protocols* before the war was in fact limited. Zhevakhov tells how in 1913 Nilus complained to him: {quote} I cannot get the public to treat the *Protocols* seriously, with the attention they deserve. They are read, criticized, often ridiculed, but there are very few who attach importance to them and see in them a real threat to Christianity, a programme for the destruction of the Christian order and for the conquest of the whole world by the Jews. That nobody believes ... {endquote}" (pp. 124-5) More at [cohn.html](#)

If it were a forgery designed to stir up pogroms etc., one would think that the forgers had failed, since it had no effect for 20 years.

Given that these alleged forgers had been stirring up pogroms repeatedly, one would think that they would be better at it, than 20 years of failure implies.

It was only **when** World War I (1914-8), the Bolshevik Revolution (1917), the Balfour Declaration (1917) and the attempt to make the League of Nations a World Government at the Peace Conference of Versailles (1919) **seemed to bear out predictions in the *Protocols*** - predictions which are **not in Joly's *Dialogues*** - that **the *Protocols* was taken seriously.**

**The same people who deny Jewish control of the Bolshevik Revolution (until Stalin stole their conspiracy), also deny the authenticity of the *Protocols*.**

Therefore, demonstrating this Jewish control is the first step in puncturing their argument: [russell.html](http://russell.html).

### **3.5 Control of Media**

The London *Times* was not in Jewish hands during World War I; but its anti-Zionist owner Lord Northcliffe, was ousted soon after: [toolkit3.html](http://toolkit3.html).

Robert Wilton wrote of the Russian media:

"Moreover, the Press, almost entirely in Jewish hands, had gone over to the Soviet, and Moderate organs that would not publish the Soviet proclamations glorifying spoilation and promoting Anarchy had been summarily "expropriated" on behalf of newly founded Socialist publications." (*Russia's Agony*, London, Edward Arnold, 1918, p. 174).

Benjamin Ginsberg, Professor of Political Science at John Hopkins University writes,

"Today, though barely 2% of the nation's population is Jewish, close to half its billionaires are Jews. The chief executive officers of the three major television networks and the four largest film studios are Jews, as are the owners of the nation's largest newspaper chain and most influential newspaper, the *New York Times*." (*The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1993, p.1): [ginsberg.html](http://ginsberg.html).

Michael Bakunin wrote:

Arthur P. Mandel, *Michael Bakunin: Roots of Apocalypse*, Praeger, New York 1981.

{p. 330} **"I know very well,"** he went on, **"that in frankly expressing my personal thoughts about the Jews I expose myself to enormous dangers.** Many people share [these views], but **very few dare to express them publicly,** because **the Jewish sect,** far more formidable than Catholic Jesuits and the Protestants, **constitute a real force in Europe today. They reign despotically in commerce and in the banks and have overrun three-quarters of the German press and a very significant part of the press of other countries. Too bad for anyone careless enough to displease them!"** {endnote 86: Bakounine, *Oeuvres*, vol. V, pp. 243-4}. [correctness.html](#).

Israel Shahak wrote:

"The bulk of the organized US Jewish community is **totalitarian, chauvinistic and militaristic** in its views. This fact remains **unnoticed** by other Americans **due to its control of the media**, but is apparent to some Israeli Jews. As long as organized US Jewry remains united, its control over the media and its political power remain unchallenged." (*Open Secrets: Israeli Nuclear and Foreign Policies*, Pluto Press, London 1997, p. 139). More of Shahak at [shahak1.html](#).

### **3.6 Finance - the Protocols' advanced theory of Money**

The "forgery" hypothesis says that the Okhrana plagiarised the *Dialogues* of Maurice Joly. But the *Protocols* opposes the policy on government debt endorsed in the *Dialogues*.

**Joly's despot** says, "I will borrow" the funds for government expenditure (*Dialogues*, p. 209); borrow from the public (p. 215); but pay reduced interest (p. 217).

He **speaks of the benefits of government debt** (p. 214) [joly.zip](#).

The **Protocols acknowledges that government debt is a trap**; that governments need not borrow funds for their expenditure on goods & services available in the local currency, but can create the money by fiat, as the banks do (but for which the banks charge interest, in effect a private tax).

**This was the way the finance system of the USSR operated.** When taxes were insufficient for government expenditure, Gosbank (the state bank) issued fiat money to make up the difference: <http://www.cbr.ru/eng/today/history/gosbank.asp>.

Protocol 20 says:

{quote}

**Every kind of loan proves infirmity in the State** and a want of understanding of the rights of the State. Loans hang like a sword of Damocles over the heads of rulers, who, **instead of taking** from their subjects **by a temporary tax, come begging** with outstretched palm **of our bankers**. Foreign loans are leeches which there is no possibility of removing from the body of the State until they fall off themselves or the State flings them off. But the goy States do not tear them off: they go on in persisting in putting more on to themselves so that they must inevitably perish, drained by voluntary blood-letting.

What also indeed is, in substance, a loan, especially a foreign loan? A loan is - an issue of government bills of exchange containing a percentage obligation commensurate to the sum of the loan capital. If the loan bears a charge of 5 per cent., then in twenty years **the State vainly pays away in interest** a sum equal to the loan borrowed, in forty years it is paying a double sum, in sixty - treble, and **all the while the debt remains an unpaid debt**.

From this calculation it is obvious that **with any form of taxation per head the State** is bailing out the last coppers of the poor taxpayers in order to **settle accounts with wealthy foreigners, from whom it has borrowed money instead of collecting these coppers** for its own needs **without the additional interest**.

So long as **loans were internal** the goyim only shuffled money from the pockets of the poor to those of the rich, but when we bought up the necessary person in order to transfer loans into **the external sphere** all the wealth of States flowed into our cash-boxes and all the **goyim began to pay us the tribute of subjects**.

{endquote}

In other words, the interest on foreign loans must be paid by the taxpayers. Governments could avoid that interest burden by issuing the money themselves; after all, the banks themselves create it *ex nihilo*.

The lesson is, that we need a finance system akin to the Communist one.

Protocol 20 also says:

"The present issue of money in general does not correspond with the requirements per head, and cannot therefore satisfy all the needs of the workers. **The issue of money ought to correspond with the growth of population and thereby children also must absolutely be reckoned as consumers of currency from the day of their birth.**"

This is the way a welfare system operates (child endowment, pensions etc.); i.e., the government issues money to parents for the care of their children, either directly via "family allowance" payments, or via additional wages or reduced taxes for workers with dependents. Yet it's unlikely that in 1897 any state had this type of money-issue.

"... the gold standard has been the ruin of the States which adopted it ... **With us the standard that must be introduced is the cost of working-man power,** whether it be **reckoned in paper or in wood.** We shall make the issue of money **in accordance with the normal requirements of each subject, adding to the quantity with every birth and subtracting with every death.**" [protocol.html](#)

This accurately describes the sort of finance system the USSR had. I believe that, via such prescriptions, **the *Protocols* contains not only the key to what is wrong with our finance system, but also the way to fix it.**

The conspirators did not want such a solution to be implemented, until they controlled the state directly, not indirectly (through other people).

At the time the *Protocols* was written, Russia was getting deeply into foreign debt:

W. O. Henderson, *The Industrialization of Europe 1870-1914* (Thames and Hudson, London 1969).

{p. 87} Foreigners also helped to build Russia's early railway lines. **Much of the capital** of the Great Russia Railway Company of 1857 **was raised abroad.** Three French banks were particularly active in providing money for the company and the necessary bridges, locomotives and rolling-stock were largely supplied by French firms.

However, Russia's industrial progress in the 1890s was to a great extent the achievement of **Count Sergei Witte, Minister of Finance between 1892 and 1903.** In the eleven years that he held office Witte pressed forward energetically with his plans to speed up the pace of industrialization. Since he considered the construction of a greatly improved railway system the key to future economic progress, he had **the railways of Russia nearly doubled in length:** Moscow was linked with the ports of Archangel and Riga and the textile centre of Ivanovo-Vognessensk; St Petersburg gained direct access to the Ukraine, while Kiev was joined to the Donetz valley, and Rostov, on the Don, was linked with the oilfield of Baku. Witte's most spectacular railway was the Trans-Siberian line, of which well over 3,000 miles had been completed by 1899. Heavy government investment in railways fostered the expansion of the iron, steel and engineering industries; there

was great activity in the Krivoi-Rog iron-field, the Donetz coal basin and the **Baku oilfield**; the industrial resources of Siberia and Central Asia

{p. 88} began to be opened up, and even the remote Chinese provinces of Manchuria and Korea were subject to Russian economic penetration.

**To finance an enormous programme of public works Witte relied heavily upon government borrowing from abroad** and upon persuading foreign capitalists to invest in Russian industrial enterprises. In answer to his critics Witte insisted that in the past all underdeveloped countries had relied upon borrowed money to assist in financing the early phase of industrialization. But **his financial policy undoubtedly placed heavy burdens upon the Russian taxpayers and consumers**. Witte's critics complained that prices were rising, that grain was being exported even when there was a poor harvest and that 'Witte's system' could survive only so long as foreign - particularly French - investors were prepared to go on buying Russian State bonds and shares in new Russian joint-stock companies. They claimed that many of the new industries were being run by foreign entrepreneurs for the benefit of foreign investors, and that although some manufacturing regions (such as the Donetz valley) might appear to be flourishing, older industrial areas (such as the Urals) were declining. The critics also argued that if industry were to flourish there must be a heavy home demand for consumer goods.

Towards the end of his term of office Witte began to realize the need for overall State economic planning. With incomparable energy he extended his influence over the activities of one branch of the civil service after another. But in the Russia of his day he could never hope to gain decisive control over all aspects of economic life. Moreover, he came to see that the peasant problem lay at the root of Russia's difficulties in the 1890s. His recommendations for dealing with it fell upon deaf ears, though they foreshadowed the subsequent agrarian reforms of Stolypin. While Witte believed that an autocratic form of government was essential for Russia, he realized that Nicholas II lacked the understanding and will-power needed to carry out the crucial reforms. {endquote}

The *Protocols* was written around the same time as Witte was finance minister.

If the *Protocols* was created by the Okhrana (Secret Police), then this arm of government was warning of the danger of foreign debt, at the same time as the finance branch of the Russian government was endorsing Russia's getting deeply into that same foreign debt.



The State Bank of the USSR financed Industrialisation in the USSR by money printing: <http://www.cbr.ru/eng/today/default.aspx?Prtid=gbssr>

The State Bank of the USSR

[...] In the latter half of the 1920s the functions and activities of the State Bank changed dramatically. The change was mainly the result of the accelerated rates of **industrialisation**, which **required vast capital investment** in the basic industries within a short period of time.

It was impossible to industrialise the USSR by traditional methods, that is, by accumulating financial resources inside the country and using foreign loans. The population lacked the required savings, while foreign loans could not be obtained for economic (the world was in the grip of an economic crisis) and political reasons. As a result **industrialisation in the USSR was financed by money emission**. Throughout the entire period of phasing out the NEP the Soviet authorities tried to find the simplest means by which the state could distribute funds between the various sectors of the economy. {endquote}

This sort of **money-printing** is not like that done by the Federal Reserve. The money it creates ex nihilo is loaned at low rates to the private banks, which use it for selfish and unproductive measures such as speculation, manipulation of the stock market and of currency exchange rates - anything to make a quick dollar. If the money was provided to the Federal, State and Local Governments, and used to fund infrastructure and other public-sector employment, it would have a beneficial outcome. The only drawback **is accounted a public debt** (ie a debt of the Treasury to the Central Bank), and therefore repayable (with interest) out of taxation, **even though the central bank created it ex nihilo**.

**Ambrose Evans-Pritchard**, the UK Telegraph's economic commentator, **called for Public Debt to Central Banks to be written off**, to avoid a global depression:

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/finance/ambroseevans-pritchard/100019130/the-collapse-in-us-manufacturing-and-services-shows-that-things-could-be-about-to-get-a-lot-worse/>

Wednesday 22 August 2012

Weimar solution beckons as manufacturing crashes in US Fifth District?

By Ambrose Evans-Pritchard

Last updated: July 25th, 2012

As Britain tanks by 0.7pc in the second quarter (much worse than Spain at 0.4pc), it is worth keeping a close eye on the very ominous turn of events in the US.

The Richmond Fed's twin indices of manufacturing and services a very good indicator at the onset of the Great Recession collapsed this month. ...

If so, we can all have a ferocious argument yet again about what to do next **to avoid a global depression (if we are not in a "contained" variant already)**.

Needless to say, **I will be advocating 1933 monetary stimulus** à l'outrance, or trillions of asset purchases through old fashioned open-market operations through the quantity of money effect (NOT INTEREST RATE 'CREDITISM') to avert deflation and continue doing so until nominal GDP is restored to its trend line, at which point the stimulus can be withdrawn again.

And the Austro-liquidationists (whom I love during bubbles, and hate during busts) can all hurl shoes at me.

We can also argue about another sneaky idea. If the central banks are able to buy fistfuls of bonds right now without a ripple effect on inflation and investors are still rushing into the safe havens, Bunds, Gilts, Treasuries, JGBs, etc. **why not just quietly write off those central bank holdings and seize the moment to slash public debt by non-inflationary fiat?** {endquote}

The point is, there is no need to reckon Government debt to its own central bank as real debt. **Governments do not need to borrow money - they can create it, as central banks do.**

**Richard Werner, Professor of International Banking** at the University of Southampton, wrote a book titled *Princes of the Yen*, about the Central Bank of Japan.

In it he **commented on the paper money of Kublai Khan, Emperor of China**. Our information about it comes from Marco Polo, a merchant who spent twenty years there in the late thirteenth century.

{p. 40} He did not fail to give an account of the most advanced monetary system at the time.

The world's first paper money was launched in the tenth century in China by the ruling Sung Dynasty. In this advanced monetary system, there was no doubt about what money was: **the paper money issued by the emperor** and stamped by his

seal. **He was the central bank. No other institution was allowed to create money, on penalty of death.**

The **emperor was directly in control of the money supply**. This meant that he could stimulate demand by creating more paper money, or cool the economy by taking paper out of circulation. ...

At the time, **European** kings and princes could only dream of such wealth or such power over the economy and their dominions. Things had developed quite differently for them in Europe. The **rulers there failed to understand the true nature of money. To them, only gold or other precious metals could be money**. But if gold is the main currency, it is impossible for a ruler to control the money supply. Gold cannot be created at will. Rulers tried, though in vain. Thanks to their efforts, chemistry got an early start in the form of the doomed attempts at creating gold through alchemy.

Compared to their colleagues in China, **European rulers could not really be considered fully in charge**. They could not control the resources in their countries. Kings had to compete with their own subjects for resources. A government that does not control the money supply has hardly any influence over its economy. Such a government is not sovereign. The great **Kublai Khan**, emperor of China and the Mongolian Empire, **would probably have shaken his head in disbelief if he had known that European rulers could not issue money to implement public-sector projects**. Instead, **European governments had to rely on taxes**. Often tax levels were already close to the pain threshold, and money was still needed for government investments or expenditures. **If the kings and princes still wanted to build roads, hospitals, and castles or raise an army to defend their country**, more often than not **they had to borrow money**. No matter how absolutist or all-powerful they may have called themselves, when it came to money most European rulers had to ask for help. ...

{p. 42} By about the thirteenth century, **paper money therefore also had its debut in Europe**. However, it was crucially different in its form, function, and implications from China's paper money. **It was issued not by the government but by a private group of businessmen**.

The Biggest Trick in History ...

{p. 43} **They charged interest for issuing paper slips that cost them nothing to produce!** They became wealthier and henceforth would be known as bankers.

The bankers had managed to do what kings, emperors, and alchemists had failed to do - they were creating money. They had found the philosopher's stone. They were the central bank of their time.

This had fundamental implications that were to change the course of history, for it meant that **the allocation of new purchasing power was not under the control of the government**. Europe's monarchs did not see through the deception. They naively believed that the bankers had large amounts of gold. When governments needed money and could not raise taxes further, **they too thought they had to borrow from the bankers**.

The irony was that **the bankers were just doing what the kings could have done themselves: issue paper money**. Yet because the monarchs came to rely on their bankers to fund large ventures, ultimately the bankers gained great influence over national policies. Soon it became doubtful who was really in charge of the country. The Old Testament says that the borrower is servant to the lender. Thus it came that the kings often had become servants. **Bankers were the masters** who created and allocated purchasing power. {endquote) More at [werner-princes-yen.html](http://werner-princes-yen.html)

### 3.7 Broadening the Topic

Cohn could have agreed, like Benjamin Ginsberg (above), that Jews created the Bolshevik Revolution (not *all* Jews, but Jews), and that they largely control the US media and government. He could have said, "yes, but", as Israel Shahak does. That would have been an acceptable position.

Instead, **Cohn broadens the topic beyond the *Protocols of Zion***, to any material on Jews behaving in a conspiratorial way:

**"Stalin in his last years produced a new version of the conspiracy-myth, in which Jews figured as agents of an imperialist plot to destroy the Soviet Union and assassinate its leaders; this was used to secure the execution of Rudolf Slansky and his Jewish colleagues on the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist party in 1952, and it also formed the basis for the story of the 'doctors' plot' in 1953."** (*Warrant For Genocide*, p. 15).

Stalin was murdered soon after: [death-of-stalin.html](http://death-of-stalin.html).

After Stalin, the contest between Zionists and anti-Zionists continued in the USSR. A document called "The Catechism of the Jew in the [former] Soviet Union",

circulated in the last decades of the USSR, and was published there in a newspaper in 1990. A copy is at <http://www.radioislam.org/zionism/#catechi>.

Cohn wrote,

**"New forgeries were also produced to supplement the *Protocols* and bring them up to date.** The most celebrated of these was a document said to have been found on a Jewish Bolshevik commander in the Red Army, of the name of Zunder." (*Warrant For Genocide*, p. 130).

**He rejects not only the *Protocols*, but any claim of Jews acting in a conspiratorial way,** treating this as tantamount to the *Protocols*.

In thus **overstating his case, he makes refutation easier.** It can be refuted by any direct evidence, e.g. of **Jewish domination of the US media.**

**Can one disclose** such information in public, **without being ignored, vilified,** subjected to *argumentum ad hominem*? Then this also provides **evidence of who is in power: those you cannot criticize, are those in control.**

Cohn's book, and books arguing a similar viewpoint, can be sold in bookshops. Can one get a critique of Cohn and Bernstein into the bookshops? Why?

### **3.8 Procedure**

The *Protocols*, on its own, cannot be used to establish a "One World" conspiracy, Jewish or otherwise.

But if such a conspiracy can be verified FROM OTHER SOURCES - such as H. G. Wells' affirmation of the Open Conspiracy for World Government ([opensoc.html](http://opensoc.html)) or the 1946 Baruch Plan ([baruch-plan.html](http://baruch-plan.html)) - then the *Protocols* can be examined to see if it provides extra information.

That is the only way to evaluate it.

Herman Bernstein & Norman Cohn do not evaluate it that way; instead they compare it with other like material, and say, "this is the old familiar literature".

The *Protocols* predicts that, after a world war, there will be an attempt to form a world government, secretly orchestrated by Jewish financiers.

This happened at the Treaty of Versailles: [wells-lenin-league.html](http://wells-lenin-league.html).

The Protocols also predicted a despotic government in the guise of socialism, once again secretly Jewish. This happened when Lenin & Trotsky set up the USSR: [lenin-trotsky.html](http://lenin-trotsky.html).

It is this kind of "coincidence" that keeps the Protocols relevant. Is there any other literature that made such a prediction?

### 3.9 The Question of Socialism

I maintain that the USSR, if only we could study it properly, would offer both lessons to avoid and lessons to adopt. In saying so, I expect to win few friends; but I believe that Capitalism is on its last legs. Any future attempt at socialism cannot be dominated by Jews, but neither can it exclude Jews; therefore the whole question of Jewish politics must be brought out into the open.

The secret Jewish control of Bolshevism was complicated by Stalin. After his ascendancy, there was a continuing struggle between the two factions, until Gorbachev. This bitter struggle destroyed Communism, except in Asian countries where Jews were lacking.

Stalin overthrew Jewish control, but still had to use Jews in his administration. He could not admit that the USSR had been established by Jews, for fear that the regime he had inherited would be delegitimated. Similarly, Christians are often embarrassed about the Jewish origins of Christianity, and try to deny it.

If today's proponents of One World are benevolent as they claim - if they only wish our good - why do they not admit the truth about the USSR?

## 4. Nesta Webster on Free Masonry, the French Revolution, and the *Protocols of Zion*

Let us begin with Leon Trotsky's observations on Freemasonry, which he studied when in Odessa prison:

From **Leon Trotsky**, *My Life*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1975.

{ p. 124 } It was during that period that **I became interested in freemasonry**. ... In the eighteenth century **freemasonry became expressive of a militant policy of enlightenment, as in the case of the Illuminati, who were the forerunners of the revolution**; on its left it culminated in the Carbonari. Freemasons counted among their members both Louis XVI and the Dr. Guillotin who invented the guillotine. In southern Germany freemasonry assumed an openly revolutionary character, whereas at the court of Catherine the Great it was a masquerade reflecting the { p.

125} aristocratic and bureaucratic hierarchy. A freemason Novikov was exiled to Siberia by a freemason Empress. ...

{ p. 126} I discontinued my work on freemasonry to take up the study of Marxian economics. ... The work on freemasonry acted as a sort of test for these hypotheses. ... I think this influenced the whole course of my intellectual development. {p. 127} {end quotes}

Nicholas Best on Templars, Freemasons and the French Revolution:  
[correctness.html](http://correctness.html).

**Nesta H. Webster**, *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, Omni Publications, Palmdale Ca; no publication date supplied, but the title pages say "first published 1924".

{p. 252} After the death of Babeuf, his friend and inspirer **Buonarotti** with the aid of Marat's brother **founded a masonic lodge**, the *Amis Sinceres*, which was affiliated to the *Philadelphes*, at Geneva, and as "Diacre Mobile" of the "Order of Sublime and Perfect Masons" created three new secret degrees in which the device of the Rose-Croix I.N.R.I. was interpreted as signifying "Justum necare reges injustos." {footnote 1: Archives Nationales, *Piece remise par le Cabinet de Vienne* (1824), F7.7566.}

The part to be assigned to each intrigue in preparing **the world-movement of which the French Revolution was the first expression** is a question on which no one can speak with certainty. But, as at the present moment, the composite nature of this movement must never be lost to sight. Largely perhaps the work of Frederick the Great, it is probable that but for the Orleanistes the plot against the French monarchy might have come to nought; whilst again, but for his position at the head of illuminized Freemasonry it is doubtful whether the Duc d'Orleans could have commanded the forces of revolution. Further, **how far the movement**, which, like the modern Bolshevik conspiracy, appears to have had unlimited funds at its disposal, **was financed by the Jews yet remains to be discovered**. Hitherto only the first steps have been taken towards elucidating the truth about the French Revolution.

In the opinion of an early nineteenth-century writer the sect which engineered the French Revolution was absolutely international:

---

1 CH: Het is rechtvaardig onrechtvaardige koningen te doden.

{quote} **The authors of the Revolution** are not more French than German, Italian, English, etc. They **form a particular nation which took birth and has grown in the darkness, in the midst of all civilized nations**, with the object of subjecting them to its domination.<sup>2</sup> {footnote 2: Chevalier de Malet, *Recherches politiques et histoiques*, p. 2 (1817).}

**It is curious to find almost precisely the same idea expressed by the Duke of Brunswick**, formerly the "Eques a Victoria" of the Stricte Observance, "Aaron" of the Illuminati, and Grand Master of German Freemasonry, who, whether because the Revolution had done its work in destroying the French monarchy and now threatened the security of Germany, or **whether because he was genuinely disillusioned** in the Orders to which he had belonged, **issued a Manifesto to all the lodges in 1794, declaring** that in view of the way in which **Masonry**

{p. 253} **had been penetrated by this great sect** the whole Order must be temporarily suppressed. It is essential to quote a part of this important document verbatim:

{quote} **Amidst the universal storm produced by the present revolutions in the political and moral world**, at this period of supreme illumination and of profound blindness, it would be a crime against truth and humanity to leave any longer shrouded in a veil things that can provide **the only key to past and future events**, things that should show to thousands of men whether the path they have been made to follow is the path of folly or of wisdom. It has to do with you, VV. FF. of all degrees and of all secret systems. The curtain must at last be drawn aside, so that your blinded eyes may see that light you have ever sought in vain, but of which you have only caught a few deceptive rays....

**We have raised our building under the wings of darkness; ... the darkness is dispelled, and a light more terrifying than darkness itself strikes suddenly on our sight.** We see our edifice crumbling and covering the ground with ruins; **we see destruction that our hands can no longer arrest.** And that is why we send away the builders from their workshops. With a last blow of the hammer we overthrow the columns of salaries. We leave the temple deserted, and we bequeath it as a great work to posterity which shall raise it again on its ruins and bring it to completion. {endquote}

Brunswick then goes on to explain what has brought about the ruin of the Order, namely, **the infiltration of Freemasonry by secret conspirators:**



{quote} **A great sect arose which**, taking for its motto the good and the happiness of man, **worked in the darkness of the conspiracy to make the happiness of humanity** a prey for itself. This sect is known to everyone: its brothers are known no less than its name. It is they who have undermined the foundations of the Order to the point of complete overthrow; **it is by them that all humanity has been poisoned and led astray for several generations**. The ferment that reigns amongst the peoples is their work. They founded the plans of their insatiable ambition on the political pride of nations. **Their founders arranged to introduce this pride into the heads of the peoples. They began by casting odium on religion. ... They invented the rights of man** which it is impossible to discover even in the book of Nature, and they urged the people to wrest from their princes the recognition of these supposed rights. The plan they had formed for **breaking all social ties and of destroying all order** was revealed in all their speeches and acts. They deluged the world with a multitude of publications; they recruited apprentices of every rank and in every position: they deluded the most perspicacious men by falsely alleging different

{p. 254} intentions. **They sowed in the hearts of youth** the seed of **covetousness**, and they **excited it with the bait of the most insatiable passions**. Indomitable **pride**, thirst of **power**, such were the **only motives of this sect**: their masters had **nothing less in view than the thrones** of the earth, and the government of the nations was to be **directed by their nocturnal clubs**.

This is what has been done and is still being done. But we notice that **princes and people are unaware how and by what means this is being accomplished**. That is why we say to them in all frankness: **The misuse of our Order**, the misunderstanding of our secret, has produced all the political and moral troubles with which the world is filled to-day. You who have been initiated, you must join yourselves with us in raising your voices, so as to teach peoples and princes that **the sectarians, the apostates of our Order**, have alone been and will be **the authors of present and future revolutions**. We must assure princes and peoples, on our honour and our duty, that our association is in no way guilty of these evils. But in order that our attestations should have force and merit belief, we must make for princes and people a complete sacrifice; so as to cut out to the roots the abuse and error, **we must from this moment dissolve the whole Order**. This is why we destroy and annihilate it completely for the time; we will preserve the foundations for posterity, which will clear them when humanity, in better times, can derive some benefit from our holy alliance. {endquote} {footnote 1: Eckert, *La Franc-Maçonnerie dans sa véritable signification*, II. 125.}

Thus, in the opinion of the Grand Master of German Freemasonry, **a secret sect working within Freemasonry had brought about the French Revolution and would be the cause of all future revolutions.** We shall now pursue the course of this sect after the first upheaval had ended.

Three years after the Duke of Brunswick issued his Manifesto to the lodges, **the books of Barruel, Robison, and others appeared, laying bare the whole conspiracy.** It has been said that all these books "fell flat." {footnote 2: Mr. Lucien Wolf, "The Jewish Peril," article in the *Spectator* for June 12, 1920.} This is directly contrary to the truth. **Barruel's book went into no less than eight editions, and I have described elsewhere the alarm that his work and Robison's excited in America.** In England they led to the very tangible result that **a law was passed by the English Parliament in 1799 prohibiting all secret societies with the exception of Freemasonry.**

{The books by Barruel and Robison are: (a) Abbe Barruel, *Memoire pour servir a l'histoire du jacobinisme* (1797) (b) John Robison, *Proofs of a Conspiracy against All the Religions and Governments of Europe*}

It is evident, then, that the British Government recognized the continued existence of these associations and the danger

{p. 255} they presented to the world. **This fact should be borne in mind when we are assured that Barruel and Robison had conjured up a bogey which met with no serious attention from responsible men.** For the main purpose of Barruel's book is to show that not only had Illuminism and Grand Orient Masonry contributed largely to the French Revolution, but that **three years after that first explosion they were still as active as ever.** This is the great point which the champions of the "bogey" theory are most anxious to refute. "The Bavarian Order of the Illuminati," wrote Mr. Waite, "was founded by Adam Weishaupt in 1776, and it was suppressed by the Elector of Bavaria in 1789. ... Those who say that 'it was continued in more secret forms' have never produced one item of real evidence." {footnote 1: A. E. Waite, "Occult Freemasonry and the Jewish Peril," in *The Occult Review* for September, 1920.} Now, as we have seen, **the Illuminati were not suppressed by the Elector of Bavaria in 1789, but in 1786 - first error of Mr. Waite.** But more extra ordinary confusion of mind is displayed in his *Encyclopedia of Freemasonry*, where, in a **Masonic Chronology**, he gives, **this time under the date of 1784, "Suppression of the Illuminati," but under 1793: "J. J. C. Bode joined the Illuminati under Weishaupt."** At a matter of fact, this was the year Bode died. These examples will serve to show the reliance that can be placed on Mr. Waite's statement concerning the Illuminati.

We shall now see that not only the Illuminati but Weishaupt himself still continued to intrigue long after the French Revolution had ended.

**Directly the Reign of Terror was over, the masonic lodges, which** during the Revolution **had been replaced by the clubs, began to reopen, and by the beginning of the nineteenth century were** in a more **flourishing** condition than ever before. "It was the most brilliant epoch of Masonry," wrote the Freemason Bazot in his History of Freemasonry. Nearly 1,200 lodges existed in France under the Empire; generals, magistrates, artists, savants, and notabilities in every line were initiated into the Order. {footnote 2: Deschamps, op. cit., II. 197, quoting *Tableau historique de la Maconnerie*, p. 38.} The most eminent of these was Prince Cambaceres, pro Grand Master of the Grand Orient. It is in the midst of this period that we find Weishaupt once more at work behind the scenes of Freemasonry. ...

{p. 408} APPENDIX II

## THE "PROTOCOLS" OF THE ELDERS OF ZION

Contrary to the assertions of certain writers, **I have never affirmed my belief in the authenticity of the Protocols, but have always treated it as an entirely open question.** The only opinion to

{p. 409} which I have committed myself is that, **whether genuine or not, the *Protocols* do represent the program of world revolution,** and that in view of their prophetic nature and of their extraordinary resemblance to the protocols of certain secret societies in the past, **they were either the work of some such society or of someone profoundly versed in the lore of secret societies** who was able to reproduce their ideas and phraseology.

**The so-called refutation of the *Protocols* which appeared in the *Times* of August 1922, tends to confirm this opinion. According to these articles the *Protocols* were largely copied from the book of Maurice Joly, *Dialogues aux Enfers entre Machiavel et Montesquieu*, published in 1864. Let it be aid at once that **the resemblance between the two works could not be accidental,** not only are whole paragraphs almost identical, but the various points in the program follow each other in precisely the same order. **But whether Nilus copied from Joly or from the same source whence Joly derived his ideas is another question.** It will be noticed that **Joly in his preface never claimed to have originated the scheme** described in his book; **on the contrary he distinctly states that it "personifies in particular a political system which has not varied for a single****

**day in its application since the disastrous and alas! too far-off date of its enthronement."** Could this refer only to the government of Napoleon III, established twelve years earlier? Or might it not be taken to signify a Machiavellian system of government of which Napoleon III was suspected by Joly at this moment of being the exponent? We have already seen that **this system is said by M. de Mazeres**, in his book *De Machiavel et de l'influence de sa doctrine sur les opinions, les moeurs et la politique de la France pendant la Revolution*, published in 1816, **to have been inaugurated by the French Revolution**, and to have been carried on **by Napoleon I against whom he brings precisely the same accusations of Machiavellism that Joly brings against Napoleon III**. "The author of *The Prince*," he writes, was always his guide," and he goes on to describe the "parrot cries placed in the mouths of the people," the "hired writers, salaried newspapers, mercenary poets and corrupt ministers employed to mislead our vanity methodically" - all this being carried on by "the scholars of Machiavelli under the orders of his cleverest disciple." **We have already traced the course of these methods from the Illuminati onwards.**

Now **precisely at the moment when Joly published his *Dialogues aux Enfers* the secret societies were particularly active**, and since by this date a number of Jews had penetrated into their ranks **a whole crop of literary efforts directed against Jews and secret societies marked the decade** - Eckert with his work on Freemasonry in 1852 had given the incentive; Cretineau Joly followed in 1859 with *L'Eglise Romaine en face de la Revolution*, reproducing the documents of the Haute Vente Romaine; **in 1868**

{p. 410} **came the book of the German anti-Semite Goedsche**, and in the following year on **a higher plane the work of Gougenot Des Mousseaux, *Le Juif, le Judaisme, et la Judaisation des Peuples Chretiens***. Meanwhile **in 1860 the Alliance Israelite Universelle had arisen**, having for its ultimate object "the great work of humanity, the annihilation of error and fanaticism, **the union of human society in a faithful and solid fraternity**" - a formula singularly **reminiscent of Grand Orient philosophy; in 1864 Karl Marx obtained control of the two-year-old "International Working Men's Association,"** by which a number of secret societies became absorbed, and in the same year **Bakunin founded his *Alliance Sociale Democratique* on the exact lines of Weishaupt's Illuminism**, and **in 1869 wrote his *Polemique contre les Juifs* (or *Etude sur les Juifs allemands*) mainly directed against the Jews of the Internationale**. The sixties of the last century therefore mark **an important era in the history of the secret societies**, and it was **right in the middle of this period that Maurice Joly published his book.**

Now it will be remembered that amongst the sets of parallels to the *Protocols* quoted by me in *World Revolution*, two were taken from the sources above quoted - the documents of the Haute Vente Romaine and the programme of Bakunin's secret society, the *Alliance Sociale Democratique*. **Meanwhile Mr. Lucien Wolf had found another parallel to the *Protocols* in Goedsche's book.** "The *Protocols*," Mr. Wolf had no hesitation in asserting, "are, in short an amplified imitation of Goedsche's handiwork" {footnote: *Spectator* for June 12, 1920} and he went on to show that "Nilus followed this pamphlet very closely." **The *Protocols* were then declared by Mr. Wolf and his friends to have been completely and finally refuted.**

But alas for Mr. Wolfe's discernment! **The *Times* articles came and abolished the whole of his carefully constructed theory. They did not, however, demolish mine;** on the contrary, they supplied another and a very curious link in the chain of evidence. For is it not remarkable that **one of the sets of parallels quoted by me appeared in the same year as Joly's book,** and that **within the space of nine years no less than four parallels to the *Protocols*** should have been discovered? Let us recapitulate the events of this decade in the form of a table and the proximity of dates will then be more apparent:

1859. Cretineau Joly's book published containing documents of Haute Vente Romaine (parallels quoted by me)

1860. *Alliance Israelite Universelle* founded.

1864. 1st Internationale taken over by Karl Marx

" *Alliance Sociale Democratique* of Bakunin founded (parallels quoted by me).

" Maurice Joly's *Dialogue aux Enfers* published (parallels quoted by Times).

{p. 411} 1866. 1st Congress of Internationale at Geneva.

1868. Goedsche's *Biarritz* (parallels quoted by Mr. Lucien Wolf).

1869. Gougenot les Mousseaux's *Le Juif*, etc.

" Bakunin's *Polemique contre les Juifs*.

It will be seen, then, that **at the moment when Maurice Joly wrote his *Dialogues*, the ideas they embodied were current in many different circles.** It is interesting, moreover, to notice that **the authors of the last two works referred to above, the Catholic and Royalist Des Mousseaux and the Anarchist Bakunin,** between whom it is impossible to imagine any connexion, **both in the same year**

**denounced the growing power of the Jews whom Bakunin described as "the most formidable sect" in Europe, and again asserted that a leakage of information had taken place in the secret societies.** Thus in 1870 Bakunin explains that his secret society has been broken up because its secrets have been given away, {footnote 1: James Guillaume, *Documents de l'Internationale*, I, 131} and that his colleague Netchaieff has arrived at the conclusion that "*in order to found a serious and indestructible society one must take for a basis the policy of Machiavelli.*" {footnote 2: *Correspondence de Bakounine*, published by Michael Dragomanov, p. 325} **Meanwhile Gougenot Des Mousseaux had related in *Le Juif*, that in December 1865 he had received a letter from a German statesman saying:**

{quote} **Since the revolutionary recrudescence of 1848, I have had relations with a Jew who, from vanity, betrayed the secret of the secret societies with which he had been associated, and who warned me eight or ten days beforehand of all the revolutions which were about to break out at any point of Europe. I owe to him the unshakeable conviction that all these movements of "oppressed peoples," etc., etc., are devised by half a dozen individuals, who give their orders to the secret societies of all Europe. The ground is absolutely mined beneath our feet, and the Jew provide a large contingent of these miners. ... "** {endquote} {footnote 3: *Le Juif*, etc., pp. 367, 368}

**These words were written in the year after the *Dialogues aux Enfers* were published.**

It is further important to notice that **Joly's work is dated from Geneva, the meeting-place for all the revolutionaries of Europe**, including Bakunin, who was there in the same year, and where the first Congress of the Internationale led by Karl Marx was held two years later. **Already the revolutionary camp was divided into warring factions**, and the rivalry between Marx and Mazzini had been superseded by the struggle between Marx and Bakunin. And **all these men were members of secret societies**. It is by **no means improbable then that Joly, himself a revolutionary, should during his stay in Geneva have come into touch with the members of some secret organization, who may have betrayed to him their**

{p. 412} **own secret or those of a rival organization** they had reason to suspect of working under the cover of revolutionary doctrines for an ulterior end. Thus **the protocols of a secret society modelled on the lines of the Illuminati or the Haute Vente Romaine may have passed into his hands** and been utilized by him as an attack on Napoleon who, owing to his known connexion with the Carbonari

might have appeared to Joly as the chief exponent of the Machiavellian art of duping the people and using them as the lever to power which the secret societies had reduced to a system.

This would explain Maurice Joly's mysterious reference to the "political system which has not varied for a single day in its application since the disastrous and alas! too far-off date of its enthronement." Moreover, it **would explain the resemblance between all the parallels to the *Protocols* from the writings of the Illuminati and Mirabeau's *Projet de Revolution* of 1789 onwards.** For if the system had never varied, the code on which it was founded must have remained substantially the same. Further, if it had never varied up to the time when Joly wrote, why should it have varied since that date? **The rules of lawn tennis drawn up in 1880 would probably bear a strong resemblance to those of 1920, and would also probably follow each other in the same sequence.** The differences would occur where modern improvements had been added.

**Might not the same process of evolution have taken place between the dates at which the works of Joly and Nilus were published? I do not agree with the opinion of the *Morning Post* that "the author of the *Protocols* must have had the *Dialogues* of Joly before him."** It is possible, but not proven. Indeed, I find it difficult to imagine that anyone embarking on such an elaborate imposture should not have possessed the wit to avoid quoting passages verbatim - without even troubling to arrange them in a different sequence - from a book which might at any moment be produced as evidence against him. For **contrary to the assertions of the *Times* the *Dialogues* of Joly is by no means a rare book,** not only was it to be found at the British Museum but at the London Library and recently I was able to buy a copy for the modest sum of 15 francs. There was therefore every possibility of Nilus being suddenly confronted with the source of his plagiarism. Further, is it conceivable that a plagiarist so unskilful and so unimaginative would have been capable of improving on the original? For the *Protocols* are a vast improvement on the *Dialogues* of Joly. **The most striking passages they contain are not to be found in the earlier work, nor, which is more remarkable, are several of the amazing prophecies concerning the future which time has realized. It is this latter fact which presents the most insuperable obstacle to the *Times* solution of the problem.**

To sum up then, the *Protocols* are either a mere plagiarism of Maurice Joly's work, in which case the prophetic passages added

{p. 413} **by Nilus or another remain unexplained, or they are a revised edition of the plan communicated to Joly in 1864, brought up to date and supplemented so as to suit modern conditions** by the continuers of the plot.

Whether in this case the authors of the *Protocols* were Jews or whether the Jewish portions have been interpolated by the people into whose hands they fell is another question. Here we must admit the absence of any direct evidence. **An International circle of world revolutionaries working on the lines of the Illuminati, of which the existence has already been indicated, offers a perfectly possible alternative to the "Learned Elders of Zion."** It would be easier, however to **absolve the Jews** from all suspicion of complicity **if they and their friends had adopted a more straightforward course from the time the *Protocols* appeared.** When some years ago a work of the same kind was directed against the Jesuits, containing what purported to be a "Secret Plan" of revolution closely resembling the *Protocols*, {see footnote 1 below} **the Jesuits indulged in no invectives, made no appeal that the book should be burnt by the common hangman, resorted to no fantastic explanations, but quietly pronounced the charge to be a fabrication. Thus the matter ended.**

But **from the moment the *Protocols* were published the Jews** and their friends had recourse to every tortuous method of defence, **brought pressure to bear on the publishers** - succeeded, in fact, in **temporarily stopping the sales** - **appealed to the Home Secretary to order their suppression, concocted one clinching refutation after another,** all mutually exclusive of each other, **so that by the time the solution now pronounced to be the correct one appeared, we had already been assured half a dozen times that the *Protocols* had been completely and finally refuted.** And when at last a really plausible explanation had been discovered, why was it not presented in a convincing manner? All that was necessary was to state that the origin of the *Protocols* had been found in the work of Maurice Joly, giving parallels in support of this assertion. What need to envelop a good case in a web of obvious romance? Why all this parade of confidential sources of information, **the pretence that Joly's book was so rare as to be almost unfindable when a search in the libraries would have proved the contrary?** Why these allusions to Constantinople as the place "to find the key to dark secrets," to the mysterious Mr. X. who does not wish his real name to be known, and to the anonymous ex-officer of the Okhrana from whom by mere chance he bought the very copy of the *Dialogues* used for the fabrication of the *Protocols* by the Okhrana itself, although this fact was unknown



{footnote 1} 1. *Revolution and War or Britain's Peril and her Secret Foes*, by Vigilant (1913). A great portion of this book exposing the subtle propaganda of Socialism and Pacifism is admirable; it is only where the author attempts to lay all this to the charge of the Jesuits that he entirely fails to substantiate his case. {end footnote}

{p. 414} to the officer in question? **Why, further, should Mr. X., if he were a Russian landowner, Orthodox by religion and a Constitutional Monarchist, be so anxious to discredit his fellow Monarchists** by making the outrageous assertion that "**the only occult Masonic organization** such as the *Protocols* speak of" - that is to say, a Machiavellian system of an abominable kind - which he had been able to discover **in Southern Russia "was a Monarchist one"**?

It is evident then that the complete story of the *Protocols* has not yet been told, and that much yet remains to be discovered concerning this mysterious affair.

{p. 370} 15. The Real Jewish Peril

In considering the immense problem of the Jewish Power, perhaps the most important problem with which the modern world is confronted, it is necessary to divest oneself of all prejudices and to enquire in a spirit of scientific detachment whether any definite proof exists that a concerted **attempt is being made by Jewry to achieve world-domination** and to obliterate the Christian faith.

That such a purpose has existed amongst the Jews in the past has been shown throughout the earlier chapters of this book. **The conception of the Jews as the Chosen People who must eventually rule the world forms indeed the basis of Rabbinical Judaism.**

{p. 402} It is this solidarity that constitutes the real Jewish Peril and at the same time provides the real cause of "**anti-Semitism.**" If in a world where all patriotism, all national traditions, and all Christian virtues are being systematically destroyed by the doctrines of International Socialism one race alone, a race that since time immemorial has cherished the dream of world-power, is not only allowed but encouraged to consolidate itself, to maintain all its national traditions, and to fulfil all its national aspirations at the expense of other races, it is evident that Christian civilization must be eventually obliterated. The wave of anti-Jewish feeling that during the last few years has been passing over this country has nothing in common with the racial hatred that inspires the "anti-Semitism" of Germany; it is simply the answer to a pretension that liberty-loving Britons will not admit. Those of us who, sacrificing popularity and monetary gain, dare to speak out on this question have no

hatred in our hearts, but only love for our country. We believe that not only our national security but our great national traditions are at stake, and that unless England awakens in time she will pass under alien domination and her influence as the stronghold of Christian civilization will be lost to the world.

{p. xii}

{footnote 10} 10. **I use the word "anti-Semitism"** here in the sense in which it has come to be used--that is to say, **anti-Jewry**, but place it in inverted commas because it is in reality **a misnomer coined by the Jews in order to create a false impression**. The word anti-Semite literally signifies a person who adopts a hostile attitude towards all the descendants of Shem--the Arabs, and the entire twelve tribes of Israel. To apply the term to a person who is merely antagonistic to that fraction of the Semitic race known as the Jews is therefore absurd, and leads to the ridiculous situation that one may be described as "anti-Semitic and pro-Arabian." This expression actually occurred in *The New Palestine* (New York), March 23, 1923. One might as well speak of being "anti-British and pro-English."

{end of quotes} Nesta Webster's book *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements* is online at these websites:

<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/19104/19104-h/19104-h.htm>  
<http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/19104>  
<http://textual.net/access.gutenberg/1/Nesta.H.Webster>  
<http://www.archive.org/details/secretsocietiesa19104gut>.

Trotsky on the Illuminati penetration of Freemasonry at the time of the French Revolution: [worst.html](#).

Nicholas Best on the link between Templars and Freemasons, and the Freemasons' role in the murder of the King during the French Revolution, as payback for the execution of Templar leader Jacques de Molay: [correctness.html](#).

The secret Zionism of the Freemasons and Rosicrucians; includes a photo of Karl Marx giving what is claimed as a Masonic handsign: [rosicrucian.html](#).

## **5. The *Protocols of Zion* compared to the *Tanaka Memorial***

**Ben-Ami Shillony, *The Jews and the Japanese: the Successful Outsiders***, Charles E. Tuttle Company, Rutland, Vermont, 1991.

Professor Shillony, who bills himself as "a Jew, an Israeli" (p. 10), combines Zionism with Marxism (Trotsky's, not Stalin's). Here, he explains the Jewish religion to Japanese readers, perhaps more frankly than he would to Westerners:

{p. 224} **The Japanese and the Jews complement each other in many ways. While the Jews have developed much of the "software" of Western civilization: great philosophical constructs, new theories, and revolutionary ideologies,** they often failed to act prudently on these ideas, becoming themselves the victims of their own contributions, as in the case of Marxism {an allusion to Stalin}. **The Japanese**

**{p. 225} are now providing the "hardware" of modern civilization: the machines and the material assets, but they have not yet produced any grand theories** that could deploy material abundance in a new way. **These two kinds of mastery, if combined, could provide new and unforeseeable achievements. ... In an economically and culturally integrated world,** in which people enjoy unrestricted mobility and access to each other's cultural assets, **the labels "Jews" and "Japanese",** as well as those of other ethnic and religious groups, **may lose their validity. When every human being becomes heir to the whole cultural heritage of mankind, there will be no more outsiders.**

{Is this what Zionism has striven for ... its own disappearance?}

{p. 64} ... **the Jews sought to revise, redraw, and replace the basic tenets of the West.**

{p. 64} **It is difficult to imagine the world today without the contributions of Karl Marx** {note that he is placed first, although the list is not chronologically ordered}, **Leon Trotsky** {tribute to Trotsky is the mark of a Trotskyist: Stalinists never do it}, **Sigmund Freud ... Many of these eminent persons were iconoclastic geniuses ... all shared the Jewish trait of challenging accepted truths** and searching out new ways of understanding the world. Carrying on the tradition of non-conformism and argumentation, **they came to shatter accepted doctrines and to offer new theories and concepts.**

{but if Jewish iconoclasm is mainly directed at non-Jewish culture, may it not be a type of propaganda - especially if scrutiny and criticism of Jewish politics is stymied as "anti-Semitic"?}

{p. 65} Unlike Marx, Freud never abandoned Judaism, even though he was not a practising Jew. ...

{p. 68} **The strong moral element in Judaism**, and the fact that they had long been the victims of persecution and discrimination, **made the Jews sensitive to all forms of injustice**. {what about the Red Terror, established by Lenin & Trotsky?} **The conspicuous role Jews played in socialist and communist movements** in many countries **was a clear expression of this moral sensitivity**. {but the Palestinians and the Arabs have not noticed it} In Germany one finds **Moses Hess, Karl Marx**, Ferdinand Lassalle, Eduard Bernstein, and Rosa Luxembourg. In the Russian revolution one finds **Leon Trotsky** {here's a Zionist supporting Trotsky}, Maxim Litvinov, **Grigori Zinoviev**, Lev Kamenev, Karl Radek, and **Lazar Kaganovich**.

{Kaganovich's nephew Stuart Kahan wrote, "**Lazar Moiseyevich Kaganovich ... orchestrated the deaths of 20 million people**" (*The Wolf of the Kremlin*, pp. 14-15): [kaganovich.html](http://kaganovich.html)}

{p. 70} **To be Jewish in the ethnic sense and to be Jewish in the religious sense were considered one and the same**. In modern Hebrew **the single word *yahadut* stands for both Jewry and Judaism**. {i.e. Jews are a religion}

{p. 17} Like most other peoples in the world, **the Jews and the Japanese have regarded themselves as unique nations**.

{Shillony claims that the Jews are a nation, but I argue that Jews, like Moslems, are a religion. The quote from p. 70 (above) supports this case; below (p. 19), Shillony says that Abraham was not born a Jew, but became one through adopting the Jewish religion. On p. 30, below, Shillony says that to become a Jew involves religious conversion}

**... in Judaism, the concept of a Chosen People ... referred to a particular ethnic group, the Children of Israel, who were bound by blood ties, and at the same time was conditional on their behaviour towards God and one another.**

{but not conditional on their behaviour to those not of their faith; has this not also been a mark of Christianity and Islam, Judaism's daughters?}

{p. 19} **Abraham was not born a Jew.**

{p. 20} **Both the Jews and the Japanese regarded themselves - and still do - as categorically different from any other peoples. ...**

**From what did this sense of separateness derive? In the case of the Jews, the cause was originally religious: Jews believed that God had chosen them above all other peoples, established a covenant with them, and entrusted to them his**

**holy commands. ... Other nations** that were not chosen for this special covenantal relationship **were called "gentiles" or "the other nations of the world". The Bible puts the following description of Israel in the mouth of the gentile prophet Balaam: "There is a people that dwells apart ..."**

{p. 22} The religion that was subsequently called **Judaism started as a spiritual revolution. ... The reduction of the number of deities from many to one ... was an affirmation of the basic unity of the universe and of the moral purposiveness that underlies it**

{thus put, Judaism would develop non-theistic variants too, as in the case of Marx and Freud}

**... Judaism and Shinto have treated other religions and creeds in opposite ways. The strict monotheism of Judaism excludes the belief in any other divinity.**

{p. 23} **This religious exclusivity was transmitted to Christianity and Islam.**

{as a result, clashes between them are titanic and uncompromising} ...

Shinto ... has been tolerant towards other religions and deities. ...

**Judaism sets strict moral rules** ... there are hundreds of injunctions regarding how one should behave toward God and toward one's fellow human beings, what one should eat, and what one should wear. ...

{p. 24} **Shinto does not have such a strict moral code. ... it presents no specific injunctions ... there is no Satan, or ultimate evil, in Shinto.**

{p. 25} The Jews, however, were the first to sanctify the week ... based on the biblical story of creation ...

{Shillony implies that Judaism invented the seven-day week. But the number seven had long been venerated in Babylonia because there were Seven Planets, each considered a god: Sun, Moon, Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn. Sunday is the Sun's day, Monday the Moon's day, Tuesday Mars' (Teutonic Tiu's) day, Wednesday Mercury's (Teutonic Woden's) day, Thursday Jupiter's (Thor's) day, Friday Venus' (Freya's) day, Saturday Saturn's day. Gilbert Murray writes, "Secondly, all the seven planets. ... Even Plato in his old age had much to say about the souls of the seven planets. Further, each planet had its sphere. The Earth is in the centre, then comes the sphere of the Moon, then that of the Sun, and so on

through a range of seven spheres" (*Five Stages of Greek Religion*, Watts & Co., London 1935, p. 140).}

{p. 26} **Different as these two religions are in their fundamental spirituality, they are both interested in this world rather than in the next.**

{p. 27} **Shinto and Judaism are religions that affirm life and shun suffering and death.** There are no Jewish monks or nuns, as there are no Shinto monasteries. **Neither of these religions considers sex to be a sin or a weakness of the flesh** as Christianity and Buddhism do. Both Shinto and Judaism reject celibacy. Abraham had both a wife and a concubine ... The Japanese emperors ... used to have many wives and concubines, as did the Jewish kings. It was only in the twentieth century

{p. 29} In Shinto not only mortals have weaknesses, but so do the gods. {like the old Indo-European tribal gods}

... Judaism and Shinto ... have both remained national religions. Belonging to the Jewish people and to the Jewish religion are synonymous; a

{p. 30} **Jew who converts to another religion ceases to be a member of the Jewish community, and a convert to Judaism automatically joins the Jewish people.** Most of the Jewish festivals relate to the history of the nation ...

{i.e. the Jews are a religion, not a nation in the normal sense; Jews constitute "a nation" only in the way Moslems do. That's why non-Jews i.e. goyim are called "the nations"; it follows that, within Judaism, there is no separation between "church" and "state". This contributed to Marx's concept of Praxis, the unity of thought and action, which led to the stifling of dissent under communism. }

{p. 31} **... Judaism was the first religion to make world peace a central element in its eschatology.** {borrowed from Zoroastrianism}

{p. 32} **Yet quite often peace implies domination, and in many languages the word "pacify" also means "conquer".** King Solomon could afford to be a king of peace because he ruled "over all the kings from the Euphrates to the land of the Philistines, and to the border of Egypt."

{this quote is from 1 Kings 4:21. At Genesis 15: 18, Exodus 23: 30-31, Deut 11: 24, and Josh 1:4, Jews are promised that they will rule these lands again}

**... The peaceful world that the Jewish prophets envisioned was to be ruled over by a scion of the House of David, later called the Messiah.**

**The Jews ... were always inspired by the belief that in the future world of peace and justice they would serve as spiritual leaders {i.e. rulers}. This vision of a world mission gave them the strength to suffer severe persecution and propelled them to the forefront of various messianic and "idealistic" movements in modern times like those of human rights, socialism, and communism.**

{i.e. Jewish Internationalism is partly motivated by the desire to rule}

{p. 38} **Versed in languages, familiar with different cultures, and with relatives or associates scattered throughout many towns and countries, the Jews were well suited to engage in international trade.** Indeed, their trading expertise made them assets to rulers of countries wishing to advance their own economies, such as the kings of Poland in the sixteenth century, who, to this end, invited Jews to come and settle there. {from where they later went to Russia}

{p. 40} **Despite the fact that for almost two thousand years there has been no Temple, the hereditary Jewish priests still enjoy a special religious status and a Jewish male usually knows if he is a priest or not.** This is often apparent in his

{p. 41} **last name, for if it is Cohen, Kuhn, Kaplan, or any of the derivatives of these, it is highly probable that he is a *kohen*.** As the distinction between priests and ordinary Israelites is transmitted from one generation to the next, those who are kohanim are usually aware of their status even if their names do not suggest it. ... **The Jews have preserved the identity not only of their hereditary priests, but also of the whole tribe of Levi, of which the priests were a part. Descendants of that tribe, the Levites, still tend to carry such last names as Levy, Levinson, Segal (an abbreviation of *sega*n Levi, or deputy Levite), or derivatives of these. ... various traditions and regulations that have no immediate relevance ... are retained in reverence for the past, as a substitute for the rites of the Temple, and in anticipation of the eventual return to the Holy Land and the rebuilding of the Third Temple there.**

{and in the endnotes to this chapter (Chapter 4), on p. 229, he adds: **"Kaplan" is "chaplain", i.e. "priest". As "Kahn" in German means "ship", some German Jews who were called Kahn changed their name to the other German word for "ship", which is "Schiff."**}

{p. 71} Many ... famous Jews ... were apostates, but some of these converts, like Heine and the British statesman Benjamin Disraeli, remained proud of their Jewish

origins and continued to consider themselves ethnically and spiritually Jewish people despite their conversions.

{i.e. were Marranos, practitioners of Marranism}

{p. 74} **Christianity embodied the spiritual essence of the West; it was the religion of the white man. ... both the Jews and the Japanese rejected Christianity out of conviction that it was unnecessary for achieving modernization and out of fear that it might destroy their self-perceived uniqueness.**

{Shillony implies that Jews do not think of themselves as "whites", even if widely regarded as such; presumably "whites" means "Aryans" to him}

{p. 77} Anti-Semitism is as old as the Jewish people {why? why don't other religions have the same problem?} ... **The great anti-Semites in modern times were often those who also feared and hated the "yellow race."**

{p. 78} By the beginning of the twentieth century **the racists claimed that Western civilization was under double attack from the inscrutable Japanese without and the cunning Jews within.**

{p. 79} **World War I ... advanced the international status of both the Japanese and the Jews due to Britain's dire need for support in the war.** In 1914 Japan acceded to Britain's request to join the war against Germany and was promised, as the spoils of victory, part of the German empire in Asia and the Pacific. ... **Britain also needed the support of the Jews**, especially those in the United States and in post-revolutionary Russia, **for fighting the war against Germany. ...**

{p. 80} But in 1922 Britain abrogated its treaty with Japan, and in its White Paper of 1930 it reneged on much of its commitment to a Jewish national home in Palestine, slaps in the face that both groups would not forget.

The suspicion with which large segments of Western society viewed Jews and Japanese after World War I was reinforced by the

{p. 81} **appearance of two forged documents ... One of these was the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* ... The other forged document was the *Tanaka Memorial*.**

{To the contrary, I argue that both are genuine; the Tanaka Memorial (July 25, 1927) was a blueprint for Japan's conquest of China and then Asia: [tanaka.html](http://tanaka.html). Ironically, the strongest reason for having a the UN, or even "One World"



government, is our fear of each other - fear of domination by any nation, race, religion, or class}

{p. 85} Cordell Hull, whose 1941 note, demanding a complete Japanese withdrawal from China as a condition for lifting the embargo on Japan, finally pushed Japan toward war.

{p. 86} After World War II the Jews and the Japanese became the two most upwardly mobile ethnic minorities with the highest levels of education and the lowest rates of crime.

The Japanese who emigrated to the United States assumed new identities. ... they transferred their commitments and allegiances from their former nation to their new one.

{p. 87} It is significant that **Americans of Japanese ancestry call themselves Japanese-Americans, whereas the Jews living in America refer to themselves as American Jews.** ...

**Unlike the Japanese-Americans who gave up allegiance to Japan, American Jews later became vigorous supporters of Israel.** ... American Jews lobby for Israel.

{p. 95} Auschwitz and Hiroshima thus represent new kinds of modern atrocities ... The fact that these horrors were perpetrated against the Jews and the Japanese puts these two peoples in the unique position of having experienced the worst that modern science enables human beings to do to human beings.

{yet Shillony lists Trotsky and Kaganovich as heroes, on p. 68 above, without any hint of compassion for their victims}

{p. 103} **The difference between Israel's earnings and its greater expenditures is covered by U. S. grants, which are larger than those to any other country.** ... Israel has become a major exporter of armaments.

{p. 106} Germany's trade surplus in 1988 was larger than that of Japan ... but the resentment against Japan was much stronger ...

{p. 107} **Like the Jews in the Protocols, they are depicted as strongly knit aliens ("Japan Inc.") plotting world domination.**

{p. 108} **Ever since the wars between the Greeks and the Persians in the fifth century BCE, the West has been haunted by the specter of domination by Orientals. During the Middle Ages and for most of the modern period the Jews**

**constituted the Oriental element ... In the twentieth century the Japanese** assumed the position of Oriental menace to Western civilization.

{this is a repudiation of the Liberal view emphasising the virtues of Athens; but George Soros warned against Japan, in his book *The Alchemy of Finance* (pp. 350-4), and many other Jewish leaders did likewise, such as Daniel Burstein, author of the book *Yen: The Threat of Japan's Financial Empire*. Another Jew, Ezra Vogel, presently heads the American Government's intelligence agencies' Japan specialists}

{Shillony, somewhat odiously, keeps playing the "whites" (i.e. Aryans to him) against the Japanese. But **another Jew, Samuel Roth, wrote "America ... will expel us, just as Spain expelled us ... Before America will have realized her loss in the loss of the Jews the yellow peoples will be on her back and at her throat.** ... But we still have a century or so in America - perhaps more, perhaps less." (*Now and Forever: A conversation between Israel Zangwill and Samuel Roth*, Robert M. McBride & Company, New York, 1925, p. 138)}

{p. 112} **In the sixteenth century**

{p. 129} **the word "Portuguese," when referring to people in Europe outside of Portugal, was often taken as synonymous with "Jew."** One of the first Portuguese to arrive in Japan was Fernao Mendes Pinto, a merchant, adventurer, and for a short time a Jesuit, whose written accounts of his travels stirred the imagination of many Europeans. According to the editor of the English translation of his *Travels*, Pinto may have been related to the wealthy Mendes family of former Jews. Luis de Almeida, a merchant and physician who arrived in Japan in 1556 and later joined the Society of Jesus, may also have been a former Jew, as former Jews were prominent among Portuguese physicians at that time. **There were several former Jews among the founders of the Society of Jesus, and some of them engaged in propagating the faith in the Middle East, but as the order grew, former Jews were gradually forced out of its ranks, and by the seventeenth century they were forbidden to join.**

{p. 147} The Japanese victories ... were hailed by American Jews ... Shortly after the war broke out, on February 26, 1904, the London newspaper *Jewish Chronicle* reported that the Jews of Atlanta, Georgia, were collecting three million dollars in order to purchase a battleship for Japan, to be named the *Kishineff*.

**The Jewish resentment against czarist Russia produced financial support for Japan. The phenomenon of Jewish financiers raising loans for Japan out of a**

special attraction to that country **started in 1894, when Albert Kahn**, director of the French bank Goudchaux and later head of his own bank, **helped to float a Japanese loan in Paris to finance the Sino-Japanese War**, which broke out that year ...

**When the Russo-Japanese War broke out Jewish financiers in Europe and the United States, including the Rothschilds, refrained from extending assistance to Russia but were willing to give aid to Japan. This assistance, crucial in preventing a Japanese defeat, was initiated and engineered by Jacob H. Schiff** (1847-1920), a leading

{p. 148} Jewish-American figure and president of the banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb, and Co., one of the major investment banks in the United States. ... Schiff convinced his own firm as well as the First National Bank and the National City Bank to sponsor the Japanese war loans in the United States. His efforts helped Japan raise nearly two hundred million dollars on American markets, about half of the total war loans floated abroad to buy the warships, cannons, and ammunition needed to win the war.

**In March, Jacob Schiff and his wife visited Japan. Emperor Meiji** hosted them at a luncheon at the imperial palace, and **conferred upon Schiff the Order of the Rising Sun**, having earlier awarded him the Order of the Sacred Treasure. **He was the first foreigner to be awarded the Order of the Rising Sun.**

{p. 149} Although the Japanese feared socialism and anarchism at home, during the war they looked favorably on the Russian revolutionaries, among whom were many Jews.

{p. 150} While Jews regarded the victory of Japan as divine retribution for Russian anti-Semitic policies, the great Russian writer **Leo Tolstoy viewed it** as precisely the opposite: **as a punishment of Russia for its being too influenced by Jews**. In a 1905 letter to a friend he explained his country's defeat:

{Tolstoy quote} This debacle is not only of the Russian army, the Russian fleet and the Russian state, but of the pseudo-Christian civilization as well ... **The disintegration began long ago, with the struggle for money and success** in the so-called scientific and artistic pursuits, **where the Jews got the edge on the Christians in every country and thereby earned the envy and hatred of all. Today the Japanese have done the same thing in the military field**, proving conclusively, by brute force, that there is a goal which Christians must not pursue,

for in seeking it they will always fail, vanquished by non-Christians. {end Tolstoy quote}

Although Tolstoy disapproved of anti-Semitism, **his analysis of the Russian defeat reflected the anxiety of those Christians at the time, who viewed the victory of Japan and the ascendancy of the Jews as two aspects of the same phenomenon.** According to their interpretation, **the infidel Jews were undermining Western society from within while the heathen Japanese were eroding it from without.** From that erroneous perspective, the Jewish moral and financial support for Japan during the Russo-Japanese War was seen as further proof of the complicity of these two peoples in a plot directed against the Western world.

{p. 153} **In 1927 on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Balfour Declaration Baron Tanaka Giichi, prime minister and foreign minister of Japan (whose name had been appropriated in the same year in the forged [Tanaka Memorial](#)), instructed the Japanese**

**{p. 154} consul general in Shanghai to convey to the Shanghai Zionist Association "heartly congratulations on the steadily progressing organizations of the Zionists, and on the remarkable advancement of the Jewish nationalist institutions, which they have achieved in Palestine."**

{the [Tanaka Memorial](#) was a blueprint for the invasion of Asia}

{p. 209} **Ishihara Shintaro, ... known for his support of nationalist causes, was elected in 1988 as president of the Japan-Israel Friendship Association.**

{p. 218} **In the 1980s the Protocols of the Elders of Zion came to enjoy a new popularity.** In 1986 Yajima Kinji, professor of political science at the Christian Aoyama Gakuin University, published a book about how to read the "hidden meaning of the Jewish *protocols*." He **called the *Protocols* the most mysterious document of the twentieth century, because all its prophecies had been fulfilled, in spite of its being regarded as a forgery.** Yajima advised the Japanese to take the Protocols seriously in order to be prepared for the future. **His book was a great success with fifty-five printings.**

{p. 224} On September 26, 1988, Ibuka Masaru, honorary president of Sony, wrote an article ... in which he cited education as the reason that Jews, contributing only three-tenths of one percent of the world's population, had received 10 percent of all Nobel prizes.

{That's 30 times as many as the world per-capita average! The [Jewish participation rate](#) in the anti-Vietnam War protest movement in the U.S. was also about 30 times the rate for non-Jews (Philip Mendes, a Jewish author, in his book *The New Left, The Jews, and the Vietnam War 1965-1972*, pp. 21-22), and their entry into New Age sects (Buddhist, Hindu) was up to 16 times the non-Jewish rate at that time ([The Jew in the Lotus](#), p. 7 & p. 9.)

{end of quotes}

The Protocols of Zion Toolkit - Part 2

Peter Myers; date October 8, 2002; update May 8, 2006. My comments are shown {thus}.

Part 2 of the Protocols of Zion Toolkit deals with the Revolutionary background to Napoleon III, against whom Joly's *Dialogues* is pitched. The French Revolution, the Communist Revolutions of 1830, 1848 and 1871, and the Bolshevik Revolution are covered here.

Joly's *Dialogues* was written during the rule of Emperor Napoleon III of France, and directed against him. Given the despotic nature of Bolshevism, and the plan for such despotism enunciated in the *Protocols*, **it is instructive to compare Napoleon with the Bolsheviks, to see which has the worse record for killing, torture etc.**

It will be seen that the Bolsheviks win hands-down; it's no contest. But those claiming the *Protocols* a forgery, must pin the despotism on Napoleon III rather than the Bolsheviks.

**As Joly presents it, Napoleon III is the Machiavellian, fooling the people; as the *Protocols* present it, the Revolutionaries are the Machiavellians, causing chaos and turmoil, and aiming at totalitarian control and a Reign of Terror.**

*The Ancestry of Political Correctness:* [correctness.html](http://correctness.html).

## 6. The Revolutionary background to Napoleon III

### 6.1 Communist Revolutions of 1830, 1848 and 1871

Emperor **Napoleon III** of France **came to power soon after the attempted Europe-wide Communist Revolution of 1848; and after his ousting there was another Communist Revolution, the Paris Commune of 1871.**

**Karl Marx took part in both revolutions** (the German part of the 1848 one, and the 1871 Paris Commune).

Of Marx' role in the Paris Commune, Michael Shapiro writes in his book *The Jewish 100: A Ranking of the Most Influential Jews of All Time*, Simon & Schuster, London, 1997:

{p. 33} In their frenzy, **the Commune leaders executed the archbishop of Paris and other prominent leaders.** Establishment forces reacted with a massacre of their own, staining the medieval byways of old Paris blood red. **For his support,**

**Marx became internationally known as the infamous "Red Doctor."** In the common psyche, **communism became synonymous with deadly violence, an association which Lenin and Mao later proved true.** {endquote}

Interpreting the Revolutions begun in 1789, which were attempted again in 1830, 1848, and 1871, Marx wrote:

Karl Marx, *The Holy Family*, in *Karl Marx Frederick Engels Collected Works*, Volume 4, Lawrence & Wishart, London 1975:

{p. 119} ... **the French Revolution gave rise to ideas which led beyond the ideas of the entire old world order. The revolutionary movement** which began in 1789 in the *Cercle social*, which in the middle of its course had as its chief representatives *Leclerc* and *Roux*, and which finally **with Babeuf's conspiracy** was temporarily defeated, **gave rise to the communist idea which Babeuf's friend Buonarroti re-introduced in France after the Revolution of 1830. This idea, consistently developed, is the idea of the new world order.** {endquote}

Karl Marx, *Socialism*, in *Karl Marx Frederick Engels Collected Works*, Volume 25, Lawrence & Wishart, London 1987:

{p. 244} **The state based on reason completely collapsed. Rousseau's Contrat Social had found its realisation in the Red Terror, from which the bourgeoisie, who had lost confidence in their own political capacity, had taken refuge first in the corruption of the Directorate, and, finally, under the wing of the Napoleonic despotism.** The promised eternal peace was turned into an endless war of conquest. The society based upon reason had fared no better.

{p. 245} The right of the first night was transferred from the feudal lords to the bourgeois manufacturers. ...

**The propertyless masses, during the Reign of Terror, were able for a moment to gain the mastery.** {endquote}

It seems, then, that the French people had to choose between Marx and Napoleon III.

**6.2 Isaiah Berlin, *Karl Marx: his life and environment*, Thornton Butterworth, London 1939.**

{p. 16} All that is important during the actual war is accurate knowledge of one's own resources and of those of the adversary ... *Das Kapital* is an attempt to provide such an analysis. ... **The conceptions of natural rights, and of conscience, as belonging to every man irrespective of his position in the class struggle, are rejected as liberal illusions ... Moral, political, economic conceptions and ideals alter ... to regard any one of them as universal and immutable is tantamount to believing that the order to which they belong ... is eternal. ... Hence the contempt and loathing poured by Marx upon the common assumption, made by liberals and utilitarians, that since the interests of all men are ultimately and have always been the same, a measure of goodwill and benevolence on the part of**

{p. 17} everyone may yet make it possible to manufacture some sort of general compromise. If the war is real, **these interests are totally incompatible**. ... He detested romanticism, emotionalism, and humanitarianism of every kind, and, in his anxiety to avoid any appeal to the idealistic feelings of his audience, **systematically removed every trace of the old democratic vocabulary** from the propagandist literature of his movement. ...

The war must be fought on every front, and ... a political party must be formed out of those elements ... destined to emerge as the conquering class.

{p. 20} The characteristic for which Marx sought was not novelty but truth, and when he found it in the works of others, he endeavoured, at any rate **during the early years in Paris, in which his thought took its final shape**, to incorporate it in his new synthesis. ...

{p. 21} Marx sifted this immense mass of chaotic material ... and in the light of it constructed a **new** instrument of **social analysis**, whose merit consists ...

{p. 22} ... in the remarkable combination of simple fundamental principles with comprehensiveness, detail and realism. ...

**It was composed largely in Paris during the troubled years between 1843 and 1850 ...**

{p. 143} In 1847 the London centre of the Communist League showed its confidence in him by commissioning him to compose a document containing a definitive statement of its beliefs and aims. He eagerly embraced this opportunity for an explicit summary of the new doctrine which had lately assumed its final shape in his head; He delivered it into their hands early in 1848. **It was published a few weeks before the outbreak of the Paris revolution** under the title of *The Manifesto of the Communist Party*. ...

{p. 147} The Manifesto ends with the celebrated words "The workers have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workers of all lands, unite!"

{p. 148} ... As an instrument of destructive propaganda it has no equal anywhere ... **The Belgian Government**, which behaved with considerable tolerance to political exiles, could not overlook this formidable publication, and brusquely **expelled him** and his family from its territory. **On the next day the long expected revolution broke out in Paris**. Flocon, a radical member of the new French Government, in a highly flattering letter, **invited Marx to return to the revolutionary city**. He immediately set off and arrived a day later.

He found the city in a state of universal and uncritical enthusiasm. The barriers had fallen once more, this time it seemed forever. ...

{p. 149} News presently arrived that **Naples had revolted, then Milan, Rome, Venice and other Italian cities. Berlin, Vienna, and Budapest had risen in arms**. Europe was ablaze at last.

{p. 150} Acting in the name of the Communist League, Marx sent his agents to agitate among the German industrial masses, and used their reports as the material

for his leading articles. There was at this time no formal censorship in the Rhineland, and his inflammatory words reached an ever-widening public.

{p. 151} **As in 1842 Marx demanded an immediate war with Russia**, both because no attempt at democratic revolution could succeed in Germany in view of the certainty of Russian intervention, and as a means of welding the German principalities into a united democratic whole ...

{p. 153} **By July, 1848, the heroic phase of the Paris revolution had spent itself**, and the conservative forces began to rally their strength.

{p. 156} **The Prussian Government**, which had annulled his Prussian citizenship four years previously, unable to reverse the verdict itself, in July 1849 **expelled him** from the Rhineland. **He went to Paris, where the Bonapartist agitation in favour of Napoleon's nephew** made the political situation even more confused than before, and it looked as if something of importance might occur at any moment.

... The revolution had patently failed.

{p. 157} ... **only one European country placed no obstacle in his path**. ... He arrived in London on the 2th August, 1849; his family followed a month later, and Engels, after dallying in Switzerland, and making a long and agreeable sea voyage from Genoa, came in the beginning of November. He found Marx **convinced that the revolution might at any moment break out once more**, and engaged on a pamphlet against the conservative republic.

{p. 164} There is no doubt that **by 1848 Marx thought of it in terms of a self-appointed elite** ... as Babeuf had conceived it in 1797, a small body of convinced and ruthless individuals, who were to wield dictatorial power and educate the proletariat until it reached a level at which it comprehended its proper task.

{p. 224} The Commune, as the new government described itself, was neither created nor inspired by the International ... By a great effort **the people had shaken off the nightmare first of the Empire** then of the siege; ... they announced

{p. 225} that the state in its old form was abolished, and called upon the people in arms to govern itself.

Presently, as supplies began to give out, and the condition of the besieged grew more desperate, **terror developed: proscriptions** began, **men and women** were condemned and **executed**, many of them certainly **guiltless**, and few deserving of death. **Among those executed was the Archbishop of Paris** who had been held as a hostage against the army at Versailles. The rest of Europe watched the monstrous events with growing indignation and disgust. **The Communards seemed** even to enlightened opinion, even, to old and tried friends of the people like Louis Blanc and Mazzini, to be **a band of criminal lunatics** dead to the appeal of humanity, social **incendiaries pledged to destroy all religion and all morality**, men driven out of their minds by real and imaginary wrongs, scarcely responsible for their enormities.



{p. 226} ... **Marx ... acclaimed it as the first open and defiant manifestation in history of the strength and idealism of the working class - the first pitched battle** which it had fought against its oppressors before the eyes of the whole world ...

The pamphlet, later entitled *The Civil War in France* was not primarily intended as a historical study: it was a tactical move, and one of typical audacity and intransigence. Marx was sometimes blamed by his own followers for allowing the International to be linked in the popular mind with a band of law-breakers and assassins, an association which earned for it an unnecessarily sinister reputation. This was not the kind of consideration which could have influenced him in the slightest degree. He was, all his life, a convinced and uncompromising believer in a violent working class

{p. 227} revolution. The Commune was the first spontaneous rising of the workers in their capacity as workers: the July *emeute* of 1848, was, in his view, an attack on, and not by, them. ...

{p. 228} Marx attempted to forestall all reproaches by revealing his name as the sole author of the work. "**The Red Terrorist Doctor,**" as he was now popularly known, **became overnight the object of public odium ...**

{p. 229} **A large part of Paris was destroyed by fire during the Commune:** this fire seemed to him a symbol of his own life, and **a magnificent realization of his favourite paradox: "Destruction, too, is a kind of creation."**

{end of quotes}

### 6.3 The Machiavelli Tradition

**The *Protocols of Zion* and Joly's *Dialogues* are political documents in the tradition of Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527).**

Machiavelli's book *The Prince* is one of the most famous, if notorious, texts in Political Science. Yet, although the disparaging term *Machiavellian* implies that Machiavelli himself was an intriguer, in fact all he did was document how unscrupulous absolute rulers operated. He did this in the guise of giving them advice.

The proof is that his exposes were not published until after his death. His own life might have been endangered, by publication while he was alive.

John Plamenatz writes,

"Of Machiavelli's four major works, only one, *The Art of War*, was printed during his lifetime, in 1521. The other three, ***The Prince*, *the Discourses* and *the Florentine Histories* were not published till more than four years after his death.**" (John Plamenatz, ed., *Machiavelli: The Prince, selections from The Discourses and other writings*, Fontanas/Collins, London, 1972, p. 12).

J. R. Hale writes,

**"The *Discourses*, like *The Prince*, were never revised for the press, they were not printed in Machiavelli's lifetime, and it is hazardous to conjecture from the work as it stands what its final form would have been"** (*Machiavelli and Renaissance Italy*, The English Universities Press Ltd, London 1961, p. 173).

*The Prince* is at <http://www.constitution.org/mac/prince00.htm>.

*The Discourses* is at <http://www.constitution.org/mac/disclivv1.htm#1:11>.

Moses and Machiavellism: <http://cla.calpoly.edu/~smarx/Publications/moses.html>.

To undermine the Old World Order, the Enlightenment activists chose to use the same methods the Old Order used to maintain itself, which Machiavelli had described in *The Prince*. In other words, it adopted the ethic that the end justifies the means.

This is clearly stated by Jean Jacques Rousseau in *The Social Contract*:

**"Machiavelli's Prince is a handbook for Republicans."** (Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1970, p.118).

**Rousseau's footnote** to the above, on p. 118, reads:

**"Machiavelli was a gentleman and a good citizen;** but being attached to the house of Medici, **he was forced** during the oppression of his country **to disguise his love of liberty. The very choice of an execrable hero reveals his secret intention,** and the antithesis between his principles in his book *The Prince* and those in his *Discourses on Livy* and his *History of Florence* proves that this profound thinker has so far had only superficial or corrupted readers. **The Pope's court strictly prohibited his book,** which I can well believe, since **that was the court he depicts most plainly.**" (p. 118n).

By this he meant, that Machiavelli's insights could be used by the revolutionary movement. **Further, Rousseau stated,**

"In ancient times, Greece flourished at the height of the cruellest wars; blood flowed in torrents, but the whole country was thickly populated. **'It appeared,' says Machiavelli, 'that in the midst of murder, proscription and civil wars, our republic became stronger than ever;** the civil virtue of the citizens, their morals, and their independence, served more effectively to strengthen it than all their dissensions may have done to weaken it.' A little disturbance gives vigour to the soul, and what really makes the species prosper is not peace but freedom." (*The Social Contract*, Penguin, note on p.131).

**Even Babeuf, the only person praised by Karl Marx in the *Communist Manifesto*, appealed to Machiavelli in his defence during the French Revolution.**

## **6.4 Babeuf on the Revolution**

Marx and Engels name six people in the *Communist Manifesto*: Sismondi, Proudhon, Babeuf, St. Simon, Fourier and Owen. Babeuf is held up as a hero; all the others are criticised.

Robespierre was overthrown on July 29, 1794.

Francois-Noel Babeuf, who adopted the revolutionary name *Gracchus*, was arrested by the Directorate (principally Napoleon), who had seized power following the fall of Robespierre. Babeuf had been agitating for equality, peoples's rights, and a return to the Jacobin Constitution of 1793; but the Republican Government which tried and executed him probably saw him as representing a return to the Terror.

**J. L. Talmon, *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy*, Frederick A. Praeger, New York 1960.**

{p. 196} THE STORY OF THE PLOT OF BABEUF

(a) THE PREHISTORY OF THE CONSPIRACY

THE seeds of the Conspiracy of the Equals were sown in the political prisons which held the Jacobins taken captive after the unsuccessful uprisings of the 12 Germinal and 1 Prairial. These prisons became a kind of political academy.

... The Irreconcilables raised the rallying cry of "Bread and the Constitution of 1793". Some of these moved still further to the Left, to Communism, but even those who would not go so far welcomed and encouraged the vigorous and effective propaganda against the regime conducted by the extreme Left, especially Babeuf in his *Tribune du Peuple*, which was the successor of the more moderate *Journal de la Liberte de la Presse*.

The Left had no proper organization. Its members were in loose touch with each other, met casually in cafes and parks, indulging in general discussions. The Jacobin Club had been dissolved. The Constitution of 1795 forbade affiliations and correspondence between societies, prohibited the election of permanent officers and fixed conditions of admission and eligibility. It also banned collective petitions and closed meetings. The

{p. 197} popular societies were to be no more than casual Hyde Park gatherings to listen to a soap-box speaker.

During the liberal period soon after the Vendemiaire events, the Directory allowed the Society of the Pantheon, called the "Reunion des amis de la Republique", to be founded, and to become a rallying centre for the Left. The Government hoped to be able to control the Society through its agents.

The Society proceeded without permanent officers, rules of procedure, registers or minutes. It was a very loose body. The meetings were held in the ancient refectory of the nuns, and, when this hall was occupied, in the Convent's vault or crypt, "where", in the words of Buonarroti, "the dim paleness of the torch light, the hollow echoes of their voices, and the constrained positions of the persons present, either standing or seated on the ground, impressed on them the greatness and the perils of their enterprise, as well as of the courage and prudence it required".

The Societé de Pantheon became the scene of a tug of war between Left extremists and Government agents. When its discussions became too menacing, the Government ordered General Bonaparte to close it down, on 1 Ventase, an IV.

{p. 198} Events were however hastening the outbreak of the insurrection. {end quotes}

**In his defence**, at his trial for conspiracy to overthrow the Government, **Babeuf said**:

John Scott, ed., *The Defense of Gracchus Babeuf Before the High Court of Vendome*, University of Massachusetts Press, 1967 (with an Essay by Herbert Marcuse):

{p. 19} Gentlemen of the Jury, ...

{p. 22} **Socrates made war on bigotry** - and drank the poisoned cup. **Jesus of Galilee**, who taught men to love equality, truth, and justice, and to hate the rich, **was nailed live to the stake**. Lycurgus fled his native land to escape death at the hands of those whom his deeds had made happy. ...

{p. 23} Two hundred and eighty-four members of the Areopagus passed sentence upon Socrates, to be sure; but they were the creatures of two scoundrels, Anytus and Meletus, and **Socrates did not defend himself. Christ's trial amounted to nothing more than a brief interrogation before Pontius Pilate.**

{Karl Marx rejected the analogy drawn by F. C. Baur between Socrates and Christ (see his Notebooks on Epicurean Philosophy, in *Karl Marx Frederick Engels Collected Works, Volume 1*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, pp. 493-4)}

{p. 24} It cannot be said too often that this trial is the trial of the Revolution itself.

{p. 26} I am aware that in this last observation I reveal the secret of the people's weakness and the corresponding strength of their would-be oppressors. My words, indeed, might provide them with a commentary upon a theme by **Machiavelli**. ... In a democracy, yes, even in Rome, I would be brought before the people themselves, in the public square, to argue my case.

{p. 41} After 13 vendemairie **I became aware that the masses - weary of a Revolution whose twists and turns had brought them only sorrow - had, it must be admitted, turned back to royalism**. In Paris I saw that the simple and unlettered people had been led by their enemies to feel a cordial detestation for the Republic. The masses, whose judgment is guided by daily experience, had with little difficulty been induced to ask themselves: How did we fare under the Crown, and how is it now under the Republic? In the ensuing comparison the Republic came off second best. It was then only a step to the conclusion that the Republic was something detestable and that monarchy was far better.

{p. 42} I launched the *Tribune of the People* and through it I spoke to the masses.

*Listen to me, I say, many of you have drawn the same conclusion that the long succession of disasters which we have suffered that the Republic is worthless and that monarchy is preferred. You are right - and I spell it out in capitals - WE WERE BETTER OFF UNDER THE BOURBONS THAN WE ARE NOW UNDER THE REPUBLIC. But, I continue, we must be clear which Republic we mean ... The real Republic is something of which we have not yet made trial. ...*

*The slogan of liberty and equality, which was for so long dinned into your ears, had a certain charm in the early days of the Revolution, because you believed that it contained real meaning. Today this slogan means nothing to you anymore; it is only an empty oratorical flourish. But we must repeat again and again that this*  
{p. 44} *slogan, notwithstanding all our recent painful experiences, can and should connote something of deep significance for the masses.*

*The Revolution, I went on, ought not to pass into history as an event without meaning. It is inconceivable that the people should shed their blood in torrents only to end up in greater torment than before. ...*

{p. 48} *The man who wills an end also wills the means to gain that end.*

{p. 51} *In the Tribune*

{p. 52} *of the People* (number 55, page 102), I wrote:

*In the beginning the soil belonged to none, its fruits to all. The introduction of private property was a piece of trickery put over on the simple and unassuming masses. The laws that buttressed property operated inevitably to create social classes - privileged and oppressed, masters and slaves.*

*The law of inheritance is a sovereign wrong. It breeds misery even from the second generation. ... Hence we find masters and servants even among the grandchildren of a single man.*

*The law of inalienability is no less unjust. This one man, already master over all the other grandchildren in the same line, pays what he will for the work they must do for him. ...*

*The gulf between rich and poor, rulers and ruled, proceeds from yet another cause, the difference in value and in price that arbitrary opinion attaches to the diverse products of soil and manufacture. Thus a watchmaker's working day has been valued twenty times higher than a ploughman's or laborer's. The wages of the watchmaker enable him to get possession of the inheritance of twenty ploughmen ...*

{p. 57} *We must try to guarantee to each man and his posterity, however numerous, a sufficiency of the means of existence, and nothing more. We must try and close all possible avenues by which a man may acquire more than his fair share of the fruits of toil and the gifts of nature.*

*The only way to do this is to organize a communal regime which will suppress private property, set each to work at the skill or job he understands, require each to deposit the fruits of his labor at the common store, and establish an agency for the distribution of basic necessities. ...*

*A system such as this has been proven practicable by actual experience, for it is used by our twelve armies with their 1,200,000 men. And what is possible on a small scale can also be done on a large one. ...*

{p. 58} *Such a regime, I continued, will sweep away iron bars, dungeon walls, and bolted doors, trials and disputations, murders, thefts and crimes of every kind; it will sweep away the judges and the judged ...*

Such, gentlemen of the jury, was the body of truth that I concerned myself with and that I thought to have divined from my study of the ageless book of nature.

{p. 61} What are the quotations from **Rousseau**, that I shall cite later, doing here, if the intention is not to **convict him along with us**?

{p. 62} Poor Jean-Jacques! This will not save you from being sentenced *in absentia* ...

{p. 63} As you may easily see, it is writers like Rousseau who have subverted us. ... Rousseau, who is cast here in the role of our accomplice ...

{p. 64} Such are the ravings of **Rousseau, our co-conspirator**, about private property ... If the Genevan dreamer were still alive, he would learn soon enough that dissent is dangerous. {end quotes}

Babeuf and A. A. Darthe were found guilty on May 24, 1797; sentenced on May 26; and executed on May 27. Seven others, including Philippe Buonarroti, were also found guilty, and deported (p. 11).

Buonarroti later memorialized Babeuf in his book *Babeuf's Conspiracy for Equality*, tr. Bronterre O'Brien, 1836.

## 6.5 Social Revolution from Babeuf to the Bolsheviks

The revolutionary movement spans centuries, from the French Revolution to Karl Marx, to the Bolsheviks, to our own time. And thus our investigation must delve into the historical continuity.

The Anarchist leader Bakunin wrote in his paper *Federalism, Socialism, Anti-Theologism*:

**"Babeuf's conspiracy failed; he was guillotined, together with some of his old friends. But his idea of a socialist republic did not die with him. It was picked up by his friend Buonarroti, the arch-conspirator of the century, who transmitted it as a sacred trust to future generations".**

According to James Billington, in his book *Fire In the Minds of Men: Origins of the Revolutionary Faith*, Buonarroti was a member of the Illuminati. Billington's big book is an account of the secret societies behind revolutions.

The back of the dust jacket of this book reads:

{quote} JAMES H. BILLINGTON has been, since 1973, director of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars ... he received his doctorate as a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford ...{endquote}

Billington later became Librarian of Congress.

There's no mention in the book of the secret society of Cecil Rhodes for furthering the British Empire, which endows the Rhodes Scholarships to this day: [rhodes-scholars.html](http://rhodes-scholars.html).

And despite its size (677 pages, weighing 1.1 kgs), Billington's book manages to omit any Jewish connection to Revolutions.

That Jewish connection is, however, supplied by two impeccable Jewish sources, Benjamin Disraeli and J. L. Talmon.

Benjamin Disraeli wrote in his "novel" *Coningsby*, in 1844 (5th edition, published by Peter Davies, London, 1927):

**'that mighty revolution which is at this moment preparing in Germany, and which will be, in fact, a second and greater Reformation, and of which so little is as yet known in England, is entirely developing under the auspices of Jews, who almost monopolise the professorial chairs of Germany. ... '** (p. 264).

**Disraeli, writing in 1844, is referring** (four years in advance) **to the revolution of 1848**, launched shortly after the appearance of *The Communist Manifesto*.

In 1852 Disraeli wrote in *Lord George Bentinck: A Political Biography* (Archibald, Constable & Co. Ltd., London 1905):

{p. 324} **An insurrection takes place against tradition and aristocracy, against religion and property.** Destruction of the Semitic principle, extirpation of the Jewish religion, whether in the mosaic or in the Christian form, the natural equality of man and the abrogation of property, are proclaimed by **the secret societies** who **form provisional governments, and men of Jewish race are found at the head of every one of them. The people of God co-operate with atheists; the most skilful accumulators of property ally themselves with communists;** the peculiar and chosen race touch the hand of all the scum and low castes of Europe! And all this **because they wish to destroy that ungrateful Christendom which owes to them even its name, and whose tyranny they can no longer endure.**

**When the secret societies, in February 1848, surprised Europe, they were themselves surprised by the unexpected opportunity, and so little capable were they of seizing the occasion, that had it not been for the Jews, who of late years unfortunately have been connecting themselves with these unhallowed associations, imbecile as were the governments the uncalled-for outbreak would not have ravaged Europe. But the fiery energy and the teeming resources of the children of Israel maintained for a long time the unnecessary and useless struggle. If the reader throws over the provisional governments of Germany, and Italy, and even of France, formed at that period, he will recognise everywhere the Jewish element.** {end quote}

Disraeli's message is: if you don't want Communism, support Zionism. The West used this strategy in the Cold War.

More from Disraeli at [disraeli.html](http://disraeli.html).

J. L. Talmon wrote two studies of the revolutionary tradition. The first, *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy*, "writes out" any mention of Jewish involvement.

The second, *Israel Among the Nations*, "writes it back in":

{p. 1} It has for a long time been almost an axiom that **The Revolution was the ally, some were even wont to say saviour of the Jews, and that the Jews were the natural standard-bearers of the revolution. ... Those who should be most interested, revolutionaries of Jewish extraction, or revolutionaries in general, tend to deny the very legitimacy of the juxtaposition, 'Jews and revolution'.** It is, they argue, men, classes, peoples who rise in revolt against oppression, that many revolutionaries have {p. 2} been of Jewish ancestry is quite irrelevant and the very desire to see it as relevant arises out of a sinister intention to discredit the cause of revolution itself ... **Then there are those Jews who are unable to ignore the intimate relation between Jews and revolution, but wish they had never heard of it. ... {p. 69} Three years later the Tsar and all his family were helpless prisoners guarded by a Jew and a few Latvian assistants. ... - 'in the fact that the chief executioner of Tsar Nicholas II and his family in the Ekaterinburg cellar was a Jew', Jacob Yurovsky.**

{p. 21} **The great wave of revolutions in 1848, spreading with lightning speed from capital to capital, almost from town to town across Europe, was greeted by very many Jews as proof that all nations were about to enter into a revolutionary world association. {i.e. World Government, i.e. the messianic age}**

Not only the democratic and Socialist aspirations, but even the national liberation movements bore at least in the early phase a distinctly universalist character. **So great was the enthusiasm of the Jews that they were prepared to overlook the anti-Jewish excesses ... and even to proclaim that the victory of universal brotherhood had put 'an end to any distinct Jewish history', 'for liberty, like love, is cosmopolitan, wandering from people to people'.**

**There was hardly a revolution - that year of revolutions - in which Jews were not prominent or at least very active.** {end of quotes}

More of Talmon at [talmon.html](http://talmon.html).

John S. Curtiss wrote a book (an Anvil Original) titled *The Russian Revolutions of 1917* (D. Van Nostrand Company, Princeton, NJ 1957), in which the word "Jew" does not even appear in the index. Not surprisingly, Curtiss' book about the *Protocols*, titled *An Appraisal of the Protocols of Zion* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1942) takes a similar line to Herman Bernstein.

Nesta Webster's book *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements* is another indispensable source. First published in 1924, it is now issued by Omni Publications of Palmdale, Ca (no date supplied):

<http://www3.addall.com/New/submitNew.cgi?query=Secret+Societies+Subversive+Movements>.

Unlike Marx, Babeuf and Buonarroti offered detailed plans for the New Order, but their organisation had the same "vanguard" and conspiratorial qualities as Lenin's.



Rousseau inspired the American Revolution of 1776, and French of 1789. **As theorised by Rousseau and Babeuf, the New Order is nationalist:** socialism in one country. However, **as theorised by Weishaupt and later Marx, it is internationalist:** on a world-wide scale: [rousseau.html](http://rousseau.html).

**The divergence between the nationalist ("non-Jewish") and internationalist ("Jewish") forms of the New Order appears in the confrontation between the Stalinist and Trotskyist traditions,** although that was complicated by the struggle between Slavs and Jews in Eastern Europe, the Jews having rallied to Trotsky, who described himself as a "non-Jewish Jew". Stalin's purges were in part a cover for the removal of the Jewish intelligentsia which had rallied to the Red Army during the civil war and which dominated the administration for the first 20 years of the New Order.

## **6.6 The "Social Revolution" as "Heaven on Earth"**

We now connect the current "social revolution" in the Anglo-American countries, with its ancestors in France and Russia.

The U.S. is being undermined both by "right-wing" internationalist bankers and their lawyers, media and academics, and by "left-wing" subversives. The former destroy the American economy, while the latter launch a social revolution which destroys the metaphysics at the centre of society, and upon which its ethics and civility rests.

E.F. Schumacher, in his book *Small Is Beautiful*, quotes the statement **"It was not barbarian attacks that destroyed the Greco-Roman world ... The cause was a metaphysical cause. The 'pagan' world was failing to keep alive its own fundamental convictions ...** because owing to faults in metaphysical analysis it had become confused as to what those convictions were ... If metaphysics had been a mere luxury of the intellect, this would not have mattered".

Then he comments, **"This passage can be applied, without change, to present-day civilisation."** (p.90).

This revolution in the West was **launched as much in the name of Socrates as of Marx - Socrates being the Christ of Enlightenment intellectuals.**

Following the fall of Robespierre, **Babeuf**, in the trial prior to his execution, **appealed to both Socrates and Christ** (John Scott, op. cit.).

Works such as Scott's were being published and studied in the U.S. in the decade from the mid-60s to the mid-70s, because the revolution which had smouldered in nineteenth century Europe finally broke out in the United States at that time.

**Marx opposed F. C. Baur's appropriation of Socrates to Christianity**, in his book *Das Christliche im Platonismus*. He rejected Baur's depiction of Socrates as a **Jesus-like figure**, a forerunner of Christ, in his doctoral dissertation:

*The Difference Between the Democritean and Epicurean Philosophy of Nature* - in From the Preparatory Materials, Second and Sixth Notebooks. *Collected Works, Volume 1*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975:

{p. 494} If therefore there is any analogy between Socrates and Christ, it must consist in the fact that Socrates is philosophy personified and Christ is religion personified.

{p. 495} In general it is far more correct to say that there are Platonic elements in Christianity rather than Christian elements in Plato. {end quote}

This thesis displays the foundations of all **Marx'** later thinking, in particular his **condemnation of Democritus for asserting the uncertainty of all human knowledge, and his praise of Epicurus for being, on the contrary, a dogmatist** (op. cit., pp. 34-45).

**Engels, in describing the history of the Communist movement, candidly admits the role of secret societies**, unlike some later historians who pretend that all those uprisings happened purely spontaneously. Engels, *History of the Communist League*, in Lewis D. Feuer (ed.), *Marx & Engels: Basic Writings on Politics & Philosophy*, 1959, pp. 459-470.

In the same article **he states that the revolutionary movement had been underground (conspiratorial) until 1847**, when the first Congress of the League of the Just was held. At this Congress the league was reorganised and renamed the "Communist League", and, **coming out of its underground mode, "barred all hankering after conspiracy, which requires dictatorship"**.

Acknowledgement of the connection to Weishaupt is implied: **"Whatever remained of the old mystical names dating back to the conspiratorial period was now abolished"**.

Such names (*Spartacus*, *Philo*, *Gracchus* etc.) had been a feature of Weishaupt's underground organisation, the Illuminati; although Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin etc. were "new names" in the same style.

The granting of such new names upon conversion to a new faith is reminiscent of the way Catholic monks and nuns, on admission to the order, gave up their old name and used a new, religious, one, that of a saint. Weishaupt, of course, would have been familiar with this.

In 1848 the Communist League commissioned Marx and Engels to write the *Manifesto*.

According to Marxist theory, the metaphysics at the core of a society's beliefs is but a fabrication, a smokescreen to legitimate the status quo; the real basis of the society is its economy.

The destruction of the U.S. economy in recent decades has been done by the internationalists, through laissez-faire policies which remove the operation of the economy as an issue for determination by the public, and hand it to private interests - moneylenders, local and foreign. Greed and manipulation were legitimated by economic theories based on deduction from first principles, in the Platonic style, as is the trademark of academia these days.

But if the social revolutionaries of the Left believed the economy to be so important, in line with Marx' view, why did they not try to save their own economy? In recent decades they have been more concerned with feminism and the gay movement, liberating students from the rigours of schooling, etc. Why did they take their economy for granted?

They were led by intellectuals forged by Trotskyist Internationalists. **Germaine Greer writes in *The Female Eunuch*:**

"Hopefully, this book is subversive ... the oppression of women is necessary to the maintenance of the economy ... If the present economic structure can change only by collapsing, then it had better collapse as soon as possible." (Paladin, 1972, p.21).

Greer continues,

"The most telling criticisms will come from **my sisters of the Left, the Maoists, the Trots, the I.S., the S.D.S.**, because of **my fantasy that it might be possible to leap the steps of revolution and arrive somehow at liberty and communism without strategy or revolutionary discipline**. But **if women are the true proletariat**, the truly oppressed majority, the revolution can only be drawn nearer by their withdrawal of support for the capitalist system. **The weapon I suggest is that most honoured of the proletariat, withdrawal of labour**" (p. 22; the I.S. are International Socialists; they and the "Trots" are Trotskyist communists).

Trotskyism is thus at the heart of Radical Feminism, yet this fact remains un-commented on by the media which have promoted the Feminist and Gay movements.

**Greer is here calling upon women to destroy the family.** The family being a microcosm of society, the price of Radical Feminism is the social and economic destruction of the old society; but for what?

In 1920, **Alexandra Kollontai**, Lenin's Minister for Social Welfare, **published a pamphlet called *Communism and the Family*** (republished in Sydney in 1971), in which she uses the expression "heaven on earth", in describing the Bolshevik strategy:

**"The red flag of the social revolution** which will shelter, after Russia, other countries of the world also, already **proclaims to us the approach of the heaven on earth** to which humanity has been aspiring for centuries".

The expression "social" revolution was the heritage of the French Revolution, whereas the American was little more than a "political" revolution. In the last 30 years, this same "social" revolution has shaken the entire Anglo-American world.

**Marx himself used the expression "heaven on earth"**, in describing his goal at the First International:

"Someday **the worker must** seize political power in order to build up the new organization of labor; he must overthrow the old politics which sustain the old institutions, if he is **not to lose heaven on earth, like the old Christians who**

**neglected and despised politics"** - Qualifying Violent Revolution (speech on September 8, 1872), Karl Marx Library, McGraw-Hill, 1971, Vol. 1, p.64.

Finally **Engels explained** the socialist heaven thus:

**"The history of early Christianity has notable points of resemblance with the modern working-class movement.** Like the latter, Christianity was originally a movement of oppressed people: it first appeared as the religion of slaves and emancipated slaves, of poor people deprived of all rights, of peoples subjugated or dispersed by Rome. Both Christianity and the workers' socialism preach forthcoming salvation from bondage and misery; **Christianity places this salvation in a life beyond, after death, in heaven; socialism places it in this world, in a transformation of society"**. *On the History of Early Christianity*, in *Collected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Progress Publishers, Moscow 1975, Volume 27.

**Marx' expression "lose heaven on earth" is elucidated by Engels** a little further on, as follows:

If, therefore, Professor Anton Menger wonders ... why ... "socialism did not follow the overthrow of the Roman Empire in the West", it is because he cannot see that this "socialism" did in fact, as far as it was possible at the time, exist and even became dominant - in Christianity. Only this **Christianity ... did not want to accomplish the social transformation in this world, but beyond it, in heaven ..."**

Engels' article *On the History of Early Christianity* is at <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1894chri/index.htm>.

In the light of Engels' statements, it is clear that today's Liberation and Social Justice movements in the churches are Marxist in inspiration, and represent, not a return to the roots of Christianity, but an infiltration of the Churches, which Marx saw as the basis of the Old Order, by the Marxist movement.

For comparison, here is a speech by Trotsky on this theme:

### **A Paradise In This World, by Leo Trotsky**

An Address delivered to a Working Class audience on April 14th, 1918

Published by British Socialist Party, London, 1920

{p. 19} ... **we shall turn the whole globe into one world re-**

{p. 20} **public of Labour.** All the earthly riches, **all the lands and all the seas** - all this shall be one **common property of the whole of humanity ... one blossoming garden, where our children, grand-children, and great-grand-children will live as in a paradise.** Time was when people believed in legends which told of a paradise. These were vague and confused dreams, the yearning of the soul of the oppressed Man after a better life. There was the yearning after a purer, more righteous life, and Man said: "There must be such a paradise, at least, in the 'other' world, an unknown and mysterious country." But we say, **we shall create such a paradise with our toiling hands here, in this world, upon earth,** for all, for our children and grandchildren and for all eternity! ... {end}

## 6.7 The Revolutions of 1848

**6.7.1 J. L. Talmon, *Israel Among the Nations*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London 1970.**

{p. 9} **With the exception of the ultra-orthodox, desperately fearful of change of any kind, Jews everywhere looked upon the French Revolution as a date comparable to the exodus from Egypt, and to the issuing of the Law from Mount Sinai, this time not to the Jews alone, but to all the nations.** France of the Revolution became to them a second country, to more exalted believers in the superiority of the spirit over matter, their sole spiritual fatherland, just as the Soviet Union was to millions of Communists throughout the world just a short while ago.

{p. 17} I believe that **there is reason to speak of a certain common denominator linking the Jewish Saint-Simonists - among the first Socialists in France, Moses Hess - the first Communist (at a later date Zionist) in Germany, the two leading Socialists of Europe, Karl Marx and Ferdinand Lassalle, and many lesser Jewish figures in the camp of revolution.**

To be sure, it was not the Jews who created that particular climate of Messianic revolutionary expectation and preparation which it takes today some effort of imagination to conjure up. **Babeuf, Buonarotti, Blanqui, Barbes, Mazzini, Harney, Mieroslawski - none of them and hardly any of their immediate followers were Jews. But it was the Jews who experienced and articulated that state of mind with peculiar intensity and their restless zeal spilled over into effective organisational activity.**

{p. 21} **The great wave of revolutions in 1848, spreading with lightning speed from capital to capital, almost from town to town across Europe, was greeted by very many Jews as proof that all nations were about to enter into a revolutionary world association.** {i.e. World Government, i.e. the messianic age}

Not only the democratic and Socialist aspirations, but even the national liberation movements bore at least in the early phase a distinctly universalist character. **So great was the enthusiasm of the Jews that they were prepared to overlook the anti-Jewish excesses or gloss them over as tokens of too great an exuberance, misguided expressions of social resentment, marginal episodes, unavoidable accidents or counter-revolutionary provocations, or 'birth pangs, which bring redemption to our world'; and even to proclaim that the victory of universal brotherhood had put 'an end to any distinct Jewish history', 'for liberty, like love, is cosmopolitan, wandering from people to people'.**

**There was hardly a revolution - that year of revolutions - in which Jews were not prominent or at least very active.**

{p. 22} **In France**, where there was no Jewish proletariat and where Jews except for the Jewish Saint-Simonists, were generally no further to the Left than bourgeois republicanism, **Adolphe Cremieux** and **Goudchaux** **joined** the government of the Republic as **mild liberal Republicans**. **In Germany**, where the Jews were more numerous, of a lesser social status, and less a part of the general society than across

the Rhine, we find a much greater proportion of Jews in the Radical Left. **Karl Marx is the editor of the extreme *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Jacoby is the spokesman of radical democracy ...**

Although **it would be a wild exaggeration to depict the wave of revolutions as led by Jews or as a result of a Jewish plot**, it was possible for King Friedrich Wilhelm IV of Prussia to charge **'the circumcised' for having brought 'that shame upon Germany' ...**

**We have two astonishingly similar comments on the role of the Jews in the revolution from two eminent Jews** standing at opposite poles of the political spectrum. One comes from **Benjamin Disraeli** in his *Life of Lord George Bentinck*, published in 1852, and the other from the German-Jewish Socialist **J. L. Bernays** in the

{p. 23} New York German-Jewish journal *Israels Herold* in 1849. Disraeli had set out to prove the superiority of the Jewish race.

{p. 24} {quote} **Had it not been for the Jews ...** imbecile as were the governments, **the uncalled-for outbreak would not have ravaged Europe.** But **the fiery energy and the teeming resources of the Children of Israel maintained** for a long time **the unnecessary and useless struggle ... everywhere the Jewish element. ... And all this because they wish to destroy that ungrateful Christendom** which owes to them even its name, and whose tyranny they can no longer endure. {end quote} ...

**Bernays gives a similar evaluation of 'the Jewish element in the latest European movement', but in a spirit** that he himself recognises 'will be considered by a large part of the readers as highly dangerous', namely that of **joyous triumph**, instead of the anxious regret of Disraeli. Bernays is soaked in young Hegelian modes of thought, and often employs **the same terms as Marx**, only to reach the opposite conclusion. **Both were agreed that the surest way of destroying political and social oppression was through the destruction of the faith in and respect for God and all religious authority** - the fountain-head of all systems of oppression and alienation which the Gentile leftist Hegelians like Feuerbach, Fr. D. Strauss, Rugge, and Bauer brothers actually set out to do. **The Jews** - Bernays claims - **have succeeded in 'galvanising the raw mob' against Pope, bishops, kings and princes**, feudal potentates and plutocrats. They 'laid bare the human essence buried under the thick crust of intolerance', and 'in the face of human worth, ... there comes an end to priest and Rabbi'. **In order to obtain their emancipation, the Jews had first to destroy the Christian essence of the state, the 'Christian State'. 'They criticised Christianity with great dialectical skill and with no pity'**, and by becoming 'in the process atheists, radicals, they became truly free men, with no prejudices'. And **once they had shown that the Christian religion was nothing but a myth, 'the work was accomplished'**.

More than that, **the Jews 'have rescued men from the narrow idea of an exclusive fatherland, from patriotism. ... The Jew is not only an atheist, but a cosmopolitan, and he has turned men into**

{p. 25} **atheists and cosmopolitans; he has made man only a free citizen of the world.'** Almost consciously contradicting Marx's famous dictum on the emancipation of mankind through its emancipation from Judaism, and of the Jews from Judaism, Bernays triumphantly proclaims: **'In their struggle for emancipation the Jews have emancipated the European States from Christianity'**. In other words it is not the Christians who gave emancipation to the Jews, the Jews enabled the Christians to obtain their own emancipation. **'The Jews took their revenge upon the hostile world in an entirely new manner ... by liberating men from all religion, from all patriotic sentiment ... from everything that reminded them of race, place of origin, dogma and faith.** Men emancipated themselves that way, and the Jew emancipated them, and the Jew became free with them ... They achieved the incredible, and historians of the people will in the future recognise their merit willingly and justly.' It was not their religion or racial qualities that enabled the Jews to accomplish all this. It was their existential situation, their fate: **'Only as the result of a general emancipatory effort could they become free themselves.'** The Jews succeeded in forging for themselves some mighty levers of power to help them in their work: **'the power of mobile property represented by the Rothschilds'**; the psychological, spiritually therapeutic influence of Jewish doctors whose very existence and sought-after activity defied religious taboos and differences of religion, race and tradition; and **above all the press, 'which fell everywhere in Europe into Jewish hands'.** And **when the revolution broke out, the Jews were everywhere in the forefront.** After all, Christendom had now become atheistic and cosmopolitan, **the Jews might as well leave the stage as a separate people.** Their mission had been fulfilled. **In a Hegelian manner the highest assertion of their particularity marks their disappearance within universality.**

{p. 26} Bernays and the Jews in general, so eager in that year of universal brotherhood to renounce their corporate identity, in some cases even their religious separateness, entirely misread the real significance of the revolutionary upheaval. **The victor in that revolution proved to be not universalism, but nationalism of the exclusive type** {symbolised by Emperor Napoleon III, target of Maurice Joly's *Dialogues*}; not abstract idealism, but historic continuity; not rationalism, but the powers of instinct; not the idea of concord, but the fact of force. The Jews became the test case and whipping-block, when the victory of these counter-revolutionary forces had time to work itself out.

In the meantime, **some fifteen years after the debacle of the revolutionary hopes in 1848, two Jews emerged as the acknowledged leaders of the revolution.** German workers made their appeal to the Jewish *litterateur* Lassalle to become their chief and in response the young dictatorial leader launched his terrific campaign, which was cut short by his death in an absurd duel, and **Karl Marx became the head of the First International.**

**At that very time the problem of Jews and revolution began to assume truly vital significance in the Empire of the Tsars.** {end of quotes}

**6.7.2 Benjamin Ginsberg, *The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1993).**

{p. 17} In the decades after the war, **governments became increasingly** {p. 18} **dependent upon foreign borrowing - an activity that the Rothschilds came to dominate.** Between 1818 and 1832, Nathan Rothschild handled 39% of the loans floated in London by such governments as Austria, Russia and France. Similarly, the Vienna and Paris branches of the family raised money and sold bonds for the Hapsburgs, Bourbons, Orleanists, and Bonaparts. **By mid-century, the entire European state system was dependent upon the international financial network dominated by the Rothschilds.** In the 1860s and 1870s, another Jewish financier, Baron Gerson von Bleichroeder, was a principal figure in the creation of a united German state. Bleichroeder helped Bismarck obtain loans for the war against Austria after the chancellor failed to secure financing from the Prussian parliament. Subsequently, Bismarck entrusted Bleichroeder with negotiating the indemnity to be paid by France after its defeat in the Franco-Prussian War in 1871 (on the French side, negotiations were conducted by the Rothschilds).

{p. 18} **Significant numbers of Jews participated in the liberal revolutions of 1848 in central Europe.** In Germany, Jews fought at the barricades in Berlin and helped to lead the Prussian national assembly and

{p. 19} Frankfurt parliament. Such intellectuals as Heinrich Heine and Ludwig Borne were major publicists and propagandists for the liberal cause. In Austria, Jews participated in the Vienna uprising and helped to formulate a new liberal constitution. In Hungary, 20,000 Jews enlisted in the national army formed by Louis Kossuth. The constitutions of most of the liberal regimes established in 1848 provided for emancipation of the Jews. After these regimes were overthrown by conservative forces, however, many of the Jews' new privileges were rescinded. Central European Jews continued to support liberal movements even after the revolutions of 1848 were defeated. In the 1860s and 1870s Austrian and German rulers were compelled to make concessions to liberal forces, and Jewish disabilities were removed as they had been earlier in France and Britain when liberal regimes were consolidated in those countries....

**In France, Jews supported the liberal revolution of 1848. Two prominent Jews, Adolphe Cremieux and Michel Goudchaux, served the Second Republic as ministers of justice and finance, respectively. The accession of Napoleon III brought an end to this short-lived regime, and Jews played little role in the Second Empire** that followed. After the rout of French forces in the Franco-Prussian War and the collapse of the Second Empire in 1870, Jews were active in the founding of the Third Republic. The Rothschilds organized the payment of the German war indemnity, and a number of Jews participated in the early republican governments. Cremieux once again served as minister of justice; Eugene Manuel, Narcisse Leven, and Leonce Lehmann occupied important government posts; and several Jews served in the Chamber of Deputies.



{p. 20} Between the Franco-Prussian War and the First World War, Paris was a major international banking and financial center, and Jews were among the dominant figures in French finance. In the late nineteenth century, roughly one-third of all Paris bankers were Jews. {end quote}

More of Ginsberg at [ginsberg.html](http://ginsberg.html).

## 7. Napoleon III's Rule

### 7.1 Napoleon III's Political Program

**Napoleon III, *Napoleonic Ideas*** - originally published as *Des Idées Napoleoniennes*, par le Prince **Napoleon-Louis Bonaparte**, in July, 1839. Edited by Briston D. Gooch, Harper Torchbooks, New York, 1967.

Napoleon III here writes (before he became Emperor) of his uncle, Napoleon I, and sets out his program.

{p. 41} The Domestic Situation

The different governments which held power successively from 1789 to 1800 obtained great results in spite of their excesses. The independence of France had been maintained, the feudal system had been broken up, and salutary principles had been widely spread. Nevertheless, nothing was as yet solidly established; too many hostile elements stood face to face.

At the epoch when Napoleon arrived at power, true legislative genius consisted in judgments based on an awareness of how past, present, and future were related.

{p. 42} It was necessary to solve and answer the following questions:

What ideas have passed away never to return?

What ideas must ultimately triumph?

Finally, what ideas are susceptible of immediate application, and will hasten the reign of those destined to prevail?

The Emperor rapidly discerned these various distinctions, and though he clearly foresaw the possibilities of the future, he confined his action to the realization of present possibilities.

The great difficulty in revolutions is to avoid confusion in popular ideas. **The duty of every government is to oppose false ideas and to guide true ones by placing itself boldly at their head;** for if a government allows itself to be led instead of guiding, it hastens to destruction and compromises society instead of protecting it.

**The Emperor acquired his immense ascendancy so easily because he represented the true ideas of his age.** As to harmful ideas, he never attacked them frontally, but always flanked, parleyed and negotiated with them, finally reducing them to submission by moral influence, for **he knew that violence is unavailing and worthless against ideas.**

Having always an object in view, he employed the promptest means which circumstances permitted to attain it.

What was his ultimate object? ... Liberty!

Yes, liberty! and the more one studies the history of Napoleon, the more will he be convinced of this truth. For **liberty is like a river; in order that it may bring abundance and not devastation, it is necessary to prepare for it a broad and deep channel.** If in its regular and majestic course it remains within its natural limits, the regions it traverses bless its passage; but if it comes like an overflowing torrent, it is regarded as the most terrible of calamities; it awakens every form of distrust, and then one

{p. 43} sees men in their fear reject liberty because she may destroy, as if one should banish fire because it may burn or water because it may inundate.

But is it said liberty was not secured by the imperial laws? The name of liberty was not, it is true, placed at the head of every law or placarded at every public square, but every law of the Empire prepared for its peaceful and certain reign.

When in a country there exist parties exasperated with each other and possessing violent mutual hatreds, it is necessary for these parties to disappear and for these hatreds to be pacified before liberty is possible.

When in a country become thoroughly democratic like France, the principle of equality is not generally applied, it must be introduced into all the laws before liberty is possible.

When there is neither public spirit nor religion nor political faith, it is necessary to create at least one of these elements before liberty is possible.

**When the ancient manners and customs have been destroyed by a social revolution, it is necessary to create new manners and customs** in harmony with the new principles before liberty is possible.

**When there is no longer an aristocracy** in a nation, and nothing remains organized but the army, **it is necessary to reconstruct a civil order based upon a precise and regular organization** before liberty is possible.

Finally, when a country is at war with its neighbors and contains in its bosom partisans of its enemies, it is necessary to conquer those enemies and convert them into sure allies before liberty is possible.

We must pity those who wish to reap before having plowed the field or sown the seed or given to the plant the necessary time to germinate, to blossom, and to ripen its fruit. It is a fatal error to imagine that a declaration of principles is sufficient to constitute a new order of things.

{p. 44} After a revolution the essential thing is not to make a constitution but to adopt a system which, based upon popular principles, possesses all the force necessary to found and establish and which, while surmounting the difficulties of the moment, possesses flexibility enough to adapt itself to circumstances. Besides, after a conflict, can a constitution safeguard itself against reactionary passions? How dangerous it is to attempt to convert transitory necessities into general and

permanent principles! "A Constitution," Napoleon has said, "is the work of time; one cannot provide in it too broad a power of amendment."

We proceed to recapitulate under the preceding points of view the actions of the Emperor. To judge is to compare. We will compare his reign with the epoch which preceded it and with the epoch which followed. We will judge his plans by what he did when victorious - by what he has left in spite of his defeat.

When Napoleon returned from Egypt all France received him with enthusiasm, regarding him as the savior of the dying Revolution. France, fatigued by so many successive efforts, agitated by so many different parties, had gone to sleep amidst the thunder of her victories, and seemed about to lose the fruit of what she had acquired. The government was without moral force, without principle, without virtue. Furnishers and contractors were at

{p. 45} the head of society and held the highest rank in the midst of corruption. Generals of the army, such as Championnet at Naples and Brune in Lombardy, feeling that they were the strongest, began to refuse obedience to the government and imprisoned its representatives. Credit was annihilated, the treasury was empty, public stock had fallen to eleven per cent, waste was rife in the administration, the most odious brigandage infested France, and the provinces of the west were in a constant state of insurrection. Finally, the old regime approached again with alarming speed, for the axe of the lictor no longer protected the cap of liberty.

Everybody talked of liberty and equality, but each party wished them only for itself. We want equality, said some, but we do not wish to grant the rights of citizenship to the relatives of nobles and of emigrants, and we propose to leave 145,000 Frenchmen in exile. We want equality, said others, but we do not wish to give offices to conventionalists. Finally, we want liberty, but we are for maintaining the law which condemns to death those whose writings tend to recall the old regime; we are for maintaining the law of hostages, which destroys the security of 200,000 families; we are for maintaining the impediments which nullify the liberty of worship, etc., etc. Such contradictions between professed principles and their practical application tended to introduce confusion into ideas and things. It must have been so as long as there was not **a national power which, by its stability and conscious strength, was exempt from passion and able to give protection to all parties without losing any of its popular character.**

{end of quotes}

## 7.2 How Napoleon III Came to Power

**7.2.1 Jean Sigmann, 1848: *the Romantic and Democratic Revolutions in Europe*,** tr., Lovett F. Edwards, George Allen & Unwin, London 1973.

{p. 228} The crushing **victory won on 10 December 1848 by Louis Napoleon was primarily due to the peasantry. But the workers too had a considerable share in it;** with their five-and-a-half million votes, the "nephew of the little corporal" defeated the candidate of the bourgeoisie, the republican General Cavaignac (one-and-a-half million), leader of the executive and "prince of the

blood" since his triumph in June and also crushed that of the Left-wing parliamentarian Ledru-Rollin (370,000), the socialist Raspail (37,000) and Lamartine (17,000) the symbol of a dead hope.

Universal suffrage had put an end to the revolution in April. Was it now to substitute the Empire or the Monarchy for the Republic? To this alternative the day of 13 June 1849 gave an answer of which the people dimly perceived the anachronism. {end quote}

### **7.2.2 Documents in the Political History of the European Continent 1815-1939.**

Selected and edited by G. A. Kertesz, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1968:

{p. 98} 43. *Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte in 1848*

Although Prince Louis **Napoleon** Bonaparte, a nephew of Napoleon I, **tried to return to France repeatedly after the February Revolution, and in fact was elected several times to the Assembly, the Government** and the National Assembly **prevented his return** until September. He was then allowed to take his seat in the National Assembly (a), and became **a candidate in the presidential elections in December, winning them with an overwhelming majority**. Part of his programme is included under (b). The two selections provide an interesting contrast to the documents in section VII.

Source: *The Political and Historical Works of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte* (London, Illustrated London Library, 1852), vol. i, pp. 96-7, 101-5.

(a) Louis Napoleon's Speech on taking his Seat in the Assembly, 27 September 1848.

Citizen representatives:

I cannot longer remain silent after the calumnies directed against me. I feel it incumbent on me to declare openly, on the first day I am allowed to sit in this hall, the real sentiments which animate and have always animated me. After being **proscribed during thirty-three years**, I have at last recovered a country and my rights of citizenship. The Republic has conferred on me that happiness. I offer it now my oath of gratitude and devotion, and the generous fellow-countrymen who sent me to this hall may rest certain that they will find me devoted to the double task which is common to us all, namely, to assure order and tranquillity, the first want of the country, and to develop the democratic institutions which the people has a right to claim. During a long period I could only devote to my country the meditations of exile and captivity. Today a new career is open to me. Admit me in your ranks, dear colleagues, with the sentiment of affectionate sympathy which animates me. My conduct, you may be certain, shall ever be guided by a respectful devotion to the law. It will prove, to the confusion of those who have attempted to slander me, that no man is more devoted than I am, I repeat, to the defence of order and the consolidation of the Republic.

{p. 99} (b) Louis Napoleon's Programme, November 1848.

Fellow Citizens:

In order to recall me from exile, you elected me a representative of the people. On the eve of your proceeding to the election of chief magistrate of the republic, my name presents itself to you as a symbol of order and security.

These testimonies of a confidence so honourable are due, I am aware, much more to the name which I bear than to myself, who have as yet done nothing for my country;- but the more the memory of the Emperor protects me, and inspires your suffrages, the more I feel myself called upon to make known to you my sentiments and principles. There must not be anything equivocal in the relations between us.

I am not an ambitious man, who dreams at one time of the Empire and of war; at another of the adoption of subversive theories. Educated in free countries, and in the school of misfortune, I shall always remain faithful to the duties which your suffrages, and the will of the Assembly, may impose upon me.

If I am elected President, I should not shrink from any danger, from any sacrifice, to defend society, which has been so audaciously attacked. I should devote myself wholly, without reserve, to the confirming of a republic, which has shown itself wise by its laws, honest in its intentions, great and powerful by its acts.

I pledge my honour to leave to my successor, at the end of four years, the executive powers strengthened, liberty intact, and a real progress accomplished.

Whatever may be the result of the election, I shall bow to this will of the people; and I pledge beforehand my co-operation with any strong and honest government which shall re-establish order in principles as well as in things; which shall efficiently protect our religion, our families, and our properties - the eternal basis of every social community; which shall attempt all practicable reform, assuage animosities, reconcile parties, and thus permit a country rendered anxious by circumstances, to count upon the morrow.

To re-establish order is to restore confidence - to repair, by means of credit, the temporary depreciation of resources - to restore financial positions and revive commerce.

{p. 158} 74. *Decree dissolving the National Assembly, 2 December 1851*

**Louis Napoleon Bonaparte**, having been **elected president in 1848** (cf. No. 43(b)) **worked hard at making himself and his policies popular in the country and, indeed, by 1851, was assured of substantial support** not only among the population, but also in the National Assembly. **Many thought that only his continuance in the presidency could assure the maintenance of internal peace and order, but re-election of a president after his four-year term was prohibited** by the 1848 constitution.

Petitions for the revision of this provision were received in large numbers during 1851 (many of them organized by the prefects), and the National Assembly voted by a large majority in favour of such revision, but it was short of the constitutionally required two-thirds majority. Louis Napoleon and his entourage therefore **decided on a coup d'etat** which, after several postponements, took place

in the early hours of 2 December 1851. The first step was the dissolution of the National Assembly.

Source: *The Political and Historical Works of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte* (London, Illustrated London Library, 1852), vol. ii, p. 354.

In the name of the French people the President of the Republic decrees:

1. The National Assembly is dissolved. 2. Universal suffrage is re-established. The law of the 31st of May is abrogated. 3. The French people is convoked for their votes from the 14th December to the 21st December following. 4. The state of siege is decreed throughout the first military division. 5. The Council of State is dissolved. 6. The Minister of the Interior is charged with the execution of the present decree.

#### *75. Proclamation and Decree on the Plebiscite, 2 December 1851*

The dissolution of the National Assembly (No. 74) was justified by Louis Napoleon in the proclamation that follows (a). In it, he also indicated the main constitutional changes he wanted to introduce and announced the holding of a plebiscite to ascertain the will of the people. The terms of the plebiscite are contained in his decree (b)

Source: *Annual Register*, 1851, pp. [254-5, 201].

1 In this law the Assembly, against the wishes of the president, re-introduced restrictions on the suffrage.

{p. 159} (a) Proclamation of 2 December 1851.

Frenchmen,

The present situation cannot last much longer. Each day the situation of the country becomes worse. The Assembly, which ought to be the firmest supporter of order, has become a theatre of plots. The patriotism of 300 of its members could not arrest its fatal tendencies. In place of making laws for the general interest of the people it was forging arms for civil war. It attacked the power I hold directly from the people; it encouraged every evil passion; it endangered the repose of France. I have dissolved it, and I make the whole people judge between me and it. The Constitution, as you know, had been made with the object of weakening beforehand the powers you entrusted to me. Six millions of votes were a striking protest against it, and yet I have faithfully observed it. Provocations, calumnies, outrages, found me passive. But now that the fundamental part is no longer respected by those who incessantly invoke it, and the men who have already destroyed two monarchies wish to tie up my hands in order to overthrow the Republic, and to save the country by appealing to the solemn judgment of **the only sovereign I recognize in France - the people.**

I, then, make a loyal appeal to the entire nation; and I say to you, if you wish to continue this state of disquietude and uneasiness that degrades you and endangers the future, choose another person in my place, for I no longer wish for a place which is powerless for good, but which makes me responsible for acts that I cannot

hinder, and chains me to the helm when I see the vessel rushing into the abyss. If, on the contrary, you have still confidence in me, give me the means of accomplishing **the grand mission I hold from you**. That mission consists in **closing the era of revolution, in satisfying the legitimate wants of the people, and in protecting them against subversive passions**. It consists especially in the power to create institutions which survive men, and which are the foundation on which something durable is based. Persuaded that the instability of power, that the preponderance of a single Assembly, are the permanent causes of trouble and discord, I submit to your vote the fundamental bases of a constitution which the assemblies will develop hereafter. ...

{p. 165} 78. *The Re-Establishment of the Empire, November-December 1852*

After Louis Napoleon took power as president for ten years in 1851, it was clear that it would not be long before he assumed the imperial dignity. In November 1852 a *senatus consultum* (a) was passed proposing this modification of the constitution, and was approved by a large majority in a plebiscite (b).

Source: *Annual Register*, 1852, pp. [263-4, 267] (with emendations).

(a) *Senatus Consultum*, 7 November 1852.

1. The imperial dignity is re-established. Louis Napoleon Bonaparte is Emperor of the French under the name of Napoleon III. 2. The imperial dignity is hereditary in the direct descendants, natural and legitimate, of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte ... 8. The following proposition shall be submitted to the people for acceptance in the form determined by decrees: 'The people desires the re-establishment of the imperial dignity in the person of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, with the succession in his direct descendants natural and legitimate or adopted; and gives him the right to regulate the order of succession to the throne in the Bonaparte family ...'

(b) Decree on the Re-establishment of the Empire, 2 December 1852.

Seeing the *senatus consultum*, dated 7 November 1852, which submitted to the people the following plebiscite:

[text in paragraph 8 of No. 78(a)];

{p. 166} Seeing the declaration of the Legislative Body, which proves that the operations of the vote have been everywhere freely and regularly accomplished;

That the general summing up of the votes on the plebiscite has given seven millions eight hundred and twenty-four thousand one hundred and eighty-nine (7,824,189) bulletins bearing the word '**Yes**';

Two hundred and fifty-three thousand one hundred and forty-five (253,145) bulletins bearing the word '**No**';

Sixty-three thousand three hundred and twenty-six (63,326) **invalid** bulletins: We have decreed and decree as follows:

1. The *senatus consultum* of the 7th of November, 1852, ratified by the plebiscite of the 21st and 22nd of November, is promulgated and becomes the law of the State.

2. Louis Napoleon Bonaparte is Emperor of the French under the name of Napoleon III.

79. *Senatus Consultum* amending Article 42 of the Constitution, 2 February 1861

The first of the liberalization measures which, though still with restrictions, enabled the public at large to be informed of the debates of the Chambers.

Source: F.-A. Helie, *Les constitutions de la France* (Paris, Duchemin, 1880), p. 1272 (trans. Ed.).

Article 42 of the Constitution is amended as follows:

The debates in the sessions of the Senate and the Legislative Body shall be taken down in shorthand and inserted, in full, in the official gazette of the following day.

In addition, reports of these sessions, compiled by editorial secretaries under the authority of the president of each Chamber, shall be put at the disposal of all newspapers each evening. ...

{p. 167} 80. *Senatus Consultum* amending articles 4 and 12 of the *Senatus Consultum* of 25 December 1852, 31 December 1861

This is another important liberalization measure. Before it, the budget had to be debated and voted as a whole: under the new arrangement it became possible to discuss the estimates of each ministry separately. At the same time, the control of the Legislative Body over supplementary or extraordinary estimates was extended.

Source: F.-A. Helie, *Les constitutions de la France* (Paris, Duchemin, 1880) pp. 1274-5 (trans. Ed.).

I. The estimates of expenditure shall be presented to the Legislative Body set out in sections, chapters and articles. The estimates of each ministry shall be voted by sections. The appropriations voted for each section shall be allocated to its chapters by a decree of the Emperor made in the Council of State. 2. Special decrees, made in the same form, may authorize transfers from one chapter to another within the estimates of the same ministry. 3. Supplementary or extraordinary appropriations may only be granted by law ...

81. *Imperial decree concerning the Relations of the Government with the Senate and the Legislative Body*, 19 January 1867

The importance of this decree is that it enables members of the two Chambers to raise questions in public session, asking for an explanation by the minister concerned. In this way grievances could be aired, and actions of the executive criticized. While it is true that

{p. 168} the general debate on the address in reply was abolished as part of this reform, the possibility of raising specific matters amply compensated for the loss.

Source: F.-A. Helie, *Les constitutions de la France* (Paris, Duchemin, 1880) p. 1283 (trans. Ed.).

1. Members of the Senate and of the Legislative Body may address interpellations to the Government. 2. All requests for interpellations must be in writing and signed



by at least five members. Such requests must explain the subject of the interpellation in summary form; they are to be sent to the president who communicates them to the minister of state and sends them to committees for examination. 3. If two committees of the Senate or four committees of the Legislative Body are of opinion that the interpellations may take place, the Chamber shall set a day for the debate. 4. After the close of the debate, the Chamber may resolve the return to the order of the day, or to communicate with the government. 5. Return to the order of the day always has priority. 6. Communication to the Government must always be couched in the following terms: 'The Senate or the Legislative Body brings the subject of the interpellations to the attention of the Government.' - In this case an extract of the debate is sent to the minister of state ... 8. Articles 1 and 2 of our decree of 24 November 1860 which order that the Senate and the Legislative Body shall each year, at the beginning of the session, vote an address in reply to our speech, are abrogated.

## 82. *The Liberal Empire, 21 May 1870*

After further measures of liberalization in 1869, the Emperor submitted, on 23 April 1870, a *senatus consultum* to the people, who were asked to approve the new constitution contained in it. The document that follows consists of the proclamation making public the result of the plebiscite and introducing the new constitution, the most important new provisions of which are included in summary form.

Source: F.-A. Helie, *Les constitutions de la France* (Paris, Duchemin, 1880), pp. 1323-7 (trans. Ed.).

{p. 169} Napoleon, by the grace of God and the national will Emperor of the French, to all present and to come, greeting.

In view of our decree of 23rd of April last which convoked the French people in its electoral assemblies to accept or reject the following proposition:

'The people approves the liberal reforms of the Constitution introduced by the Emperor, with the consent of the great bodies of the State, since 1860 and it ratifies the *senatus consultum* of the 20th of April 1870';

In view of the declaration of the Legislative Body which states that the operations of the vote have been everywhere freely and regularly accomplished; and that the general summing up of the votes on the proposition has given 7350,142 bulletins bearing the word '**Yes**'; 1,538,825 bulletins bearing the word '**No**'; and 112,975 **invalid** bulletins;

We have sanctioned and sanction, we have promulgated and promulgate as the constitution of the State the *senatus consultum* adopted by the Senate on the 20th of April 1870 the text of which is as follows: -

*Senatus Consultum* Establishing the Constitution of the Empire.

[The following are some of the more important changes from the Constitution of 1852, the provisions of which, if not expressly superseded, remain in force:

The Senate and the Legislative Body as well as the Emperor now have the initiative in introducing legislation;

A Council of Ministers is established; the ministers are responsible; they may be members of the Senate or the Legislative Body;

The Constitution can be altered only by the people on the proposal of the Emperor.]

{end of quotes }

## 8. Assessments of Napoleon III

Having connected up the various revolutionary movements, we must now re-focus on Joly and his historical context.

Joly's *Dialogues* was written during the rule of Emperor Napoleon III of France, and directed against him. Given the despotic nature of Bolshevism, and the plan for such despotism enunciated in the *Protocols*, **it is instructive to compare Napoleon with the Bolsheviks, to see which has the worse record for killing, torture etc.**

It will be seen that the Bolsheviks win hands-down; it's no contest. But those claiming the *Protocols* a forgery, must pin the despotism on Napoleon III rather than the Bolsheviks.

**As Joly presents it, Napoleon III is the Machiavellian**, fooling the people; **as the *Protocols* present it, the Revolutionaries are the Machiavellians**, causing chaos and turmoil, and aiming at totalitarian control and a Reign of Terror.

**8.1 David L. Kulstein, *Napoleon III and the Working Class: A Study of Government Propaganda Under the Second Empire***, The California State Colleges, [Sacramento?], 1969.

{p. 37} **Louis Napoleon** also attempted to gain the support of the socialist P.-J. Proudhon. **In September, 1848, he arranged a meeting with Proudhon and the republican Joly to discuss the political and social problems faced by France.**

{footnote 130: Alfred Darimon, *A travers une revolution (1847-1855)* (Paris, 1894), 68 ff. Darimon was Proudhon's secretary.}

{p. 42} **A bitter satire on the press during the Second Empire by the republican journalist Maurice Joly**, despite its exaggerations, also contains much that is true.

{footnote 17: Maurice Joly, *Dialogues aux enfers entre Machiavel et Montesquieu ou la politique de Machiavel au XIXe siecle* (Brussels, 1864), 139 ff. **The publication of this "revolutionary book" gained Joly a sentence of fifteen months in prison.** ... The famous anti-Semitic tract, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, is a paraphrase of Joly's work. Konrad Heiden, *Der Fuerrer* (New York, 1944), 1 ff.}

{end of quotes }

Natalie Isser's book *The Second Empire and the Press* (Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, 1974) is similar in style to Kulstein's.

The material in Theodore Zeldin's book *The Political System of Napoleon III* (Macmillan, London 1958) is covered by other authors quoted below.

It is strange that Kulstein, who devotes many pages to Joly's account, should need to quote a book about Hitler, to claim that the *Protocols* is a paraphrase of Joly. In fact the parallel passages in Joly's *Dialogues* comprise 16.45% of the *Protocols*, by word-count. However, even in the parallel passages, the meaning is often different. Kulstein, presumably Jewish himself, makes no mention of the specifically Jewish role in the revolutionary movement.

**8.2 James H. Billington, *Fire in the Minds of Men: Origins of the Revolutionary Faith*, Maurice Temple Smith Limited, London 1980.**

{p. 340} **Napoleon III and "Imperialism"**

The drama of de-radicalizing the masses through a new type of journalism unfolded most vividly in the France of Napoleon III. In ways that contemporaries never understood - and historians have only begun to investigate - **Napoleon turned revolutionary nationalism abroad into a means of political repression at home, and transformed revolutionary Saint-Simonian social ideas at home into a means of economic expansion abroad.**

One cannot speak of the third Napoleon without speaking of the first; for the new Napoleon rode to power in large measure on the reputation of the old. **Napoleon III was elected president of the Second French Republic by an overwhelming vote in December 1848, and was awarded dictatorial powers three years later by an even more staggering vote.** The Napoleonic legend had continued to cast its spell over many revolutionary intellectuals.

The original French Revolution brought Napoleon I to power, and the original professional revolutionaries of the early nineteenth century came together largely to overthrow him. Revolutionary thinking about power was, thus, influenced from the beginning by this supreme man of power. He set the agenda for a generation by shattering all the old

{p. 341} political legitimacies: by politicizing the Enlightenment ideal of universal rationality (the metric system, the Code Napoleon); and by imposing it all on a backward world. Above all, he fed the romantic imagination with an aesthetic fascination with power - and with the possibilities of changing the map and the life of Europe.

Whether they came from the armies that fought with Napoleon (French Philadelphians, Polish Philomats, and most Italian Carbonari) or against him (Russian Decembrists, Spanish *comuneros*, German *Tugendbund*), **the early revolutionaries were youthful soldiers who spoke French and thought in the grand Napoleonic manner.** There was, then, a hidden model or "superego" for the original revolutionaries. Bonaparte was Prometheus unbound, a parvenu in power; and the young revolutionary was almost always both a restless Promethean and an outsider in search of power.

**The most important revolutionary ideologies of the restoration era - Saint-Simonianism and Hegelianism - were born under the Napoleonic star.** They continued to attract intellectuals who sought to provide purpose for (and thus gain access to) power. This politicization of the intellect intensified under Napoleon. **Saint-Simon first began writing specifically in order to perfect and complete the Napoleonic reforms.** His long and unsuccessful campaign to reach Napoleon directly gave him a permanent predilection for seeking out a power capable of putting his ideas into force. Hegel was enraptured by the Napoleonic conquest of Germany, and saw the hand of providence in the completion of his *Phenomenology* at the time of the Battle of Jena. **His final political vision appears to have been a synthesis of Prussian reform with Napoleonic universality.**

The rational reintegration of society preached by Hegel and Saint-Simon was inconceivable without **the strange combination that Napoleon introduced** into the world: **a despot ruling in the name of liberation.** However un-Napoleonic may have been the final hopes that Saint-Simon placed in the working class and Hegel in the Prussian state, the **impulse to look for some universal secular transformation of society** came as much from the concrete fact of Napoleon as from the abstract rhetoric of the revolution.

The Napoleonic legacy thus helped create the original revolutionary ideologies; **and the Napoleonic legend helped in more subtle ways to revive and intensify the revolutionary impulse in the 1840s.** The boredom with the politics and style of Louis Philippe would not have been so acute in a land that did not have a Napoleon to remember. The insecure Louis Philippe, in search of some genealogy of legitimacy, cultivated an identification with Napoleon. He returned the ashes of Napoleon to Paris for reburial in the Invalides, and erected his statue in the Place Vendôme.

There had long been a body of Frenchmen who considered themselves **reform Napoleonists as distinct from militaristic Bonapartists.** In the 1840s their ranks were swelled by others whose political hopes focused on **Napoleon's nephew, the future Napoleon III, who had been**

{p. 342} **active in the Italian revolutionary movement and had vainly tried twice to have himself proclaimed emperor in the late 1830s.** This new Napoleon wrote in 1839 the influential *Des Idées Napoléoniennes* {excerpted below}, which **called for a new supra-political authority avoiding all doctrine and seeking only concrete benefits for the masses.**

**This influential work, which sold 500,000 copies in five years, reflected the ideas of the Saint-Simonians whom Napoleon had befriended** during his English exile of the late 1830s. He followed them in preferring administrative solutions over ideological or political ones and in his early interest in a possible canal through Nicaragua to further the "mystic marriage of East and West."

The young Saint-Simon had progressed from early dreams of becoming a new Charlemagne to his final appeal for justice to "the poorest and most numerous

class." Napoleon III in like fashion turned from writing a life of Charlemagne in the early forties to **a new vision of increasing production and ending unemployment** in his work of 1844: *Extinction of Pauperism*.

Napoleon III did not share Napoleon I's fatal opposition to ideology. Unlike the first Napoleon, who came back from Egypt and Italy as a man of war, **the third Napoleon returned to France from London as a man of ideas. He adopted as his own the Proudhonist proposal for workers' associations and benefits, and transformed the Saint-Simonianism of his youth into an authoritarian industrialism and an anticlerical positivism** that greatly strengthened the French state (and, incidentally, helped to gain for many surviving Saint-Simonians lucrative positions in banking, industry, and government service). In this respect Bismarck was his imitator, transforming Hegelianism, the ideological system hitherto prevalent among German revolutionaries, into a new and conservative German nationalism. The roots of this neo-Hegelianism lay in the tract of 1857 calling for the building of a monument to Hegel, but warning that none would be adequate "until the German nation would build its state into the living temple of purest realism." When Bismarck became premier of Prussia five years later he capitalized on the passion of Hegelian intellectuals for political relevance by enlisting many of them in the tasks of German state-building. Many came to believe that Hegel's vision of a rational ordered society giving birth to a neo-Hellenic flowering of high culture might soon become reality in the new Germany Bismarck was building.

**The principal "Napoleonic idea" was the co-optation of French revolutionary rhetoric by the patriotic press, which Napoleon III controlled brilliantly.** The problem of the press was inescapable for anyone trying to restore order to France. Triumphant in elections, Napoleon faced the challenge of a free press:

{quote} ... the great question of the century ... the greatest difficulty for constitutional order, the greatest danger for weak governments, the decisive proof of strong ones. {end quote}

Initially, Napoleon III reacted negatively to the challenge. But **his harsh press laws of 1852 were gradually relaxed. He provided a general am-**

{p. 343} **nesty for the press in 1859, and soon entered the lists of chauvinistic journalism with his own anticlerical, quasi-socialist *L'Opinion Nationale*.**

Napoleon created the "national opinion" that he purported to describe. So thoroughgoing was his control of the press that one critic complained before the legislature in 1862: "There is one journalist in France ... the Emperor." In addition to controlling the news agency Havas and flooding the market with sloganized pamphlets (*L'Empire c'est la paix, Le salut c'est la dynastie*), Napoleon bought off opposition newspapers, streamlined the official *Le Moniteur*, and added a readable evening edition in 1864. This *Petit Moniteur* was published in editions of 200,000 and sold at a depressed price of six centimes - thereby undercutting all other competitors, who had to pay a minimum tax of five centimes on each issue. **The**

**satirist Maurice Joly**, in his *Politics of Machiavelli in the Nineteenth Century* of 1864, described the technique as "neutralizing the press by the press itself."

{In footnote 102 on p. 612, Billington writes, "Cited from Joly, *Dialogues aux enfers entre Machiavel et Montesquieu ou la politique de Machiavel au XIXe siecle*, Brussels, 1864, cited in Kulstein, 42-3. The famed anti-Jewish tract, *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, was to a large extent a paraphrase of Joly's work." Kulstein's work is excerpted above. **Billington's 677-page book on the revolutionary movements entirely "writes out" the Jewish connection**, documented above by Disraeli and Talmon. **So it is not surprising that he endorses Kulstein's book against Napoleon III, and the claim that the *Protocols* was plagiarised from Joly's *Dialogues*.**}

**Napoleon** was a master of co-optation and public relations. He **often offered prominent radical personalities jobs while stealing their slogans. He sponsored banquets and even associations for workers**, and sought to channel their growing search for solidarity. **Housing projects, mutual aid societies, and other meliorative programs were introduced** and lauded with publicity on his imperial tours. Unlike Fazy in Switzerland, who introduced worker benefits out of long conviction and after careful study, Napoleon simply adopted what his monitoring of public opinion convinced him was expedient.

Historians have reached radically different verdicts on the motives and even on the results of the emperor's program. **Essentially, he seems to have prepared the way for the characteristic political formula of the Third Republic: the combination of revolutionary rhetoric and practical reliance on a permanent centralized administration left over from the first Napoleon.**

Napoleon continued his support of the Italian nationalist movement abroad, and espoused other, more remote national revolutionary causes. However, the suspicion soon grew that he was attempting to reroute abroad the popular impulses towards social revolution that had appeared at home in 1848 and 1851. "Emperor of the French" rather than of France, he increasingly seemed to use overseas adventure for domestic prestige: war in the Crimea in 1854-56, conquest of South Vietnam in 1862, and the disastrous attempt to conquer Mexico in 1866-67. All of this called forth a new word of rebuke from his erstwhile journalistic friends: *imperialism*. This, the last of the great isms to find a name, was used to describe the rapid expansion of European power overseas in the last two decades of the nineteenth century; but the term began with journalistic questioning of Napoleon III in **the final "liberal period of his reign.**

**Napoleon's scourge during these final years was the last great polemic innovator of revolutionary journalism in the Franco-centric era: Henri de Rochefort.** His remarkable career illustrated both the vulnerability of Napoleon as a leader and the ultimate victory of his chauvinist ideal.

Rochefort came out of the same low culture that had created the

{p. 344} terms chauvinism and jingoism; he was a vaudeville writer and a pupil of both Blanqui and the chansonnier Beranger. He served his journalistic apprenticeship on *Figaro* before launching in the late 1860s his radical *La Lanterne* and *La Marseillaise* and contributing to Victor Hugo's new *Le Rappel* of 1869. Rochefort's was the direct voice of proletarian ribaldry: a Daumier in prose with just a suggestion of Rabelais, promising to "register the misery of the laborers" alongside "the toilets of the Tuileries." The very title of his first journal dispensed with the romantic past and invoked the plebeian image of a gaslight atop an iron support on a Parisian street corner. "The Lantern," Rochefort bluntly explained, "can serve simultaneously to illuminate honest men and to hang malefactors." **His principal target was Napoleon, whom he assaulted with an unprecedented barrage of animal metaphors. His journal soared to an unprecedented printing of 500,000**, and its easily concealed, pocket-sized format gave it European-wide distribution. When forced to flee to Brussels, Rochefort resumed publication of *The Lantern* with a model declaration of revolutionary independence from co-optation by Napoleon:

{quote} The role of the government is in effect to amnesty me as soon as possible; but my role is not to let them ... It is original, it is even burlesque. ... {quote}

**Although Napoleon succeeded in having the weekly shut later in 1869, Rochefort simply transferred his energies to a daily, *La Marseillaise***, which one of his collaborators called "**a torpedo launched at high speed against the metal plates of the imperial navy**," and a future leader of the Paris Commune called a "**machine of war against the Empire**." If France was still the "light of the world" for foreign revolutionaries, his journal was the main beacon.

Rochefort and his associates "proposed to rally the entire European socialist party to establish through the journal permanent relations between all the groups." Such plans were fanciful, but his format was widely imitated. Students in distant St. Petersburg (including Marx's principal Russian correspondent, Nicholas Danielson) tried to set up a journal with the same title and format.

**Within France, Rochefort's appeal was so great that it had to be combatted not just with repression, but also with rival attractions.** Girardin moved into the vacuum, and, as we have seen, he became in the late years of Napoleon's reign a leading troubadour of nationalism and foreign war. Taking over the moribund *La Liberte* in the late 1860s, he lifted its circulation from 500 to 60,000 through a journalistic revolution that was "perhaps as significant as that of 1836 of which it was in any case the natural consequence and prolongation." The new mass audience that he thus created found its excitement no longer in *The Three Musketeers* and the gossip columns of *La Presse*, but in images of actual combat in the real world - telegraphic dispatches of distant military adventures, bulletins of a rising and falling stock-market, and athletic contests that *La Liberte* was the first to cover regularly in its new section, *le monde sportif*.

{p. 345} **Rochefort himself was eventually seduced by the new chauvinism - despite having served ten years in New Caledonia for supporting the Paris**

**Commune** and having founded a new journal of revolutionary opposition to moderate republicans (appropriately named *The Intransigent*) on Bastille Day 1880. He swung to the Right late in the decade to support General Boulanger, moved further to the Right a decade later during the Dreyfus case, and left *The Intransigent* altogether in 1907 to spend the last six years of his life writing for the conservative, nationalist *La Patrie*. ...

**The most dramatic and fateful event of the watershed year, 1871,**

{p. 346} **was, however, the rise and fall of the Paris Commune.** It triggered the swing to the Right throughout Europe - and opened up new horizons for the revolutionary Left.

### **The Paris Commune**

**The Paris Commune of 1871 was the largest urban insurrection of the nineteenth century** - and precipitated the bloodiest repression. It was a watershed in revolutionary history: the last of the Paris-based revolutions, bringing to an end the French domination of the revolutionary.

The Paris uprising was the first example of mass defiance of the new military-industrial state in modern Europe. The Commune created - however briefly - an alternative, revolutionary approach to the organization of authority in modern society. **Successful subsequent revolutionaries in Europe followed the communard example of making revolution only in the wake of war.** Whereas the revolutions of 1789, 1830, and 1848 had occurred in times of peace, **those that rocked Russia in 1905 and 1917, and brought other communist regimes into power in China, Yugoslavia, and Vietnam in the 1940s, were the direct outgrowth of foreign wars.**

The Commune left a legacy of legends as well as lessons. **It provided the Russian Revolution with holy relics (Lenin was buried with a communard flag,** and the spaceship Voskhod was equipped forty years later with a ribbon from a banner of the Commune), and with holy images ( the classic icon of class conflict in Eisenstein's *October* - bourgeois ladies jibbing fallen workers with pointed parasols - was taken from a mural in the Paris museum of the Commune).

Myths of the Commune abounded among anarchists as well as Social Democrats. In the period prior to World War I; among Chinese cultural revolutionaries of the 1960s no less than Russian political revolutionaries fifty years earlier; among the New Left as well as the Old in the Western world.

Insofar as all later revolutionaries were to find unity among themselves, it was in the singing of **the great hymn that emerged from the martyrdom of 1871: the Internationale.**

The simple fact of the Commune was that **a revolutionary alliance ruled Paris for seventy-two days in the spring of 1871.** It began as a patriotic protest against capitulation to the Prussian siege of Paris by a provisional French government formed **after the defeat and flight of Napoleon III** in September 1870. But the Commune soon became a vehicle for proletarian protest against the modern



centralized state. An internal social revolution became a means of restoring pride to the

{p. 347} nation **after the state had suffered defeat in a foreign war.**

{end of quotes}

**8.3 Andre Maurois, *A History of France*, University Paperbacks, Methuen, London 1964**

{p. 400} WHY THE SECOND EMPIRE DID NOT LAST:

#### THE AUTHORITARIAN EMPIRE

THE sequence of events leading from the Second Republic to the Second Empire was roughly parallel to that which, at the century's beginning, had led from the Directory to the First Empire. **The Constitution of January 1852 created in fact, if not in name, a consul in the Bonapartist sense of the word, meaning a dictator. This 'president', elected for ten years, held the executive power and had the sole right to make treaties and war; he proposed all legislation and appointed all officials; neither he nor his ministers were responsible to the Chambers.**

Said the Prince: 'I am quite willing to be baptized in the waters of universal suffrage, but I do not intend to live out my life with wet feet.' **Three major bodies were to assist the President: the Council of State, which framed the laws; the Legislative Body (elective, but selected from a list of official candidates) which voted the laws; and the Senate, which was made up of one hundred and fifty members appointed for life by the President and acting as watchdogs of the Constitution - watchdogs who in fact watched very little. No provision was made for the case of a conflict between the President and the Legislative Body.** 'I view as a serious evil', said Montalembert, the Catholic orator and one of the few courageous men in this Assembly, 'the annihilation of all control and the debasement of the only elective body existing in the French Government ...' The 1852 Constitution applied in full rigour the Bonapartist doctrine that **despotism, in order to win acceptance, must present itself as a people's dictatorship** and a temporary expedient. 'Freedom', as Louis Napoleon put it, 'has never helped in the establishment of a lasting political structure; freedom crowns such a structure when time has made it strong.' Surely he had never read the history of the United States. No more than that of the Second Republic was the 1852 Constitution practicable. 'A Constitution which does not afford a State the means of change does not afford it the means to maintain itself.'

The emperor was already beginning to hatch out of the prince-presidential shell; the eagle was replacing the republican pike on flag-staffs, and people called it the 'Eagle's first flight'. Whenever the President travelled

{p. 401} through the provinces, Persigny, more Bonapartist than this Bonaparte, had his claque cry out: 'Long live the Emperor!' The Prince lectured the masses on the excellences of a Government which would keep France as she had been 'after regeneration by the 1789 Revolution and organization by the Empire'. Soon he was able to announce: 'The burst of enthusiasm which has made itself felt throughout

France in favour of restoring the Empire forces on the President the duty of consulting the Senate with regard to this matter.' The outcome of this consultation was a foregone conclusion; **the Senate ordered a plebiscite on the re-establishment of the imperial dignity in the person of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, and seven million eight hundred and thirty-nine thousand yeas made the Prince-President into the Emperor Napoleon III.** (The King of Rome had been Napoleon II, just as the Dauphin of the Temple had been Louis XVII.) There were **two hundred and fifty-three thousand nays** and **two million abstentions**, particularly in the provinces which had remained monarchical. The only fear which might have held the French back from so dangerous a course would have been that of a fresh crop of Napoleonic wars, but Napoleon III had reassured them. 'The Empire means peace', he kept repeating, and not without meaning what he said. Of course a man bearing his name should, he thought, do great deeds; but if Napoleon I had brought France victories, Napoleon III could bring her peace, prosperity, industrial progress, the welfare of her people and perhaps, later on, freedom. 'I grant that, like the Emperor, I have many conquests to make. Like him, I want to win over to civilization the hostile parties. I want to win over to religion, morality, and comfort that portion of the population - still so numerous - which ... in the very bosom of the earth's most fertile soil, can barely obtain the prime necessities ...' **His Government was to be that of cheap bread, great public works, holidays and leisure.** He would have sincerely liked to be a good tyrant; sadly enough, there are no good tyrants.

**At the time of his becoming emperor, Napoleon III was almost forty-five years old;** he was a large, heavy man, not without dignity. His long moustache and goatee lent him a most novel appearance, in its day much imitated; his grey eyes seemed lustreless, without a spark, but on occasion they could flash like lightning. **In France he had long seemed out of place; having lived there only as a child and later as a prisoner, he had no French friends outside his little band of faithful followers.** A cosmopolitan prince, he spoke 'German like a Swiss, English like a Frenchman and French like a German' ...

{ p. 404 } Well-intentioned but poorly counselled, Napoleon III began at a disadvantage. The Empire, which strove to combine a popular vote (the plebiscite) with hereditary power, was a hybrid regime; it had won the affections of the French in Napoleon I's time because France was then emerging from a frightful upheaval; exhausted by internal strife, bled white by the Terror, the country cried aloud for a peacemaker. Such was not the case in 1852. Throughout Europe, men's minds were generally turning towards parliamentary government and freedom of thought. In France, **the middle-class businessmen and peasants, terrified at socialism ever since the June Days of 1848, as well as at the sudden revelation of the strength of the working class, had wanted a sword and voted for the Empire.** Through disgust and discouragement the workers had remained passive. But with few exceptions, the country's best minds and the student population were never reconciled to the regime; the coup d'etat was regarded as a crime; even the Empress herself remarked: 'It will be a millstone round his neck all his life.' Rebuffed by

those whom he would have liked to allure, the Emperor could rely only on the interests which had created him and, like the Saint-Simonians, **seek social progress through material prosperity**. As we shall see, he succeeded fairly well but prosperity has never compensated for freedom.

The early days of the regime were rather brilliant. In foreign policy, reasonable French people had feared that his theories might lead the Emperor to take a warlike attitude; would he demand the abrogation of the 1815 treaties, insist upon the natural frontiers, fly to the aid of

{p. 405} oppressed national groups? Quite the opposite - **he did everything he could to reassure the rest of Europe**. Not that he renounced his great forebear's ambitions; but he knew that he must prevent the formation of a coalition in order to have any chance of achieving them, and that to do this he must remain on friendly terms with England, whose hatred had overthrown the First Empire. Now the British Government of that day was resolved to defend the Ottoman Empire against Russia; Napoleon III proposed an alliance against the Czar. The ensuing conflict meant to him a means of increasing his prestige by winning England to his cause, by appeasing the French liberals - who were the enemies of autocratic Russia and the friends of Poland - and, finally, by pleasing the Catholics, since the excuse for French intervention was the protection of the Holy Places. The Crimean War was far from easy, and at first the other side was victorious. 'This new Empire', wrote Victor Hugo, 'begins with 1812.' The campaign, however, ended in the fall of Sevastopol and a total Franco-British victory; the Zouaves at Malakoff and MacMahon with his famous, 'Here I am, here I stay', won their places amid the legendary heroes of the French army. The peace conference was held at Paris, thus confirming France's new-born prestige; the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, Napoleon I's illegitimate son, Count Walewski, presided. France obtained no material advantage, but she had at last broken the league of the sovereigns against the Revolution and had even, she believed, gained the friendship of England and of Prussia. As Austria was from then on isolated, Napoleon III's schemes for the liberation of Italy had entered the realm of the possible. Unfortunately, despite his illusions, he really possessed the friendship of neither England nor Prussia. Yet on the morrow of the Crimean War, having humbled Russia, France's only rival on the Continent, he could believe himself Europe's most potent sovereign.

**France's internal prosperity seemed to match her apparent success abroad**; the early achievements of authoritarian regimes often seem propitious, some years being required to make clear the dangers inherent in the lack of freedom. Napoleon III was sincerely concerned about the welfare of poor people; under his reign, **charitable associations, day nurseries and mutual-aid societies grew in number**; in many of the larger cities, **working-class quarters were erected which were unbeautiful but an improvement on the hovels they replaced**. Today such paternalism would seem offensive; then it was thought effective. Napoleon was even considering the establishment of workmen's retirement pensions; in 1864 he

{p. 406} finally **did away with the ban on workers' associations and acknowledged the right to strike**. The conditions under which labour lived were still dreadful; the working day was twelve hours; in *l'Assommoir* and *Germinal*, Zola showed his readers the ravages of alcohol and promiscuity. Yet we must grant that **the Empire did more to cure these evils than had the regimes before it**, and it was able to do this because **France's financial position was excellent. Never before had the country grown rich so quickly. Up to that time, private banks (Rothschild, Hottinguer, Mallet) had underwritten state loans and managed portfolios; a new breed of financiers - Pereire, Fould and later Germain - had the idea of turning to the public at large and soliciting that public's savings for investment. Thus were established the Credit Mobilier (which did not succeed), the Credit Foncier and, ultimately, the Credit Industriel et Commercial, the Credit Lyonnais and the Societe Generale.** First the lower middle class and then the peasants acquired the habit of investing in securities, and by this means large-scale, corporate capitalism developed.

**Savings canalized by these banks, paid for France's economic development; the State encouraged railway construction** and granted the systems a guarantee of the interest on their indebtedness. **In 1842, France possessed only 336 miles of track** (as against about 3600 in the United States and 1650 in England); **in 1860 she had 591; in 1870, 11,000.** Transatlantic navigation companies were organized. Everywhere **the regime fostered industrial concentration**; iron and coal mines were given as concessions to powerful corporations. The managers of banks, transport companies and mines were chosen from among a small number of families; **a capitalist oligarchy, in good part Protestant or Jewish, gradually replaced the numberless family businesses** of an older France and thereby confirmed the socialists in their regard for Marx's teaching, which had foretold this centralization. **In conformity with Saint-Simon's notions great public works were undertaken to beautify the city of Paris**, where poverty-stricken enclaves lay side by side with shiny newness; that city's prefect, Haussmann, a ruthless and arrogant man but a wonderful administrator, took on the task of **supplying the capital with those broad avenues** which the increased traffic and the tourists brought in by the new railways made imperative. **The Emperor in person had laid out the plan to transform the Paris of the Old Regime into the city of today.** Certain writers found fault with the rectilinear boulevards. 'This is Philadelphia; it is Paris no longer', wrote Theophile Gautier; he had never seen Philadelphia, and **the Parisians of today are grateful to Hauss-**

**{p. 407} mann for having spared their city congestion without having deprived it of its beauty.** In 1855, a World's Fair attracted two million visitors he marvelled at France's industrial power. Technically, and from the point of view of national wealth, the Empire had imposing results to its credit. Its Council of State and its prefects were beyond dispute efficient, they were all too skilled at repression, but they were zealous administrators.

Yet, in spite of the success of its prosperity policy, the Empire was not a stable regime; it lacked that mysterious virtue, legitimacy. The adventurer seemed

successful, but he remained none the less an adventurer; a muzzled public opinion was not convinced. A government which knows it is recognized as legitimate by the majority in the country has no fear of freedom; the imperial Government was so little sure of itself that it would not even allow the publication of the debates in a wholly domesticated Legislative Body. **The newspapers, subject to censorship and to prior admonition, were cautious and pro-Government; even private conversations were subject to police surveillance:** 'Only the Government speaks, and no one believes what it says.' The public got along as best it could; **books by authors in exile** (Victor Hugo, Edgar Quinet, Emile Deschanel, Louis Blanc) **came in as contraband and won all the more readers because they were forbidden.** The Orleans monarchists and the legitimists, although unable to agree among themselves and unite under one banner, joined in their fault-finding and constituted a so-called liberal group, extraordinary because of the abilities of such leaders as Thiers, Guizot, Montalembert, Dupanloup and Berryer. **The French Academy was the stronghold** of this intellectual Fronde; solemn addresses before it supplied opportunity **for slightly veiled attacks against the Empire.** 'Let's elect Lacordaire', said Victor Cousin, 'since we can't elect the Pope as a joke on the Empire.' However a few writers, such as Sainte-Beuve, Merimee and Nisard, had attached themselves to the regime, allured by the Empress and the Princess Matilda; Sainte-Beuve went into the Imperial Senate, and the students clamorously upbraided him for it. As for the republicans, those who were not living in exile sought refuge in seclusion; whenever the exiles started plotting (which they did without skill and in vain, for they had lost contact with France and were fighting battles long out of date), new deportations at once afflicted their friends inside the country. When, in **1857, elections** took place to renew the Legislative Body, the lack of all freedom of the press or of assembly, and the shameless placarding of official candidacies, discour-

{p. 408} aged the opposition. The requirement that every deputy should swear a personal oath to the Emperor kept out most of the republicans; **between 1857 and 1863 the opposition in the Legislative Body consisted of only five members**, among these being Emile Ollivier - who many regarded as a new Thiers - Jules Favre and Ernest Picard. In 1859 Napoleon felt strong enough to grant a full and absolute amnesty; Victor Hugo and Louis Blanc refused it; said Hugo: 'Until the end I shall share freedom's exile. When she returns, I shall return.'

The whole opposition was weak, and the Emperor could have overlooked a handful of malcontents had he not alienated two powerful conservative groups which until that time had supported him. A new phase in imperial policy was precipitated by a plot organized by the Italian *carbonari*, who could not forgive the Emperor Napoleon III for having forgotten the commitments of their 'brother', Louis Napoleon Bonaparte. In his youthful days he had espoused the cause of Italian independence, but once he had come to power, he had reversed his opinions and dispatched the Rome expedition in defence of the Pope's temporal power. In 1858 Orsini and three other Italian patriots hurled bombs at the Emperor's carriage, killing or wounding more than a hundred persons. This attempted assassination was

followed by very harsh repressive measures, but it had surprising results in that it modified Napoleon III's Italian policy in the direction which Orsini desired. From his cell, the condemned man had written the Emperor beseeching him to give the Italians their freedom; were he to do this, his name would be loved and respected; were he not, the attempts would continue. In both the Empress and the Emperor this letter aroused fear and compassion; there was some question of a pardon for Orsini, who had suddenly become a hero; then the hero was guillotined, but the cause for which he died triumphed. The Emperor had a secret interview with Cavour, Minister of the King of Piedmont (and Castiglione's uncle); it was agreed that France would help the Italians to drive out the Austrians and in return for its help, would obtain Savoy and the County of Nice.

This nationality policy, a favourite fancy of the Emperor's, seemed generous since France was going to help people of the same race, held apart by force, to unite; in fact it was fraught with danger. To establish new major States in Europe was to pave the way for fresh wars and, as far as France was concerned, to set up rivals, perhaps even enemies; for gratitude is never a collective virtue. The Italian war began in 1859; the Austrian army was defeated by the French at Magenta and Solferino.

{p. 409} All Italy and especially the Romagna, rose against the Pope, whereupon the Empress and the French clerical party protested. Napoleon hesitated and temporized; and when, counter to his expectations, Prussia too sided against Italy, he signed an armistice with Austria - thus alienating the Italians - and then advised the Pope to yield - which alienated the French clergy. Ultramontane and liberal Catholics, hitherto split, joined forces to demand that the Emperor protect the Pope. Napoleon III could not refuse Rome to Italy; was he not the champion of the principle of nationality? Ultimately he begrudgingly defended the Holy See; Pius IX, however, had already turned to the French legitimists and had accepted their offer of volunteers, the papal Zouaves, who hoisted the white banner of the monarchy. Thereupon, through a plebiscite, King Victor Emmanuel created Italian unity and seized the greater part of the Papal States; the Emperor had lost the Church's support without having won Italy's friendship and had succeeded in dissatisfying both liberals and clericals - a grave source of weakness in a France where the Church was more powerful than ever.

A second cause of discontent on the part of French conservatives was **Napoleon III's free-trade policy**. In this connection, as in the matter of nationalism, he was sincere and sought the State's welfare. Having lived in England in the days of the great debate over protection, and having observed the victory of free trade and the prosperity which followed, he was determined to push France towards international free trade. The French industrialists, however, protested. Secretly and without consulting them, the Emperor in 1860 negotiated a treaty with Great Britain which eliminated all embargoes, lowered all tariffs and, in return, obtained concessions for certain French products such as wine. There followed a general and most unjust outcry from all French industry; the manufacturers thought they were ruined and cursed the Government. Thus under attack from both clericals and capitalists,

Napoleon was inclined to draw nearer to the mass of the people and the republicans - a tendency in the Bonapartist tradition and corresponding to the Emperor's personal preference. Thus began that new regime which was called the Liberal Empire.

{end of quotes}

**8.4 J. P. T. Bury, *France 1814-1940: A History*, Methuen, London, 1959**

{p. 94} In the first new phase of the Eastern Question France played a leading part. **When a dispute arose between Latin and Orthodox monks over the guardianship of the Holy Places of Jerusalem, Napoleon was quick to seize the chance of restoring France's traditional interests in the Levant ...** But Russia soon intervened on behalf of the Orthodox and widened the issues by demanding that the Turks should grant her a virtual protectorate over all Orthodox Christians within their Empire. To Britain, long suspicious of Russian designs, and to France, whose parvenu Emperor had been treated scornfully by the Tsar as an upstart, such claims were intolerable. France had long taken the British view of the Eastern Question and held that the balance of power and her own Mediterranean interests required that Constantinople and the Straits should be kept out of Russian hands; and so, when in 1853-4 Russian troops entered the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia and attempts to negotiate a settlement broke down, the two powers went to war to prevent the Turkish Empire from being crushed by Russia.

{p. 95} The Crimean War could be said to have been a war which accorded with French interests. Far otherwise was it with the Italian campaign of 1859 which was to carry the Empire to its turning-point. Here **Napoleon's Italophile sentiment, due partly to his ancestry, partly to his early associations with the *Carbonari* and to his participation in the 1831 rising** in the Romagna, and partly to his liberal dreams, led him into a course of action which ran wholly counter to France's traditional policies. In his own entourage he had many people who were Italian in origin or sympathies, the beautiful Countess Castiglione, Prince Napoleon his cousin, Arese, Comleau, his doctor, and others, and who urged him to do something for Italy, the northern part of which was still largely under Austrian rule. ...

{p. 98} The year 1860 thus marked a turning-point in Napoleon's fortunes and in s policy towards the Catholics. Henceforth the relations of Church and State were less friendly. The Church no longer enjoyed such freedom of action, and **the State system of education made notable progress under the direction of a man personally selected by the Emperor, Victor Duruy, who proved to be one of the greatest of all French Ministers of Public Instruction.** The year was no less a turning-point in economic policy. The conclusion of **a commercial treaty with Great Britain** in that year, **followed in 1861 by trade agreements with Belgium, Italy and Switzerland, and in 1862 by one with Prussia,** gave an important impulse to greater freedom of international trade. But the Anglo-French Treaty, in many ways reminiscent of an earlier Treat of 1786, marked a striking departure from the rigid protectionist policy pursued by successive French Governments ever

since the early years of the Restoration. As such it met with bitter hostility from some of the big land-owners and from many industrialists, especially the textile manu-

{p. 99} facturers of Normandy and the North and the iron masters of the East. **The change was a victory for the Saint-Simonians** and evidence of Napoleon's desire to bolster up the Anglo-French Entente, and although its most obvious effects were political it had some important economic and social consequences. **More intensive competition from England hastened the concentration of certain industries in fewer firms and in many cases led to a renewal of plant or modernization of equipment.** When factories had to be rebuilt there was generally a resulting improvement in the working conditions of the employees. On the other hand, **many weaker firms went to the wall and others were obliged to reduce wages** so that there was a considerable amount of temporary distress. This had unusually significant consequences, for it was **partly responsible for the attempt of French workers to get into touch with the working classes of Britain which resulted in the formation of the First Workers' International.** Nevertheless, in spite of the temporary distress and the political resentments caused by the new policy, the statistics of **French exports** in general, and to Britain in particular, **continued to show an upward trend.** On French industry as a whole there can be little doubt that the 1860 Treaty acted as a healthy stimulant.

This wind of free trade was not the only breath of fresh air which the Emperor now let into France. **Irritated by the opposition of the clergy and their sympathizers** to his Italian policy, **Napoleon had sought to conciliate** the other main body of opinion, the Left, **by an amnesty in 1859 and by greater leniency towards the Press.** **In 1860** he went further and issued a decree permitting the Senate and Chamber to discuss and vote an annual address in reply to the speech from the throne, and **allowing reports of debates to be published in full.** **In the following year the Legislative Body was granted a wider measure of control over national expenditure.** Thus public opinion once again had a certain restricted opportunity to form judgements about political issues and to exercise pressure. But instead of winning converts to Bonapartism these so-called Liberal reforms, by giving greater freedom to the enemies of the regime, tended only to confirm them in their intransigence. Already indeed, **in 1857, five Republican deputies had been elected to the Legislative Body** and had taken their seats, treating the oath of allegiance as a mere formality. The extreme Left may have welcomed the Italian war and the 1860 Treaty of Commerce, but they remained Republicans. Equally, many of the men who re-emerged on the Right were monarchists avowedly or at heart. ...

{p. 104} Farther east again New Caledonia had been occupied in 1853 and the persecution of French missionaries by the Emperor of Annam had led to another military expedition. In 1859 Saigon had been captured and within a few years France had gained full sovereignty over three of the provinces of Cochin China and established a protectorate in Cambodia. Furthermore, in Egypt, which French capital was rapidly helping to transform into a great cotton-growing country, the



Frenchman, Lesseps, by cutting the Suez Canal, was engaged in a work which was to transform the strategic and commercial communications of the world. Thus in the new era of exploration and exploitation which was the prelude to the great 'Scramble' for Africa and other lands outside Europe in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, France of the Second Empire played an active and enterprising part. But the French public, as ever, was little concerned or interested in these distant happenings. Algeria was still widely looked upon as a source of military weakness and doubtful economic advantage which France would have been glad to abandon had she been able to do so without loss of prestige, and the potentialities of more remote territories were even less understood by the general public.

Moreover, the success of French arms in the distant valleys of

{ p. 105 } the Senegal or the Mekong was soon completely overshadowed by the tragic failure of Napoleon's policy in Mexico.

Begun as a debt-collecting expedition of three powers, Great Britain, France and Spain in 1861-2, the Mexican venture developed into an attempt by France alone to establish a new Latin Catholic Empire in the New World.

{ p. 108 } The **relaxation of the Press legislation in 1868** had put **an end to** the warning system and the **necessity for prior government authorization before a paper could be launched** and had led to an efflorescence of new journals, **particularly in the provinces reminiscent of 1848.**

{ p. 109 } It was disquieting, too, that **the great cities remained strongly Republican**, that **revolutionary bodies and secret societies**, many of them now more or less **connected with the First Workers International**, were **beginning to operate again** and that they were **active in fomenting street demonstration from which Paris of the Empire had been singularly free**; and that **in the same year, 1870, troops had, for the first time since Napoleon came to the throne, been called in to repress a serious outbreak of strikes.** All these signs seemed to suggest that the Empire was slowly decomposing. Yet it is possible that some French Republican historians have been easily led to exaggerate the strength of the Opposition and the unpopularity of the Empire. **The voters in the plebiscite of 1870 were above all votes for peace and order - too many people remembered the disorders of the Second Republic to wish for their recurrence** - but the Republican deputies' recognition of this fact meant that they at least would not begin a revolution though they would be ready enough to profit by one.

Moreover, **the plebiscite**, as we have suggested, **was still a vote for the Empire** and, in the opinion of the latest historian of the working classes during this period, nearly twenty years of power had done little to impair the hold of Napoleon upon the loyalty of the masses: **'Napoleon III, still strong in his seven million votes, retained a singular prestige.'**

{ end of quotes }

**8.5 David Thompson, *Europe Since Napoleon*, second edition, Longmans, London 1963.**

Note: Louis Philippe reigned as King from 1830 to 1848. Thompson's account begins with the Revolution of 1848.

{p. 183} ... it was to Paris, the traditional prompter for revolutionary performances, that rebels everywhere in Europe began to look. **Faced with the popular rising in Paris on February 22, Louis Philippe decided to dismiss Guizot and his ministry.** But the Paris mobs were fast getting out of hand, and the mischance of a volley from a company of regular troops which killed or wounded 52 of the crowd tipped the scale. **Barricades were erected everywhere, gunsmiths' shops were looted, and Paris found itself in total revolution.** The middle-class National Guard turned against the king. It was supported by moderate socialists like **Louis Blanc** and by **extremist social revolutionaries, the disciples of Blanqui.** **On February 24 Louis Philippe was forced to abdicate,** and in the Chamber of Deputies the poet Lamartine announced a list of **liberal parliamentarians to form a new provisional government.** They adjourned to the Hotel de Ville to agree on the allocation of offices. Lamartine himself took Foreign Affairs, the democratic radical Ledru-Rollin Home Affairs, with the aged Dupont de l'Eure as President. But it was one thing to set up a provisional government on paper, quite another to establish its authority in Paris and in the rest of France.

This group of moderate parliamentarians formed a self-constituted provisional government, acclaimed by the mob at the city hall. They were largely the journalistic staff of *Le National*, the liberal opposition paper founded in January, 1830, which had helped to undermine the rule of Charles X and had remained the chief opposition journal under the July Monarchy.

{p. 241} **When Louis Napoleon, in December, 1852, made himself emperor of France by a coup d'etat, he reverted to a system of government closely modelled on that of his famous uncle.** His rule was a usurpation of power, for a year earlier he had violently overthrown the republican parliamentary regime which, as its elected president, he had sworn to preserve. **He tried to mask and to legitimize this usurpation by three devices: by preserving the shadow of parliamentary government in the form of packed assemblies based on managed elections; by popular plebiscites; and by giving France, in his policy, what he thought would be most popular and most beneficial to the nation.** **His rule became a strange mixture of authoritarian government with increasing concession to parliamentary power and popular demands.** Yet the final result was a **development of France's parliamentary institutions** which made the Third Republic of 1875 possible. This paradox of French politics in these decades springs initially from the enigmatic character of Napoleon III himself.

**This strange man, to whom in 1848 five and a half million French men had been persuaded to entrust the presidency** of the democratic Second Republic, had already had a colourful and varied career. Son of Napoleon's brother, Louis Bonaparte, king of Holland, he had assumed headship of the Bonapartist family and cause in 1832 when Napoleon's own son (called by courtesy Napoleon II) had died. **In 1836 and again in 1840, with a handful of personal followers, he had**

**tried to overthrow Louis Philippe by local risings** that failed ridiculously. **Imprisoned in 1840 he had escaped in 1846 by simply walking out of the fortress of Ham disguised as a stonemason.** In the early months of 1848 the man, who in the 1830's had belonged to the *Carbonari* secret societies and who never lost his taste for cloak-and-dagger intrigues, could have been seen **parading Piccadilly in the role of a special constable, defending the government of Queen Victoria against the dangers of Chartism.** Always a dreamer and intriguer rather than a practical statesman, he combined a

{p. 242} nostalgic faith in the destinies of his family with **a genuine concern for the welfare of the poor and of the French people** as a whole. From the moment when he was **elected president of the Second Republic of 1848 by so overwhelming a majority**, it seems certain that he intended to revive the regime, and if possible the glories, of the empire of Napoleon I. Nor was he without considerable abilities and qualities worthy of admiration. He had **quickness of mind and imagination, ready sympathies for all in distress, great moral and physical courage.** But he lacked a grasp of realities, and his ambitions and sympathies clouded his judgment both of men and of events. He had not the infinity of energy and patience needed to master details and clarify his purposes. His poor physical health increasingly impaired his power of decision, and from middle age onward (he was already forty-four when he became emperor) he suffered from disease and bad health. He had undoubted talents, but he certainly lacked the genius of Napoleon I.

The new constitution which he inaugurated in 1852 rested on principles which, in a preamble, he carefully expounded to the country. He himself, as chief of state, assumed almost monarchical powers: the power to make war and treaties, to choose ministers and nominate to all important offices in the state, to initiate legislation, and to frame the regulations in which the laws were embodied. **The Legislative Body**, of not more than 260 members elected by universal male suffrage, **sat for only three months a year** and had little real power. A senate of life members, chosen ex officio or nominated by the chief of state, had the duty of examining legislation to make sure it did not conflict with the constitution. **Ministers were responsible only to Napoleon**, and there was **no collective cabinet responsibility.** In short, as he explained, "Since France has only maintained itself in the last fifty years by means of the administrative, military, judicial, religious, and financial organization provided by the Consulate and the Empire, why should we not adopt the political institutions of that period?" Accordingly, **he revived the Council of State, the very core of Napoleonic autocracy**, "an assembly of practical men working out projects of law in their special committees, discussing this legislation behind closed doors, without oratorical display." In such a system, it was clear from the first, parliamentary power was reduced to a minimum, and France was ruled by a centralized despotism tempered only by opportunism and necessity.

Yet within the next eighteen years, because universal suffrage and parliamentary institutions did survive if only in attenuated form, because the ideals and habits of democratic government had become so deeply rooted in France, and because

Napoleon found that a series of reverses in foreign policy corroded his personal popularity and prestige and forced him to seek fresh support from parliament, **France recovered bit by bit a more genuine system of parliamentary government.** Universal

{p. 243} male suffrage, instituted in 1848, he never dared to infringe though he manipulated elections. In 1860 he had to make important concessions to parliament. The Legislative Body was allowed to debate its reply to the speech from the throne, which expounded government policy: a restoration of the right that had been used with great effect by the parliamentary opposition between 1815 and 1848. **Ministers began to defend government measures before the Legislative Body and became more accountable to it. The press, despite continued control and censorship, was allowed to publish fuller reports of parliamentary debates.** From 1866 until 1869 further concessions had to be made to the growing clamor of the republican opposition. **Control of the press and of public meetings was relaxed.** Ministers could be questioned more closely and opposed more openly in parliament. Despite the resources of electoral management in the hands of the prefects and the powers of police supervision at the disposal of the government, **a vigorous and eventually successful republican opposition grew up**, led by men of the caliber of Adolphe Thiers, Leon Gambetta, and Jules Ferry. The so-called "Liberal Empire" which came into existence after 1860 was at least as real a parliamentary regime as was the constitutional monarchy before 1848.

The decline of autocracy in France can be measured by election results. **In the elections of 1857 only seven candidates hostile to the government of Napoleon were returned; in those of 1863 thirty-five were returned; and in those of 1869 ninety-three.** The big cities of Paris and Marseilles, Lyons and Bordeaux, especially opposed the Empire. This impressive development was **due above all to the growing strength and effectiveness of the republican press.** Under stringent press controls set up **in 1852, the political press had been almost stifled.** But, as under Charles X, there was **an immediate increase in the number and the circulation of literary, philosophical, and apparently innocuous publications in which critics could make their political arguments obliquely** but, to the initiated, very effectively. The **amnesty granted to political prisoners and exiles in 1859 brought a rebirth of republican activity, especially in journalism.** The strongest surviving moderate republican paper, *Le Siecle*, by 1866 reached the large circulation of 44,000. **In 1868, when press controls were relaxed 140 new journals appeared in Paris within a year.** *Le Rapel* contained the biting attacks of the literary giant Victor Hugo; and the mordant wit of the journalist Henri Rochefort won for *La Lanterne* a circulation of no less than 120,000. "The Empire," ran its famous opening sentence, "contains thirty-six million subjects, not counting the subjects of discontent."

The Empire, discredited by its succession of reverses abroad and in the failing grip of its sick emperor, could not have long survived such opposition even without the military defeat of 1870 to serve as its Water-

{p. 244} loo. Ranged against it too, were legitimist royalists like Antoine Berryer who wanted to go back behind 1830, moderate constitutional liberals like Thiers who wanted to go back behind 1848, the growing forces of socialism and of revolutionary communism represented by Blanqui and the supporters of the recently formed First International. But the toughest opposition came from two main groups, the liberals led by Thiers and the republicans led by Gambetta.

Before 1863 the parliamentary opposition was still no more than the five republican deputies for Paris and two others elected at Lyons and Bordeaux. But a liberal and republican opposition in the country was forming fast. It attracted brilliant lawyers like the "three Jules" (Jules Favre, Jules Simon, and Jules Ferry); and government prosecutions of journalists and agitators gave **excellent opportunities for republican lawyers, as counsel for the defence, to expound republican principles within the immunity of courtrooms.** The young Gambetta first revealed his formidable forensic and oratorical talents in helping to defend a group of republican journalists in a famous press trial of 1868. The opposition attracted eminent literary men like Victor Hugo, whose work *Punishment (Les Chatiments)*, written in exile, constituted a devastating attack on the Second Empire. When, **in the elections of 1863 the Liberal Union (Union liberale) won 2 million votes and 35 seats**, half of the 35 were republican. In 1864 Adolphe Thiers made his famous demand for the "five fundamental freedoms," which he defined as "security of the citizen against personal violence and arbitrary power; liberty but not impunity of the press, that is to say liberty to exchange those ideas from which public opinion is born; freedom of elections; freedom of national representation; public opinion, stated by the majority, directing the conduct of government." This remained the essence of left-center liberal programs for many years to come.

**By 1868-69 the activities of the opposition became more open and militant.** In the Paris salon of Juliette Adam, the banker's wife, republican leaders could discuss politics freely over dinner parties, and Gambetta found a new milieu of influence. By 1869 when he stood for the working-class Paris district of Belleville, he was able to expound what came to be known as the "Belleville Manifesto," a program of radical republican reforms. It was the outcome of the years of courageous republican opposition, and its essentials had already in 1868 been set out in Jules Simon's *Politique radicale*. It went much further than Thiers's "five fundamental freedoms," and included universal male suffrage, for local as well as parliamentary elections; separation of church and state; free, compulsory, and secular primary education for all; the suppression of a standing army; and the election of all public functionaries. As yet this radicalism represented only the advanced ideas of the working classes and lower middle classes of the big towns, and Gambetta was triumphantly elected

{p. 245} not only in Belleville but also in Marseilles. It was well in advance of what even most republicans wanted. But it foreshadowed the program of basic democratic reforms on which the great Radical party of the Third Republic was to build. In the new republic soon to be created Gambetta became the key man in the Republican Union, prototype of more modern party organization in France. **The**

**paradoxical achievement of the Liberal Empire was to accustom France to the existence and the consequences of an energetic constitutional opposition party, and to nurture a new movement of secular radicalism.**

Bonapartist Benefits. The Second Empire achieved much else, more deliberately, in the sphere of social and administrative reorganization. Its most impressive achievement in the eyes of foreign visitors was undoubtedly the transformation of Paris. **By a decree of 1860 the area of Paris was extended to include all the outskirts** and villages between the customs barriers and the fortifications; this increased its administrative area from twelve to twenty administrative units. Whereas in 1851 Paris had just over one million inhabitants, in 1870 it had more than 1,800,000. **The rapid growth of industry combined with the replanning of the city by Baron Haussmann**, under the strongest encouragement of Napoleon III himself, **changed the whole character of the capital**. It changed it socially, for the pulling down of houses in the old labyrinths of the center to make way for Haussmann's **broad new boulevards, squares, and parks** forced **many workers to the outskirts, where new factories grew up to utilize their labor; omnibus and local railway services** made a larger city possible. It changed Paris administratively, for **a much more highly organized system of local government and police** had to be devised to rule so large a city. The broad straight boulevards had political significance, for they made the raising of barricades in working-class districts less practicable, and the charges of cavalry, police, and troops more effective. It changed Paris architecturally, for the Emperor's program of **spectacular public works** included **the building of the new Opera house and extensions to the Louvre**, new squares and churches; the encouragement of big new stores like the Bon Marche, the Printemps, and the Samaritaine and of **joint-stock banks** like the Societe Generale and the Credit Lyonnais.

With the **new network of railways and steamship services** Paris became more than ever the economic, social, and cultural center of France. Napoleon did all in his power to make it also the capital of Europe. **Great exhibitions or world fairs were held in 1855 and 1867**, and it was regarded as a diplomatic triumph to have the conference of powers which ended the Crimean War held in Paris. International showmanship, both commercial and political, was a constant feature of the Second Empire. It was an era of organization and depended on **capital accumulation and investment**, which Napoleon encouraged. Much of the real estate

{p. 246} development on the outskirts, which led to the present-day distinction between the central business and middle-class area and the outer "red belt" of working-class and industrial areas, was made possible by bankers like **the Pereire brothers, Emile and Isaac**, or the Paulin Talabot family. **Inspired by the ideas of Saint-Simon, these new financial organizers hoped for a transformation of society through industrial progress and improved methods of social and economic organization**. Down their bright new boulevards the inhabitants of the **scientific, gas-lit Empire** danced their way to the tinkling tunes of Offenbach -

their way to the national disaster of Sedan and to the horrors of the Paris Commune of 1871.

It was a time when the more modern pattern of industrial society was taking shape. The year 1864, which saw the foundation of the industrial combine of the Comité des Forges, saw also **the repeal of the clause in the French Penal Code which made concerted industrial action a crime**. Trade unions, which since 1791 had labored under the stigma of illegality, were now tolerated, and prosecutions slackened. Just as **industrial workers found their own separate dwelling places in the expanding outskirts of Paris**, so they found their own separate economic and political organizations in the trade unions. **In 1864, too, the First International was formed**. Before this Napoleon III had permitted and even encouraged **mutual insurance groups** - had he not, in 1844, written a pamphlet on the conquest of poverty? In 1862 he sent a delegation of workers, at public expense, to see the British Exhibition. They returned impressed with the new opportunities of collective bargaining which the British trade unions were discovering. After the legalization of labor unions in 1864 two main types evolved: the local association or trades council (*chambre syndicale*) and the more militant unit for collective bargaining (*société de résistance*). Even so, labor organization did not become large in scale until near the end of the century, and it was 1884 before it won full legal rights. Meanwhile Napoleon, by a decree of 1853, implemented an idea which he had put forward in **his pamphlet *The Ending of Poverty* (*L'extinction du paupérisme*)**. It revived and extended the Napoleonic idea of **conciliation boards** (*Conseils de prud'hommes*), **composed half of representatives of employers, half of representatives of workers, with their chairmen, vice-chairmen, and secretaries nominated by the government**. Designed to settle labor disputes and so prevent strikes, they were intended by Napoleon as an agency of public order and discipline. They were often means of improving working conditions and wages, and could sometimes become a focus for labor organization and agitation.

In general, **the French people gained from having a paternalist government during these years of rapid industrial growth**. They escaped something of the **hardships caused in Britain** by a more rapid industrial

{p. 247} growth in a period **when doctrines of minimum state interference held the field**. Napoleon himself has been called "**Saint-Simon on horseback**," and there is no reason to doubt either the sincerity of his desire to improve material conditions or the **reality of the benefits his rule conferred**. Politically, his policy vacillated as he sought to appease now the Catholics, now the liberals, now the socialists, and always the demands of the populace as a whole. "To-day," he had written before coming to power, "the rule of classes is over, and you can govern only with the masses." His efforts to govern with the masses led to a series of disasters in foreign policy, for he believed (not entirely without justification) that the masses wanted glory and were intensely nationalistic. But these failures should not obscure the more positive material gains that France derived from his rule. "Half-pint Napoleon" (*Napoleon le petit*), Victor Hugo had scornfully dubbed him.

The Second Empire, judged in terms of military glory or original achievement, was indeed only a pale shadow of the First. But it has considerable importance for the material development of France and for the shaping of modern Europe.

{end of quotes }

## 8.6 Writings of Karl Marx on France from 1848 to 1871

**Karl Marx, *The Class Struggles in France*. In *Karl Marx Frederick Engels Collected Works*, Volume 10, Lawrence & Wishart, London 1978.**

{p. 7} **Introduction by David Fernbach**

The Triumph of Reaction

**In August 1850 Marx recognized that the revolutionary period of 1848 was at an end. A new revolutionary outbreak was not possible until the next cyclical trade crisis**, and if Marx still believed that revolution would surely follow in the wake of this crisis, he no longer believed that a proletarian revolution could succeed in Germany until modern industry had developed more substantially. **The development of the revolution, which had earlier seemed a matter of a few years, had now to be counted in decades.**

If the 1850s and early 60s found Marx essentially a spectator of the political scene, this was by force of circumstance, not by his own choice. After the split in the Communist League in September 1850, Marx continued to work at rebuilding the League as the nucleus of a proletarian party in Germany, and at propagating the ideas of scientific communism on an international scale. But **as the reaction consolidated itself throughout Europe, he found himself fighting a losing battle**. The Central Committee of the Communist League, which was moved to Cologne following the split, was arrested *en bloc* in May 1851, and the League's German organization completely destroyed. Marx still attempted to hold together the London district, now once again the League's centre. However, the atmosphere of exile, always demoralizing, was doubly so for the German Communist refugees now that they were cut off from their comrades in Germany. Their community was riven by petty suspicion and intrigue, and many of the best Communists left to start a new life in North America. Marx and Engels themselves suffered the effects of exile. ...

{p. 8} A great deal of Marx's energy was devoted to the defence campaign for the Cologne Communist prisoners, who were only brought to trial in October 1852. After the trial, at which seven of the eleven accused were sentenced to between three and six years' imprisonment for 'attempted high treason', Marx wrote an expose of the case, and of the Prussian political police in general. But the Cologne convictions sealed the fate of the Communist League, and on 17 November the League was formally dissolved, on Marx's proposal.

The dissolution of the Communist League and the virtual disappearance of the German workers' movement for a whole decade indicates **the immense gap between the programme Marx and Engels laid down in the Manifesto of the Communist Party and the real development of the proletariat at that time**. With



the collapse of the League Marx was plunged into **twelve years** of almost complete political isolation. **Exiled in London**, he had next to no contact with events in Germany ... **Yet Marx's confidence in the future** that his theory predicted for the workers' movement **never abated**, and in their most extreme isolation he and Engels continued to regard themselves as the true representatives of the workers' party.

{end of Introduction by David Fernbach; the remainder is by Karl Marx }

{p. 48} THE DEFEAT OF JUNE 1848

**After the July Revolution**, when **the liberal banker Laffitte** led his compere, the Duke of Orleans, in triumph to the Hotel de Ville, he **let fall the words: "From now on the bankers will rule."** Laffitte had betrayed the secret of the revolution.

**It was not the French bourgeoisie that ruled under Louis Philippe, but one faction of it: bankers, stock-exchange kings, railway kings, owners of coal and iron mines** and forests, a part of the landed proprietors associated with them - the so-called finance aristocracy. It sat on the throne, it dictated laws in the Chambers, it distributed public offices, from cabinet portfolios to tobacco bureau posts.

The industrial bourgeoisie proper formed part of the official opposition, that is, it was represented only as a minority in the Chambers. Its opposition was expressed all the more resolutely, the more unalloyed the autocracy of the finance aristocracy became, and the more it itself imagined that its domination over the working class was ensured after the mutinies of 1832, 1834 and 1839, which had been drowned in blood.

{p. 49} **Owing to its financial straits, the July monarchy was dependent from the beginning on the big bourgeoisie**, and its dependence on the big bourgeoisie was the inexhaustible source of **increasing financial straits**. It was impossible to subordinate the administration of the state to the interests of national production without balancing the budget, without establishing a balance between state expenditures and state revenues. And how was this balance to be established without limiting state expenditures, that is, without encroaching on interests which were so many props of the ruling system, and without redistributing taxes, that is, without shifting a considerable share of the burden of taxation onto the shoulders of the big bourgeoisie itself?

On the contrary, the faction of the bourgeoisie that ruled and legislated through the Chambers had **a direct interest in the indebtedness of the state. The state deficit was really the main object of its speculation and the chief source of its enrichment**. At the end of each year **a new deficit**. After the lapse of four or five years **a new loan**. And every new loan offered new opportunities to the **finance aristocracy for defrauding the state**, which was **kept artificially on the verge of bankruptcy** - it had to negotiate with the bankers under the most unfavourable conditions. **Each new loan gave a further opportunity, that of plundering the public** which had invested its capital in state bonds **by means of stock-exchange manipulations, into the secrets of which the government and the majority in the**

**Chambers were initiated.** In general, the instability of state credit and the possession of state secrets gave the bankers and their associates in the Chambers and on the throne the possibility of evoking **sudden, extraordinary fluctuations in the quotations of government securities**, the result of which was always bound to be **the ruin of a mass of smaller capitalists** and the fabulously **rapid enrichment of the big gamblers**. As the state deficit was in the direct interest of the ruling faction of the bourgeoisie, it is clear why the extraordinary state

{p. 50} expenditure in the last years of Louis Philippe's reign was far more than double the extraordinary state expenditure under Napoleon, indeed reached a yearly sum of nearly 400,000,000 francs, whereas the whole average annual export of France seldom attained a volume amounting to 750,000,000 francs. The enormous sums which, in this way, flowed through the hands of the state facilitated, moreover, swindling contracts for deliveries, bribery, defalcations and all kinds of roguery. The **defrauding of the state, practised wholesale in connection with loans**, was repeated retail in public works. What occurred in the relations between Chamber and Government became multiplied in the relations between individual departments and individual entrepreneurs.

The ruling class exploited the building of railways in the same way as it exploited state expenditures in general and state loans. The Chambers piled the main burdens on the state, and secured the golden fruits to the speculating finance aristocracy. One recalls the scandals in the Chamber of Deputies, when by chance it leaked out that all the members of the majority, including a number of ministers, had been interested as shareholders in the very railway constructions which as legislators they caused to be carried out afterwards at the cost of the state.

On the other hand, the smallest financial reform was wrecked due to the influence of the bankers. For example, the postal reform. **Rothschild protested. Was it permissible for the state to curtail sources of revenue out of which interest was to be paid on its ever-increasing debt?**

The July monarchy was nothing but a joint-stock company for the exploitation of France's national wealth, the dividends of which were divided among ministers, Chambers, 240,000 voters and their adherents. Louis Philippe was the director of this company - Robert Macaire on the throne. Trade, industry, agriculture, shipping, the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie, were bound to be continually endangered and prejudiced under this system. Cheap government, *gouvernement à bon marche*, was what it had inscribed in the July days on its banner.

Since **the finance aristocracy made the laws, was at the head of the administration of the state, had command of all the organised public authorities, dominated public opinion** through the actual state of

{p. 51} affairs and through the press, the same prostitution, the same shameless cheating, the same mania to get rich was repeated in every sphere, from the Court to the Café Borgne, **to get rich not by production, but by pocketing the already available wealth of others.** ...

{p. 52} The eruption of the general discontent was finally accelerated and the mood for revolt ripened by two economic world events.

The *potato blight* and the *crop failures* of 1845 and 1846 increased the general ferment among the people. The dearth of 1847 called forth bloody conflicts in France as well as on the rest of the Continent. As against the shameless orgies of the finance aristocracy, the struggle of the people for the prime necessities of life! At Buzancais, hunger rioters executed; in Paris, oversatiated *escrocs* snatched from the courts by the royal family!

**The second great economic event** which hastened the outbreak of the revolution **was a general commercial and industrial crisis in England**. Already heralded in the autumn of 1845 by the wholesale reverses of the speculators in railway shares, staved off during 1846 by a number of incidents such as the impending abolition of the corn duties, the crisis finally burst in the autumn of 1847 with the bankruptcy of the London wholesale grocers, on the heels of which followed the insolvencies of the land banks and the closing of the factories in the English industrial districts. The after-effect of this crisis on the Continent had not yet spent itself when the February Revolution broke out.

**The devastation of trade and industry caused by the economic epidemic made the autocracy of the finance aristocracy still more unbearable**. Throughout the whole of France the bourgeois opposition agitated at banquets for an electoral reform which should win for it the majority in the Chambers and overthrow the Ministry of the Bourse. In Paris the industrial crisis had, moreover, the particular result of throwing a multitude of manufacturers and big traders, who under the existing circumstances could no longer do any business in the foreign market, onto the home market. They set up large establishments, the competition of which ruined the small *epiciers* and *boutiquiers* en masse. Hence the innumerable bankruptcies among this section of the Paris bourgeoisie, and hence their revolutionary action in February. It is well known how Guizot and the Chambers answered the reform proposals with an unambiguous

{p. 53} challenge, how Louis Philippe too late resolved on a ministry led by Barrot, how things went as far as **hand-to-hand fighting between the people and the army**, how **the army was disarmed as a result of the passive conduct of the National Guard**, how the July monarchy had to give way to a Provisional Government.

The Provisional Government which emerged from the February barricades necessarily mirrored in its composition the different parties which shared in the victory. It could not be anything but a compromise between the different classes which together had overturned the July throne, but whose interests were mutually antagonistic. The great majority of its members consisted of representatives of the bourgeoisie. The republican petty bourgeoisie was represented by Ledru-Rollin and Flocon, the republican bourgeoisie by the people from the National, the dynastic opposition by Cremieux, Dupont de l'Eure, etc. The working class had only two representatives, Louis Blanc and Albert. Finally, Lamartine in the Provisional

Government: this essentially represented no real interest, no definite class; for such was the February Revolution, the general uprising with its illusions, its poetry, its imaginary content and its rhetoric. Moreover, the spokesman of the February Revolution, according to both his position and his views, belonged to the bourgeoisie.

**If Paris**, as a result of political centralisation, **rules France, the workers, in moments of revolutionary earthquakes, rule Paris**. The first act in the life of the Provisional Government was an attempt to escape from this overpowering influence by an appeal from intoxicated Paris to sober France. Lamartine disputed the right of the barricade fighters to proclaim a republic on the ground that only the majority of Frenchmen held that right; they must await the majority vote, the Paris proletariat must not besmirch its victory by a usurpation. The bourgeoisie allows the proletariat only one usurpation - that of fighting.

Up to noon of February 2 the republic had not yet been proclaimed; on the other hand, all the ministries had already been shared out among the bourgeois elements of the Provisional Government and among the generals, bankers and lawyers of the National. But the workers were determined this time not to put up with any fraud like that of July 1830. They were ready to take up the fight anew and to get a republic by force of arms. With this

{p. 54} message, **Raspail** betook himself to the Hotel de Ville. In the name of the Paris proletariat he **commanded the Provisional Government to proclaim a republic**; if this order of the people were not fulfilled within two hours, **he would return at the head of 200,000 men. The bodies of the fallen were scarcely cold, the barricades were not yet cleared away, the workers not yet disarmed**, and the only force which could be opposed to them was the National Guard. Under these circumstances the doubts born of considerations of state policy and the juristic scruples of conscience entertained by the Provisional Government suddenly vanished. **The time limit of two hours had not yet expired when all the walls of Paris were resplendent with the historic, momentous words:**

**Republique francaise! Liberte, Egalite, Fraternite!**

Even the memory of the limited aims and motives which drove the bourgeoisie into the February Revolution was extinguished by the proclamation of the republic on the basis of universal suffrage. **Instead of only a few factions of the bourgeoisie, all classes of French society were suddenly hurled into the orbit of political power**, forced to leave the boxes, the stalls and the gallery and to act in person upon the revolutionary stage! With the constitutional monarchy vanished also the semblance of a state power independently confronting bourgeois society as well as the whole series of subordinate struggles which this semblance of power called forth!

By dictating the republic to the Provisional Government and through the Provisional Government to the whole of France, the proletariat stepped into the foreground forthwith as an independent party, but at the same time challenged the whole of bourgeois France to enter the lists against it. What it won was the terrain

for the fight for its revolutionary emancipation, but by no means this emancipation itself.

The first thing that the February republic had to do was, rather, to complete the rule of the bourgeoisie by allowing, beside the finance aristocracy, all the propertied classes to enter the orbit of political power. The majority of the great landowners, the Legitimists, were emancipated from the political nullity to which they had been condemned by the July monarchy. Not for nothing had the *Gazette de France* agitated in common with the opposition papers ... The February republic finally brought

{p. 55} the rule of the bourgeoisie clearly into view, since it struck off the crown behind which capital kept itself concealed.

Just as the workers in the July days had fought for and won the bourgeois monarchy, so in the February days they fought for and won the bourgeois republic. Just as the July monarchy had to proclaim itself a monarchy surrounded by republican institutions, so the February republic was forced to proclaim itself a republic surrounded by social institutions. The Paris proletariat compelled this concession, too.

Marche, a worker, dictated the decrees by which the newly formed Provisional Government pledged itself to guarantee the workers a livelihood by means of labour, to provide work for all citizens, etc. And when, a few days later, it forgot its promises and seemed to have lost sight of the proletariat, a mass of 20,000 workers marched on the Hotel de Ville with the cry: Organisation of labour! Formation of a special Ministry of Labour! Reluctantly and after long debate, the Provisional Government nominated a permanent special commission to find means of improving the lot of the working classes! It consisted of delegates from the corporations of Paris artisans and was presided over by Louis Blanc and Albert. The Luxembourg palace was assigned to it as its meeting place. In this way **the representatives of the working class were banished from the seat of the Provisional Government, the bourgeois part of which retained the real state power** and the reins of administration exclusively in its hands, and side by side with the ministries of Finance, Trade, and Public Works, **side by side with the Bank and the Bourse, there arose a socialist synagogue whose high priests, Louis Blanc and Albert, had the task of discovering the promised land, of preaching the new gospel and of providing work for the Paris proletariat.** Unlike any profane state power, they had no budget, no executive authority at their disposal. They were supposed to break the pillars of bourgeois society by dashing their heads against them. While the Luxembourg sought the philosopher's stone, in the Hotel de Ville they minted the current coinage.

And yet the claims of the Paris proletariat, so far as they went beyond the bourgeois republic, could win no other existence than the nebulous one of the Luxembourg.

In common with the bourgeoisie the workers had made the February Revolution, and alongside the bourgeoisie they sought to assert their interests just as they had

installed a worker in the Provisional Government itself alongside the bourgeois majority. {end}

**Karl Marx, *Affairs in France*.** In *Karl Marx Frederick Engels Collected Works*, Volume 17, Lawrence & Wishart, London 1981. Published in the New York Tribune, February 7, 1860.

{p. 330} Paris, Jan. 17, 1860

**Louis Napoleon has been converted to Free-trade, and is about to inaugurate a new era of peace.** He can hardly fail to be enrolled as a member of the Society of Friends, and the year 1810 will, in the annals of Europe, be recorded as the year 1 of the Millennium. This extraordinary news going the round of the London Press dates its origin from a letter of Louis Bonaparte published in the *Moniteur*, dated Jan. 15, 1860, and addressed to Mr. Fould, Minister of State. The first effect of the letter was to send the Funds down at Paris and to send them Up at London. ...

{p. 331} **French foreign commerce *has* made immense strides from 1848 to 1860. Amounting in 1848 to about 875 million francs, it has risen to more than double that sum in 1859. An increase of commerce by more than 100 per cent in the short space of ten years, is a thing almost unprecedented.** The causes that have brought about that increase are to be found in California, Australia, the United States, and so forth, but certainly not in the archives of the Tuileries. It appears, then, that despite the immense increase of French foreign commerce within the last ten years - an increase to be traced to revolutions in the markets of the world quite beyond the petty control of the French police - the situation of the mass of the French nation has not improved.

{p. 333} Louis Bonaparte's prescriptions for French industry, if we deduct all that is mere phraseology, or is still looming in the

{p. 334} future, are simply these: Suppression of the duties on wool and cotton, and successive reductions on sugar and coffee. Now, this is all very well, but all the gullibility of English free-traders is required to call such measures free trade. {end}

**Karl Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*.** In Karl Marx, *Surveys from Exile*, ed. David Fernbach, Penguin Books in association with New Left Review, Harmondsworth, 1973.

{p. 143} PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION (1869)

My friend Joseph Weydemeyer, who died before his time, once had the intention of publishing a political weekly in New York, as from 1 January 1852. He invited me to provide a history of the coup d'etat for this paper. Until the middle of February I therefore wrote him weekly articles under the title 'The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte'. In the meantime Weydemeyer's original plan had fallen through. Instead he started a monthly, *Die Revolution*, in the spring of 1852 and its first number consists of my 'Eighteenth Brumaire'. A few hundred copies of this found their way into Germany at that time, without, however, entering the actual book trade. A German bookseller, who affected extremely radical airs, replied to my offer of the book with a truly virtuous horror at a 'presumption' so 'contrary to the times'.

It will be seen from these facts that the present work arose under the immediate pressure of events, and that its historical material does not extend beyond the month of February (1852). It is now republished, partly because of the demand of the book trade, and partly because my friends in Germany have urgently requested it.

{p. 146} Victor Hugo confines himself to bitter and witty invective against the responsible author of the coup d'etat. With him the event itself appears like a bolt from the blue. He sees in it only a single individual's act of violence. He does not notice that he makes this individual great instead of little by ascribing to him a personal power of initiative which would be without precedent in world history. **Proudhon, for his part, seeks to portray the coup as the result of the preceding historical development. But his historical construction of the coup imperceptibly turns into a historical apology for its hero.** Thus he falls into the error of our so-called objective historians. I show how, on the contrary, the class struggle in France created circumstances and conditions which allowed **a mediocre and grotesque individual to play the hero's role.**

{p. 152} It is not sufficient to say, as the French do, that their nation was taken by surprise. **A nation and a woman are not forgiven for the unguarded hour in which the first available adventurer is able to violate them.** Expressions of that kind do not solve the problem; they merely give it a different formulation. It remains to be explained **how a nation of thirty-six millions could be taken by surprise by three swindlers and delivered without resistance into captivity.**

Let us recapitulate in their general features **the phases the French revolution passed through from 24 February 1848 to December 1851.**

**Three main periods** are unmistakable: the February period; the period of the constitution of the republic or of the Constituent National Assembly, from 4 May 1848 to 28 May 1849; and the period of the constitutional republic or of the Legislative National Assembly, from 28 May 1849 to 2 December 1851.

The first period, **from the fall of Louis Philippe on 24 February 1848 to the meeting of the Constituent Assembly on 4 May**, the February period proper, can be described as **the prologue to the revolution.** Its character was officially expressed by the decline of its own improvised government that it was merely provisional and, like the government, everything that was suggested, attempted, or enunciated in this period proclaimed itself to be merely provisional. Nobody and nothing took the risk of claiming the right to exist and take real action. The dynastic opposition, the republican bourgeoisie, the democratic and republican petty bourgeoisie and the social-democratic working class, i.e. all the elements that had prepared or determined the revolution, provisionally found their place in the February government.

It could not have been otherwise. **The original aim of the February days was electoral reform, to widen the circle of the politically privileged** within the possessing class itself and to overthrow the exclusive domination of the aristocracy of finance. However, when it came to the actual conflict, when the people mounted

the barricades, the National Guard maintained a passive attitude, the army offered no serious resistance, and the monarchy

{p. 153} ran away, **the republic appeared to be a matter of course. But every party interpreted it in its own way.** The proletariat had secured the republic arms in hand, and now imprinted it with its own hallmark, proclaiming it to be a social republic. In this way the general content of the modern revolution was indicated, but this content stood in the strangest contradiction with everything which could immediately and directly be put into practice in the given circumstances and conditions, with the material available and the level of education attained by the mass of the people. On the other hand, the claims of all the other elements which had contributed to the February revolution were recognized in that they secured the lion's share of the posts in the new government. In no period, therefore, do we find a more variegated mixture of elements, more high-flown phrases, yet more actual uncertainty and awkwardness; more enthusiastic striving for innovation, yet a more fundamental retention of the old routine; a greater appearance of harmony throughout the whole society, yet a more profound alienation between its constituent parts. **While the Paris proletariat was still basking** in the prospect of the wide perspectives which had opened before it, and indulging in earnest discussions on social problems, **the old powers of society re-grouped themselves, assembled,** reflected on the situation, and **found unexpected support from the mass of the nation,** the peasants and the petty bourgeoisie, who all rushed onto the political stage once the barriers of the July monarchy had col-

**The second period,** from 4 May 1848 to the end of May 1849, was the period of **the constitution or foundation of the bourgeois republic.** Immediately after the February days, the dynastic opposition had been taken unawares by the republicans, and the republicans by the socialists. But France too had been taken unawares by Paris. The National Assembly which met on 4 May 1848 had emerged from elections held throughout the nation; it therefore represented the nation. It was a living protest against the pretensions of the February days and an attempt to reduce the results of the revolution to the standards of the bourgeoisie. In vain did the Paris proletariat (which had grasped the nature of this National Assembly straightaway) endeavour on 15 May, a few days after the Assembly had met, to deny its existence by force, to dissolve it ... {end}

More of Karl Marx' *Eighteenth Brumaire* at

<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1852/18th-brumaire/index.htm>.

**Karl Marx, *The Franco-Prussian War*.** In Karl Marx, *The First International and After*, ed. David Fernbach, Penguin Books in association with New Left Review, Harmondsworth, 1974.

{p. 172} **FIRST ADDRESS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL ON THE FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR**

To the Members of the International Working Men's Association in Europe and the United States



**No wonder that Louis Bonaparte, who usurped his power by exploiting the war of classes in France, and perpetuated it by periodical wars abroad, should from the first have treated the International as a dangerous foe.** On the eve of the plebiscite he ordered a raid on the members of the administrative committees of the International Working Men's Association throughout France, at Paris, Lyons, Rouen, Marseilles, Brest, etc., on the pretext that the International was a secret society dabbling in a complot for his assassination, a pretext soon after exposed in its

{p. 173} full absurdity by his own judges. What was the real crime of the French branches of the International? They told the French people publicly and emphatically that voting the plebiscite was voting despotism at home and war abroad. It has been, in fact, their work that in all the great towns, in all the industrial centres of France, the working class rose like one man to reject the plebiscite. Unfortunately the balance was turned by the heavy ignorance of the rural districts. The stock exchanges, the cabinets, the ruling classes and the press of Europe celebrated the plebiscite as a signal victory of the French emperor over the French working class; and it was the signal for the assassination, not of an individual, but of nations.

The war plot of July 1870 is but an amended edition of the coup d'etat of December 1851. At first view the thing seemed so absurd that France would not believe in its real good earnest. It rather believed the deputy denouncing the ministerial war talk as a mere stock-jobbing trick. When, on 15 July, war was at last officially announced to the Corps Legislatif, the whole opposition refused to vote the preliminary subsidies, even Thiers branded it as 'detestable'; all the independent journals of Paris condemned it, and, wonderful to relate, the provincial press joined in almost unanimously.

Meanwhile, the Paris members of the International had again set to work. In the *Reveil* of 12 July they published their manifesto 'To the workmen of all nations', from which we extract the following few passages:

{quote} Once more, on the pretext of the European equilibrium, of national honour, the peace of the world is menaced by political ambitions. French, German, Spanish workmen! Let our voices unite in one cry of reprobation against war! ... War for a question of preponderance of a dynasty can, in the eyes of workmen, be nothing but a criminal

{p. 174} absurdity. In answer to the warlike proclamations of those who exempt themselves from the impost of blood, and find in public misfortunes a source of fresh speculations, we protest, we who want peace, labour and liberty! ... Brothers of Germany! Our division would only result in the complete triumph of despotism on both sides of the Rhine ... Workmen of all countries! Whatever may for the present become of our common efforts, we, the members of the International Working Men's Association, who know of no frontiers, we send you as a pledge of indissoluble solidarity the good wishes and the salutations of the workmen of France. {end quote}

This manifesto of our Paris section was followed by numerous similar French addresses ...

Whatever may be the incidents of Louis Bonaparte's war with Prussia, the death knell of the Second Empire has already sounded at Paris. It will end as it began, by a parody. But let us not forget that it is the governments and the ruling classes of Europe who enabled Louis Bonaparte to play during eighteen years the ferocious farce of the restored Empire.

On the German side, the war is a war of defence, but who put Germany to the necessity of defending herself? Who enabled

{p. 175} Louis Bonaparte to wage war upon her? Prussia! It was Bismarck who conspired with that very same Louis Bonaparte for the purpose of crushing popular opposition at home, and annexing Germany to the Hohenzollern dynasty.

{p. 178} The present war opens a new world-historical epoch, in so far as Germany has shown that, even with the exclusion of German Austria, it is prepared to go its own way independent of foreign influence. ... If the German working class does not play the historic role that has fallen to it, that will be its own fault. **This war has shifted the centre**

{p. 179} **of gravity of the continental workers' movement from France to Germany.** This has pinned on the German working class a greater responsibility ...

SECOND ADDRESS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL ON THE FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR {footnote 14}

**The war of defence ended, in point of fact, with the surrender of Louis Bonaparte, the Sedan capitulation, and the proclamation of the republic at Paris.**

{footnote 14: The Second Empire collapsed on 4 September 1870, after the defeat of Sedan. Two days later the General Council commissioned Marx to draft this Address, which was adopted at a special meeting on 9 September. It was issued as a leaflet on 11 September, and is reproduced here from the pamphlet The General Council of the International Working Men's Association on the war, Truelove, September 1870.}

{end of quotes}

The works of Karl Marx are

at <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/index.htm>.

**8.7 Alfred Cobban, *A History of Modern France Volume 2: 1799-1871*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1977.**

{p. 158} **It was difficult to make a *coup d'etat* {Napoleon's coup in 1852} without breaking some heads** as well as an oath. ... **Altogether 26,884 arrests were affected throughout France.** Of those arrested, 9,000 were transported to Algeria and 239 to Cayenne, 1,500 expelled from France, and 3,000 given forced residence away from their homes. **Soon after, a commission of revision freed**

**3,500 of all those sentenced, and by 1859, when an amnesty was offered to all the remainder except Ledru-Rollin, the number still penalised was only 1,800.**

{end of quote}

### **8.8 Michael Bakunin on Napoleon's support among the peasants**

Michael Bakunin, *Letters to a Frenchman on the Present Crisis* (1870), in Sam Dolgoff, *Bakunin On Anarchy*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York 1972.

{p. 189} **Where the Emperor [Napoleon III] is loved, almost worshipped, by the peasants, one should not arouse antagonism by attacking him.** It is necessary to undermine in fact and not in words the authority of the State and the Emperor, by undermining the establishment through which they wield their influence. To the greatest possible extent, the functionaries of the Emperor - the mayors, justices of the peace, priests, rural police, and similar officials, should be discredited. ...

{p. 190} **I am not at all disturbed by the seeming Bonapartist sympathies of the French peasants.** Such sympathies are merely a superficial manifestation of deep socialist sentiments, distorted by ignorance and the malevolent propaganda of the exploiters; a rash of measles, which will yield to the determined treatment of revolutionary socialism. The peasants will donate neither their land nor their money nor their lives just to keep Napoleon III on his throne; but they are willing to kill the rich and to take and give their property to the Emperor because they hate the rich in general. They harbor the thoroughgoing and intense socialistic hatred of laboring men against the men of leisure, the "upper crust." {end quote}

Bakunin vs. Marx: [correctness.html](http://correctness.html).

### **8.9 Immanuel Wallerstein on Napoleon III**

Fernand Braudel Center, Binghamton University

Commentary No. 114, June 1, 2003

<http://fbc.binghamton.edu/114en.htm>

The decisive turning-point was **the world revolution of 1848**, which **came as an enormous shock** to the "reactionaries." The now elderly Metternich was turned out of office. A "social" revolution occurred in France, seeking to assert the rights of the "workers." And throughout central, eastern, and southern Europe, it was the "springtime of the nations." Of course, as we know, these many revolutions all failed within a short time, and were then met with renewed and very strong repression. But **the forces right of center** had learned their lesson. **They decided to go down the path of Peel, and accept the necessity of "concessions"** in order to forestall worse. **The following decades saw the rise of** what historians call the **"enlightened conservatives"** -Disraeli in Great Britain, **Napoleon III in France**, Bismarck in Germany.

From then on, conservatives became merely a somewhat more prudent version of centrist liberalism. In fact, in order to head off the growing strength of "radical" left movements, conservatives were often more ready to use the state to enact changes than the centrist liberals: the extension of the suffrage by Disraeli, **the restoration**

of trade-union rights by **Napoleon III**, the beginnings of the welfare state by Bismarck. {endquote}

### 8.10 Karl Marx on Napoleon III and the Jewish Bankers

In two newspaper articles (*The Jewish Bankers of Europe* and *The Russian Loan*) Marx depicted Napoleon III as relying on Jewish money-lenders:

*The Karl Marx Library* Volume 5 On Religion (arranged and edited, with an introd. and new translations, by Saul K. Padover McGraw-Hill Book Company New York 1972):

{p. 219} The Jewish Bankers of Europe\*

... Through the Jewish houses, who, shut out from all more honorable branches of business, have acquired in this an inevitable degree of aptitude. There are in Vienna the Rothschilds, and Arnsteins, and Eskeles, and the Jew-Greek house of Seria ...

\* From "The Loanmongers of Europe," published in the *New York Daily Tribune*, November 22, 1855.

{p. 220} ... Let the confidence in the Rothschilds be only once slightly shaken, and the confidence in **the Foulds**, the Bischoffsheims, the Stieglitzes, the Arnsteins and Eskeles is gone. The results of despotism and monopolism are precisely similar.

**Let Louis Napoleon be chopped off**, as he may be any moment by some Pianori, **and France is in confusion**. Let Lionel Rothschild of London, James of Paris stagger under any clever combination of disasters, and the whole loanmongering fabric of Europe will perish.

{p. 221} The Russian Loan\*

THE issue of a new Russian loan affords a practical illustration of the system of loanmongering in Europe, to which we have heretofore called the attention of our readers.

This loan is brought out under the auspices of the house of Stieglitz at St. Petersburg. Stieglitz is to Alexander what Rothschild is to Francis Joseph, **what Fould is to Louis Napoleon**. The late Czar Nicholas made Stieglitz a Russian baron, as the late Kaiser Franz made old Rothschild an Austrian baron, while **Louis Napoleon has made a Cabinet Minister of Fould**, with a free ticket to the Tuileries for the females of his family. Thus we find every tyrant backed by a Jew ...

\* Published in the *New York Daily Tribune*, January 4, 1856.

{p. 222} ... the real work is done by the Jews, and can only be done by them, as they **monopolize the machinery of the loanmongering mysteries** by concentrating their energies upon the barter trade in securities, and the changing of money and negotiating of bills in a great measure arising therefrom. Take Amsterdam, for instance, a city harboring many of the worst descendants of the Jews whom Ferdinand and Isabella drove out of Spain, and who, after lingering awhile in Portugal, were driven thence also, and eventually found a safe place of retreat in Holland. ...

{p. 223} The smartest highwayman in the Abruzzi is not better posted up about the locale of the hard cash in a traveler's valise or pocket than those Jews about any loose capital in the hands of a trader. ...

{p. 224} Thus do these loans, which are a curse to the people, a ruin to the holders, and a danger to the governments, become a blessing to the houses of the children of Judah. This Jew organization of loanmongers is as dangerous to the people as the aristocratic organization of landowners. ... Let us not be thought too severe upon these loanmongering gentry. The fact that 1855 years ago Christ drove the Jewish moneychangers out of the temple, and that the moneychangers of our age enlisted on the side of tyranny happen again chiefly to be Jews, is perhaps no more than a historical coincidence. The loanmongering Jews of Europe do only on a larger and more obnoxious scale what many others do on one smaller and less significant. **But it is only because the Jews are so strong that it is timely and expedient to expose and stigmatize** their organization.

{end} More at [leftprot.html](http://leftprot.html).

### 8.11 Moses Hess on Emperor Napoleon III

**Moses Hess, the 'Red Rabbi', converted both Marx and Engels to Communism**, and originated the expression "religion is the opium of the people", which was used in the Communist Manifesto (1848).

His essay *On the Essence of Money* identified Judaism with the cult of money, and asserted the dominant role of Jews in world finance, providing Marx with the information he used in his *On the Jewish Question*.

But 20 years later, Hess rejected assimilation and returned to Judaism, pronouncing the Jews a race and a nation, and calling for a Jewish socialist state, in his book *Rome and Jerusalem* (1862).

**In 1867 Hess, by now a Zionist, joined the (Communist) International Working Men's Association, siding with Marx** in his disputes with Bakunin.

Thus **combining Zionism with Communism**, Hess has been called "the first Trotskyist": [avineri.html](http://avineri.html).

Moses Hess, *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, translated from the German with introduction and notes by Meyer Waxman, Ph. D. (Bloch Publishing Company, New York, 1918, 1949):

{p. 61} Only a short time after the February revolution, I went to France and there I learned to know the people which, in the present century, is the foremost champion of social liberty. If this people submits at present to the iron dictatorship of kinghood, it is because the Emperor is true to his revolutionary descent,<sup>2</sup> not in word alone, but also in deed. The moment dynastic interests conflict with the aspirations and strivings of the French people, kinghood will disappear from the soil of France. ...

<sup>2</sup> The Emperor of France at the time was Napoleon III, the nephew of Napoleon. - Translator.

{end}

**Note Hess' praise of Napoleon III**, which the *Dialogues* of Joly depict as a despot.

## 8.12 Summary

As shown by Cobban's figures, and the other articles above, **Napoleon III was nowhere comparable to Lenin, Trotsky and the other early Bolsheviks, in despotism or cruelty.**

Trotsky calls Stalin a Bonapartist, likening him to Napoleon I and Napoleon III: [trotsky.html](#).

The Kronstadt Massacre showed the true nature of Bolshevism: [kronstadt.html](#).

Trotsky's justification of the Red Terror: [worst.html](#).

The toll of the Bolsheviks:

R.J. Rummel's statistics on Democide (Comparative Holocaust):  
<http://www2.hawaii.edu/~rummel/HOLO.PAPER.HTM>.

Wilson Quarterly on the *Black Book of Communism*:  
<http://wwics.si.edu/OUTREACH/WQ/WQSELECT/BLACK.HTM>.

Noam Chomsky (Zmag) against the *Black Book of Communism*:  
<http://www.zmag.org/ZMag/articles/july00gallagher.htm>.

**The totalitarianism foretold in the *Protocols of Zion* has much more in common with that launched by the Bolsheviks, than with the regime of Napoleon III.**

Although I find Karl Marx' writing persuasive, **one must judge Communism by its practice rather than its theory** - as Marx himself judged Christianity.

The struggle between Jews and non-Jews ruined the communist governments in the USSR and Eastern Europe; but in Asia and elsewhere this element was lacking (since Jews were lacking), so the regimes there had - and have - more chance of being true to their people. They can't all be judged the same way.

*The Ancestry of Political Correctness*: [correctness.html](#).

The Protocols of Zion Toolkit - Part 3

Peter Myers, September 22, 2002; update July 23, 2008. My comments are shown {thus}.

added August 11, 2003: **19. Stalin accused of endorsing the *Protocols***

added May 19, 2004: **22. Dr. John Coleman on "Colonel" House**

added September 19, 2004: **23. Lenin's Opposition to the Treaty of Versailles**

## 9. The Push for World Government at the Peace Conference of Versailles (1919)

Those promoting World Government never quote ulterior motives, such as the pursuit of their own power or the imposition of their own ideology; instead, they speak of universal principles of morality and common humanity.

The attempt at world government was disguised under slogans such as "unifying mankind", "the war to end war", and "preventing future wars". Thus the name of the League To Enforce Peace.

**Cyrus Alder, *Jacob H Schiff: His Life and Letters Volume II*, Doubleday, Doran and Company, New York, 1928:**

{p. 193} He {Jacob Schiff} was also one of the first to recognize that thinking men must put their minds to work to devise **some means to avoid future wars**. In spite of his unwillingness to appear publicly in the matter, he was disposed, because of his strong convictions, to **take an earnest part in the League to Enforce Peace**, and, on October 27, 1916, he addressed a letter to President Wilson, referring to a conversation of a month previous, and urging the President to give the principal address at a dinner which was being arranged by the League for November 24. He likewise **urged Wilson** to join with Lord Bryce and other leaders of world opinion **to take active steps for the avoidance of future wars**. ...

{p. 315} Again he described the issue {in a letter to} to Zangwill, December 12th:

{p. 316} I have been carrying on ... conferences and discussions with Justice Brandeis and other Zionist leaders ... I want to be permitted to state **I do not see any *raison d'etre* for a Jewish state in Palestine that does not have Judaism as its cornerstone, nor that I can consider anyone a Jew who does not acknowledge the Jewish concept of the Deity**. ...

{end of quotes}

**Inga Floto, *Colonel House in Paris*, Princeton University Press, 1980:**

{p. 197} ... **it was Wickham Steed, more than any other man, who came to influence the atmosphere during the most critical phase of the Conference**, because just at that time, Lord Northcliffe began his frontal attack on Lloyd George, and his most important weapons for this purpose included Steed's editorials in the (Paris) *Daily Mail* and *The Times*. ...

It was **Auchincloss** who **provided Steed with** a considerable part of the **ammunition with which he thwarted all attempts by Lloyd George to support Bullitt's peace plan**, and he went even further than that. In talks with Northcliffe and Steed, he encouraged them to bring pressure to bear not only on Lloyd George but also on Wilson. However, in this extremely disloyal behaviour, **Auchincloss** appears to have been **acting entirely on his own initiative** and **House was not involved**. All the same, as we have seen, **this conduct did not escape the notice of Lloyd George or Wilson's closest advisers. Both Lloyd George and {Bernard} Baruch reacted** on 4 April, and there is really no reason for thinking that Wilson was kept ignorant on matters much longer than this.

{end of quotes}



**Alfred Zimmer**, *The League of Nations and the Rule of Law*, Macmillan, London 1939:

{p. 231} Clinton, New York

August 16, 1918

My Dear Colonel House: {from Senator Elihu Root}

**The first requisite** for any durable concert of peaceable nations **to prevent war** is a fundamental change in the principle to be applied to international breaches of the peace ...

{p. 232} **The change involves a limitation of sovereignty, making every sovereign state subject to the superior right of a community of sovereign states** to have the peace preserved. {end}

Elihu Root's role in forming the Council On Foreign Relations:

<http://www.sweetliberty.org/issues/shadow/cfrintro.htm>.

**Schiff and Baruch were leading Jewish proponents of World Government at the time of the Treaty of Versailles.**

*Encyclopedia Judaica* (Jerusalem, Keter Publishing House, 1971) records, under BARUCH:

"BERNARD BARUCH (1870-1965), stock analyst, self-styled "speculator" and statesman ... President Wilson ... made him chairman of the Commission on Raw Materials, Minerals, and Metals. During World War I he served as chairman of the War Industries Board with power to virtually mobilize the American wartime economy. At the war's end he served on the Supreme Economic Council **at the Conference of Versailles**, where **he was President Wilson's personal economic adviser** ... "

The following information on Walter Lippman, with whom H. G. Wells worked closely, is from the Spartacus site

<http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/USALippmann.htm>

{quote} **Walter Lippmann, the son of second-generation German-Jewish parents**, was born in New York City on 23rd September, 1889. While studying at Harvard University he became a socialist and was co-founder of the Harvard Socialist Club and edited the Harvard Monthly.

In 1911 Lincoln Steffens, the campaigning journalist, took Lippmann on as his secretary. Like Steffens, Lippmann supported Theodore Roosevelt and the Progressive Party in the 1912 presidential elections. Lippman's book, *A Preface to Politics* (1913) was well-received and the following year he joined Herbert Croly in establishing the political weekly, the *New Republic*.

Lippmann rejected his earlier socialism in *Drift and Mastery* (1914) and in 1916 became a staunch supporter of Woodrow Wilson and the Democratic Party. In 1917 Lippmann was appointed as assistant to Newton Baker, Wilson's secretary of war. **Lippman worked closely with Woodrow Wilson and Edward House in drafting the Fourteen Points Peace Programme.** He was a member of the



**USA's delegation to the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 and helped draw up the covenant of the League of Nations. ... {end quote}**

Trotsky wrote of Wilson's Fourteen Points, in his autobiography:

"After the October revolution, **an enterprising New York publisher brought out my German pamphlet as an imposing American book.** According to his own statement, **President Wilson asked him**, by telephone from the White House, **to send the proofs of the book to him; at that time, the President was composing his Fourteen Points, and**, according to reports from people who were informed, **could not get over the fact that a Bolshevik had forestalled him in his best formulae.**"

The reference is Leon Trotsky, *My Life: The Rise and Fall of a Dictator* (Thornton Butterworth Limited, London 1930), p. 208; and in the paperback edition, *My Life* (Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1975), p. 249.

R. H. **Bruce Lockhart** writes in *Memoirs of a Secret Agent* (Putnam, London 1932): "In the spring of 1917 **Kerensky requested the British Government to facilitate Trotsky's return to Russia.**" (p. 227).

Herman Bernstein, Jewish author of *Celebrities of Our Time: Interviews*, quotes a British officer: "We wanted to hold him, but Milukov and **Kerensky insisted upon our releasing him.**" (p. 212, below).

Kerensky, the Jewish leader of the Government in Russia after the Tsar's fall, thus facilitated the Bolshevik Revolution.

## **10. One man stops World Government**

**Henry Wickham-Steed**, newspaper editor, single-handedly **blocked the secret push for World Government at the Peace Conference of Versailles** in 1919.

Only later did he fall out with Northcliffe. Wickham-Steed condoned Zionism but opposed Bolshevism and the push for World Government by Wilson, H. G. Wells, Jacob Schiff and others.

British Prime Minister David Lloyd-George wrote in his *Memoirs of the Peace Conference* VOLUME I (NEW HAVEN, YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1939):

{p. 217} On the 16th of January I brought the whole situation in Russia before the Peace Congress. ... **The newer progressivism**, which was concerned more with conditions than with forms, **viewed the upheaval**, in spite of its crudities and barbarities, **with tolerance and a few regarded it with** a considerable measure of **sympathy**. This did not mean any degree of acceptance of Communism as a creed. ...

{p. 218} This view was also taken by President Wilson. Our attitude was that of the Fox Whigs towards the French Revolution. Men like Clemenceau, however, who forgave all the terrors of the French Revolution because they thought them unavoidable in an insurrection of the masses against their oppressors and

despoilers, judged harshly the violence and horrors perpetrated in the Russian Revolution, although the provocation was if anything greater. ...

**Personally I would have dealt with the Soviets as the de facto Government of Russia. So would President Wilson.** But we both agreed that we could not carry to that extent our colleagues at the Congress, nor the **public opinion of our own countries** which **was frightened by Bolshevik violence and feared its spread.** I therefore accepted as a compromise a proposal that we should proceed along the line of inviting delegates from all the contending sections to meet the Allies at some convenient time and place in the immediate future to effect a settlement which would bring peace to Russia and a good understanding between Russia and the rest of the world. {end quote}

**Henry Wickham-Steed, *Through Thirty Years 1892-1922: A Personal Narrative Volume II*** (London, William Heinemann Ltd, 1924):

{p. 270} The first bad blunder was made **on January 22nd** when Mr. **Lloyd George suddenly proposed that Bolshevik delegates should be invited to Paris.** A similar suggestion had been made by a Jewish writer ten days before in the *Manchester Guardian*. The notion was that **the Bolsheviks and the Russian border peoples whom they were striving to destroy** should cease fighting and **meet in Paris alongside of the Peace Conference;** but its practical effect would have been to **accredit Bolshevism** and to stimulate its growth in Central Europe. The French were aghast at this suggestion. Even President Wilson seems not altogether to have favoured the idea of bringing the Bolsheviks to Paris, though he sanctioned a pro-

{p. 271} posal that delegates from the Conference should be sent to meet them at Prinkipo in the Sea of Marmora. Even this compromise found little favour in the Peace Conference - especially when the Bolsheviks replied by offering the Allies economic and commercial concessions in return for recognition. Americans generally felt the Prinkipo proposal to be as bad a mistake as that which President Wilson had made in November, 1918, when he issued his appeal for a vote in favour of his Administration on the eve of the American Congressional Elections instead of appealing to the electorate from a non-party standpoint as the head of the whole American people. That mistake he would hardly have made had Colonel House then been at his side, just as he would scarcely have launched the Prinkipo idea if House had been well enough to advise him. Indeed, I found "the Colonel" seriously perturbed at the President's tendency to deal himself with questions which he did not really understand while immobilizing the whole Conference by his refusal to delegate work. Ultimately the Prinkipo proposal broke down. The Bolsheviks refused to cease fighting and **the various governments established on the borders of Russia declined to "sit at the same table with bandits and murderers."** Dr. Kramarzh, who had just been appointed first Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia and head of the Czechoslovak delegation in Paris, came to see me in a state of despair. He said,

"We have been working hard to consolidate the position in Czechoslovakia. The reaction against the attempt made to assassinate me at Prague brought all our Socialists on to an anti-Bolshevik basis. We have 50,000 Czechoslovak troops in Siberia who saved the situation there for the Allies and whom we have, with difficulty, persuaded not to come home at once. This **quasi-recognition of the Bolsheviks** without our opinion having been asked may upset the whole position. It is an unpardonable piece of lightmindedness."

{p. 282} **The most serious hitch** came on February 11th when Wilson absolutely declined to accept the **French demand for the creation of an international force that should operate under the executive control of the League of Nations. M. Bourgeois urged** the French view with much eloquence and pertinacity. Wilson claimed that the Constitution of the United States did not permit of any such limitation upon its sovereignty; and Lord Robert Cecil took a similar view in regard to the British Empire. The French stood their ground and declined to surrender the claim which, in their view, could alone prevent the League of Nations Covenant from being a philosophical treatise, devoid of practical authority. Thus the sitting broke up towards midnight on February 11th, leaving the position very strained. **That night, however, Mr. Oscar Straus arrived in Paris from New York with a mandate from ex-President Taft and the American League to Enforce Peace.**

{Steed then says that House, like him, wanted to plant an acorn, whereas Wilson wanted to plant a mature oak tree.}

{p. 285} Nevertheless, Mr. Wilson overcame his obstinacy of February 12th and 13th sufficiently to agree to the draft Covenant and to present it to the Conference on February 14th in a hopeful speech.

**"Armed force is in the background of this programme,"** he said, **"but it is in the background, and if the moral force of the world will not suffice, the physical force of the world shall.** But that is in the last resort, because this is intended as a constitution of peace, not as a league of war."

{p. 301} **THE BULLITT MISSION**

... a flutter was caused by the return from Moscow of Messrs. William C. Bullitt and Lincoln Steffens who had been **sent to Russia towards the middle of February by Colonel House** and Mr. Lansing "for the purpose of studying conditions, political and economic, therein for the benefit of the American Commissioners plenipotentiary to negotiate peace." Mr. Philip Kerr and, presumably, Mr. **Lloyd George knew and approved of this mission.** Mr. Bullitt was instructed to return if possible by the time President Wilson should have come back to Paris from the United States. **Potent international financial interests were at work in favour of the immediate recognition of the Bolsheviks.** Those influences had been **largely responsible for the Anglo-American proposal in January to call Bolshevik representatives to Paris** at the beginning of the Peace Conference - a proposal which had failed after having been transformed into a suggestion for a Conference with the Bolsheviks at Prinkipo. The well-known **American Jewish banker, Mr. Jacob Schiff, was known to be anxious to ensure**

**recognition for the Bolsheviks, among whom Jewish influence was predominant;** and Tchitcherin, the Bolshevik Commissary for Foreign Affairs, had revealed the meaning of the January proposal by offering extensive commercial and economic concessions in return for recognition. **At a moment when the Bolsheviks were doing their utmost to spread revolution** throughout Europe, and when the Allies were supposed to be making peace in the name of high moral principles, **a policy of recognizing them,** as the price of commercial concessions, would have sufficed to wreck the whole Peace Conference and Europe with it. **At the end of March, Hungary was already Bolshevik; Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and even Germany were in danger,** and European feeling against the blood-stained lunatics of Russia ran extremely high.

{ p. 302 } Therefore, when it transpired that **an American official,** connected with the Peace Conference, **had returned,** after a week's visit to Moscow, **with an optimistic report upon the state of Russia** and with **an authorized Russian proposal for the virtual recognition** of the Bolshevik regime by April 10th, dismay was felt everywhere except by those who had been privy to the sending of Mr. Bullitt. Yet another complication, it was apprehended, would be added to the general muddle into which the Conference had got itself, and the chances of its succeeding at all would be seriously diminished.

On the afternoon of March 26th **an American friend inadvertently gave me a notion that a revival of the Prinkipo proposal,** in some form, was in the air. That evening I wrote to Northcliffe:

{ quote } The Americans are again talking of recognizing the Russian Bolsheviks. If they want to destroy the whole moral basis of the Peace and of the League of Nations they have only to do so. { end quote }

And, in the Paris *Daily Mail* of March 27th, I wrote strongly against any proposal to recognize

{ quote } the desperadoes whose avowed aim is to turn upside down the whole basis of Western civilization. { end quote }

**That day Colonel House asked me to call upon him. I found him worried both by my criticism of any recognition of the Bolsheviks** and by the certainty, which he had not previously realized, that if the President were to recognize the Bolsheviks in return for commercial concessions his whole "idealism" would be hopelessly compromised as commercialism in disguise. I pointed out to him that not only would Wilson be utterly discredited but that the League of Nations would go by the board, because all the small peoples and many of the big peoples of Europe would be unable to resist the Bolshevism which Wilson would have accredited. **I insisted that, unknown to him, the prime movers were Jacob Schiff, Warburg, and other international financiers, who wished above all to bolster up the Jewish Bolsheviks** in order to secure a field for German and Jewish exploitation of Russia.

{p. 303} **Colonel House argued, however, that without relations of some kind with the Bolsheviks it would be impossible to prevent the utter ruin of Russia** and the starvation of thousands of the best Russians who were without food; and that, if supplies could be sent to Russia under proper control, the needy might be relieved and the Allied and Associated Governments might get trustworthy information of the true position in Russia. **He asked me therefore to meet him and Auchincloss next morning** to see if some sound line of policy could not be worked out. **This I agreed to do; but, shortly after leaving Colonel House, information reached me that Mr. Lloyd George and President Wilson would probably agree next morning to recognize the Bolsheviks** in accordance with Mr. Bullitt's suggestions. Feeling that there was no time to lose **I wrote, forthwith, a leading article for the Paris *Daily Mail* of March 28th, called "Peace with Honour."** Its principal passage ran:

{quote} The issue is whether the Allied and Associated Governments shall, directly or indirectly, accredit an evil thing known as Bolshevism. Prospects of lucrative commercial enterprise in Russia, of economic concessions and of guarantees for debts, are held out to them if they will only fall down and worship Lenin and Trotsky.

There is one man to whom such temptation cannot appeal. His name is Woodrow Wilson. Since he led his country into war against German Imperialist militarism and all the forces of international finance and unmoral commercialism that supported it, he has done more than any Allied or Associated statesman to accredit sane idealism as a positive force in the life of nations. He has stood out as the champion of small peoples and of their rights. He threw the whole strength of the American people into the struggle in support of the ideals he formulated for the world, and he promised them a peace with honour and justice. Were he to bring them a peace with commercialism, belief in the sincerity of Anglo-Saxon idealism would die the world over.

Who are the tempters that would dare whisper into the ears of the Allied and Associated Governments? They are not far removed from the men who preached peace with profitable dishonour to the British people in July, 1914. They are akin to, if not identical with, the men who sent Trotsky and some scores of associated desperadoes to ruin the Russian Revolution as a democratic, anti-German force in the spring of 1917. They are the spiritual

{p. 304} authors of the Prinkipo policy, and they it is who, in reality, inspired the offer of Tchitcherin, the Bolshevik Commissary for foreign affairs, to make economic and commercial concessions to the Allies in connection with the Prinkipo Conference. ...

That intrigue failed. It may be revived. Lenin, who is a sinister fanatic, would promise any price to secure the recognition he needs in order that his agents and helpers in Allied and Associated countries may be able to raise their heads and openly to encompass the ruin of ordered democratic civilization by claiming that

what Allied and Associated Governments had sanctioned in Russia is lawful and laudable elsewhere. ...

The establishment of just conditions of peace will by itself help to counteract Bolshevism. But the essential thing is that the Allied and Associated Governments should keep their escutcheon clean and be utterly resolved to have no peace that is not a true peace with honour. {end quote}

I had hardly sent this article to the printers when an American friend, Mr. Charles R. Crane, who had been dining with President Wilson, called to see me. He showed great alarm at the turn things were taking. **"Bullitt is back," he said, "and the President is already talking Bullitt's language.** I fear he may ruin everything. Our people at home will certainly not stand for the recognition of the Bolsheviks at the bidding of Wall Street." He urged me to point out the danger clearly in the *Daily Mail*. I reassured him and told him that what I could say was already said and that he would find it in the *Daily Mail* next morning.

**Before I was up next day, Colonel House telephoned to say that he wished to see me urgently. Apparently, to use an Americanism, my article "had got under the President's hide."** When I reached the Crillon, House and Auchincloss looked grave. I told them that, **had I waited to discuss policy** with them before writing, my article, the chances were that **there would have been no policy to discuss because the President and, possibly, Lloyd George would have committed themselves to recognition of the Bolsheviks** that very morning. The Colonel begged me, however, in view of the delicacy of the situation to refrain from further comment until it could be seen how things would go; and I consented, on the understanding that nothing irrevocable would be done unless

{p. 305} I were informed beforehand. {end of quotes}

## **11. The *Protocols of Zion* and the Peace Conference of Versailles**

**E. J. Dillon, *The Peace Conference*, Hutchinson & Co., London, 1919:**

{p. 10} **Of all the collectivities** whose interests were furthered **at the Conference, the Jews had** perhaps the most resourceful and certainly **the most influential exponents.** There were Jews from Palestine, from Poland, Russia, the Ukraine, Roumania, Greece, Britain, Holland and Belgium; but **the largest and most brilliant contingent was sent by the United States.**

{p. 422} This adverse vote on **Mr. Wilson's pet scheme to have religious inequality proclaimed** as a means of hindering sanguinary wars brought to its climax **the reaction of the Conference against** what it regarded as a systematic endeavour to establish **the overlordship of the Anglo-Saxon peoples** in the world. ... Most of them believed that **a pretext** was being sought to enable the leading Powers **to intervene in the domestic concerns of all the other States ... other Delegates ... feared that a religious - some would call it racial - bias lay at the root of Mr. Wilson's policy.** It may seem amazing to some readers, but it is

none the less a fact that **a considerable number of Delegates believed that the real influences behind the Anglo-Saxon peoples were Semitic.**

**They confronted the President's proposal on the subject of**

{p. 423} **religious inequality, and, in particular, the odd motive alleged for it, with the measures for the protection of minorities which he subsequently imposed on the lesser States, and which had for their keynote to satisfy the Jewish elements in Eastern Europe. And they concluded that the sequence of expedients framed and enforced in this direction were inspired by the Jews, assembled in Paris for the purpose of realizing their carefully thought-out programme, which they succeeded in having substantially executed. The formula into which this policy was thrown ... was this: "Henceforth the world will be governed by the Anglo-Saxon peoples, who, in turn, are swayed by their Jewish elements".**

It is difficult to convey an adequate notion of the warmth of feeling - one might almost call it the heat of passion - which this supposed discovery generated. The applications of the theory to many of the puzzles of the past were countless and ingenious. The illustrations of the manner in which the policy was pursued, and the cajolery and threats which were said to have been employed in order to ensure its success, covered the whole history of the Conference, and presented it through a new and possibly distorted medium. The morbid suspicions aroused may have been the natural vein of men who had passed a great part of their lives in petty racial struggles; but according to common account, it was abundantly nurtured at the Conference by the lack of reserve and moderation displayed by some of the promoters of the minority clauses who were deficient in the sense of measure.

{end of quotes }

Dillon says that delegates noted that, **at that very time, Communist revolutions were breaking out in Central and East European countries, led by Communist Jews for whom the religious Jews felt "disgust"** (p. 69).

**If the religious Jews distanced themselves from the Communist Jews, why did they defend the latter, instead of repudiating them, when governments cracked down on them?** Why did religious Jews like financier Jacob Schiff want to bring down the Czar's government, on account of its pogroms against revolutionary Jews, if Schiff was repudiating those revolutionary Jews?

In his letters (Cyrus Alder, *Jacob H Schiff: His Life and Letters*, 1928), **Schiff reveals an obsession with bringing down the Russian government.** He admits to loaning money to Japan for the 1904-5 war, for a political purpose:

I further said, that as a friend of Japan, who had rendered important services in financing her war loans, in order to enable her to defend herself and become victorious over Russia, "the enemy of mankind," ...' (Vol I, p. 255).

He admits, **"The claim that among the ranks of those who in Russia are seeking to undermine governmental authority there are a considerable number of**

**Jews may be true**" (Vol II, p. 131), then goes on to blame and attack the Czar, rather than repudiate those revolutionary Jews.

**Sigmund Freud and Wiliam C. Bullitt, *Thomas Woodrow Wilson: A Psychological Study***, Houghton Mifflin Company Boston 1967:

{p. 166} As a statesman, **Sir Edward Grey, the British Foreign Secretary, was House's ideal**, and Wilson liked to handle the matters of the high-

{p. 167} est importance through secret communications between House and Grey. **A passage in a letter from Sir Edward to the Colonel** dated September 22, 1915, gave House an opportunity to move toward action. **Grey wrote: "To me, the great object of securing the elimination of militarism and navalism is to get security for the future against aggressive war.** How much are the United States prepared to do in this direction? **Would the President propose that there should be a League of Nations binding themselves to side against any Power which broke a treaty;** which broke certain rules of warfare on land or sea (such rules would, of course, have to be drawn up after this war); or which refused, in case of dispute, to adopt some other method of settlement than that of war?"

Thus **for the first time, in a secret communication from the British Government to the American Government, appeared the words: League of Nations.**

{p. 252} ... Admiral Grayson brought in **Bernard M. Baruch, whose intimacy with the Wilsons had begun to increase as House's decreased.**

{end of quotes }

**William Bullitt, the co-author of this book with Freud, is the same Bullit** mentioned by Steed, **who recommended inviting the USSR to join the Peace Conference** which was drafting, in effect, a covenant for World Government.

Either the push for World Government was British, or it was Jewish. Was the latter proceeding under the guise of the former? **Steed saw that de facto recognition of the Bolsheviks, at the time that one government after another was falling to them, would destroy the "British" idea of World Government, and enthrone the Jewish one.**

Many well-meaning socialists were deceived at the time, about the true nature of Bolshevism.

The Fabians were being influenced by Israel Zangwill, a Fabian and Jewish Zionist.

The Fabian Society issued a book ***International Government: Two Reports by L. S. Woolf Prepared for the Fabian Research Department With an Introduction by Bernard Shaw***, London, George Allen & Unwin, 1923.

H. G. Wells, a major apologist for World Government at the Versailles Conference, was influenced by Zangwill, by Walter Lippman, and by David Lubin (all Jewish), and was an admirer of Trotsky: [wells-lenin-league.html](http://wells-lenin-league.html).



C. Howard-Ellis, *The Origin Structure & Working of the League of Nations*, George Allen & Unwin, London 1928:

{p. 5} To H. G. WELLS BERNARD SHAW, G. LOWES DICKINSON and BERNARD RUSSELL the Prophets of a New Age, this Book is dedicated, in the Hope that it may prove a Useful Monograph on the Obstetrics of the Womb of Time

{p. 85} It is an interesting fact that **the proposals relating to technical co-operation can be traced directly to Mr Leonard Woolf's *International Government***, already quoted. This book is a striking analysis of what already existed before the war in the way of technical co-operation and a powerful argument against rooting the League as deeply as possible in this particular field of international relations. **The book was read by a prominent member of the Foreign Office, who was concerned with preparing the British official draft, and led him to write a lengthy minute strongly urging the inclusion of these provisions in the draft, which was accordingly done.** In addition to stating that "the High Contracting Parties place **under the control of the League all international bureaux established by general treaties** and now located elsewhere, if the parties to such treaties consent," the draft provides ...

{p. 89} Signor Orlando presented a hastily concocted Italian scheme and **M. Leon Bourgeois** a carefully thought-out and elaborate French draft, framed by an important French official committee, of which M. Bourgeois himself had been the chairman.

{end of quotes}

**L. V. A. Bourgeois, proponent of World Government at Versailles, is mentioned in the *Protocols of Zion*.**

From Marc Cohen at [yvvvvv93@yahoo.com](mailto:yvvvvv93@yahoo.com):

{quote}

Hello all - I have made **a new discovery concerning the "*Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*" and the diaries of Theodor Herzl !!!**

Protocol 16, point 8 ends with:

"The system of bridling thought is already at work in the so-called system of teaching by OBJECT LESSONS, the purpose of which is to turn the GOYIM into unthinking submissive brutes waiting for things to be presented before their eyes in order to form an idea of them .... **In France, one of our best agents, Bourgeois, has already made public a new program of teaching by object lessons.**"

Now - please see "*The Diaries of Theodor Herzl*", pgs. 313 - 314:

"The Hague. June 13, [1899].

**... In the evening I dined at Suttner's with Leon Bourgeois** and others."

[The sentence that follows was CENSORED OUT of the first edition of these diaries - the 1922-1923, "*Theodor Herzl's Tagebucher*", published in 3 Volumes by the "*Judischer Verlag*", Berlin; it has been reproduced in the 1962 edition -

Translated & Edited by Marvin Lowenthal; The Universal Library; Grosset & Dunlap, New York, 1962; Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 56-8112. O.K. , here's the censored sentence:]

**"Bourgeois produced, if anything, an unpleasant impression. Poseur et phraseur sans distinction, a faithless radical with oversleek manners, a priestling of Free Thought."**

The diary goes on to say that **Suttner spoke to BOURGEOIS about Zionism, and the latter "liked the idea"**, and on pg. 314 **Herzl and Bourgeois exchange a joke about not wanting to have their actions recorded for posterity.**

**On page 270, Bourgeois' name is dropped by Herzl in on 18 October, 1898, in an audience with the Kaiser.** The sentence I have quoted - which is mocking of Bourgeois - is the only one censored from the 1922/1923 publication mentioning Bourgeois. The Bourgeois in question was, according to Lowenthal's "Biographical and Topical Notes" [pg. 447], a

"LEON VICTOR AUGUSTE BOURGEOIS (1851-1925) French statesman and author."

This is at the very least strong evidence that whomever wrote the PROTOCOLS was aware that Herzl/the Zionists were in cahootz with the same Bourgeois mentioned in Protocol 16:8. I have never seen mention of this fact before.

Spread the Word !

Marc Cohen [VVVVV93@yahoo.com](mailto:VVVVV93@yahoo.com)

{end quote}

For *Protocols* 16:8 see <http://abbc.com/islam/english/toread/pr-zion.htm> or [protocol.html](http://protocol.html).

The following biographical information is from <http://www.nobel.se/peace/laureates/1920/bourgeois-bio.html>

{quote}

"Léon Victor Auguste Bourgeois (May 21, 1851-September 29, 1925), the «spiritual father» of the League of Nations, was a man of prodigious capabilities and diversified interests. A statesman, jurist, artist, and scholar, Léon Bourgeois, in the course of a long career, held almost every major office available in the French government of the Third Republic. ...

"As minister of public instruction in Freycinet's cabinet from 1890 to 1892 and again in 1898 under Brisson, Bourgeois instituted major reforms in the educational structure, reconstituting the universities by regrouping the faculties, reforming both the secondary and primary systems, and extending the availability of postgraduate instruction. When he gave up the education portfolio in 1892, he accepted that of the Ministry of Justice for two years. ...

"In January of 1918, heading an official commission of inquiry on the question of a League of Nations, he presented a draft for such an organization. President of a

newly formed French Association for the League of Nations, he attended the 1919 international congress, convened in Paris, of various organizations interested in establishing a League, and in the same year served as the French representative on the League of Nations Commission chaired by Woodrow Wilson. He brought out another collection of his speeches at this time, *Le Pacte de 1919 et la Société des Nations*.

"The culmination of Bourgeois' career came in 1920 when he assumed the **presidency of the French Senate**, was unanimously elected the first president of the Council of the League of Nations, and was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize."

{end quote}

Even so, in 1920, when the Red Army was invading Poland with a view to reaching Germany ([wells-lenin-league.html](http://wells-lenin-league.html)), France sent help to Poland.

## 12. Douglas Reed on the ousting of Lord Northcliffe

12.1 The following information on Northcliffe is from the Spartacus site <http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/FWWtimes.htm>:

{quote} In 1898, Lord Northcliffe purchased *The Times* for £320,000 was accepted. Circulation of the paper had fallen to 38,000 and was losing money. Northcliffe re-equipped its outdated printing plant, reduced the newspaper's price by a penny to two-pence, and appointed a new editor, Geoffrey Dawson.

In March, 1914, Northcliffe reduced the price even further, and by the outbreak of the First World War, the one penny *Times* was selling 278,000 copies a day. During the early stages of the war Northcliffe created a great deal of controversy by advocating conscription and criticizing David Lloyd George and Lord Kitchener. This upset many readers and circulation of *The Times* began to fall again. Harmsworth stopped attacking the government and in 1918 was asked to take control of British war propaganda.

After a row with Northcliffe, Dawson resigned as editor of *The Times* in 1919. He was replaced by Henry Wickham Steed, the former foreign correspondent. When Lord Northcliffe, died in 1921, the newspaper passed into the hands of John Jacob Astor, the younger son of Lord Astor.

{endquote}

12.2 Douglas Reed, *The Controversy of Zion*, Veritas Publishing Company, PO Box 20, Bullsbrook, Western Australia 6084, 1985.

{p. 295} **In 1919-1922 the censorship was ending** and the newspapers naturally reverted, in the main, to the earlier practice of true reporting and impartial comment on the facts reported. This re-established the former check on governmental policies, and if it had continued would undoubtedly have thwarted the Zionist project, which could not be maintained if it were open to public scrutiny.

Therefore **the entire future for the Zionists, at this crucial moment when "the Mandate" still was not "ratified", turned on the suppression of adverse newspaper information** and comment. At that very juncture an event occurred

which produced that result. By reason of this great effect on the future, and by its own singular nature, the event (denoted in the heading to the present chapter) deserves relation in detail here.

At that stage in the affair England was of paramount importance to the conspirators (I have shown that Dr. Weizmann and Mr. House both used this word) and **in England the energetic Lord Northcliffe was a powerful man.** The former Alfred Harmsworth, bulky and wearing a dank Napoleonic forelock, **owned the two most widely read daily newspapers, various other journals and periodicals, and in addition was majority proprietor of** the most influential newspaper in the world, at that time, *The Times* of London. Thus he had direct access to millions of people each day and, despite his business acumen, he was by nature a great newspaper editor, courageous, combative and patriotic. He was sometimes right and sometimes wrong in the causes he launched or espoused, but he was independent and unpurchasable. He somewhat resembled Mr. Randolph Hearst and Colonel Robert McCormick in America, which is to say that he would do many things to increase the circulation of his newspapers, but only within the limits of national interest; he would not peddle blasphemy, obscenity, libel or sedition. He could not be cowed and was a force in the land.

**Lord Northcliffe made himself the adversary of the conspiracy from Russia in two ways. In May 1920 he caused to be printed in *The Times* the article, previously mentioned, on the *Protocols*.** It was headed, "The Jewish Peril, A Disturbing Pamphlet, Call for Enquiry". It concluded, 'An impartial investigation of these would-be documents and of their history is most desirable ... **are we to dismiss the whole matter without inquiry and to let the influence of such a book as this work unchecked?"**

**Then in 1922 Lord Northcliffe visited Palestine, accompanied by a journalist, Mr. J.M.N. Jeffries (whose subsequent book, *Palestine: The Reality*, remains the classic work of reference for that period). This was a combination of a different sort from that formed by the editors of *The Times* and *Manchester Guardian*, who wrote their leading articles about Palestine in England and in consultation with**

{p. 296} the Zionist chieftain, **Dr. Weizmann.** Lord Northcliffe, on the spot, reached the same conclusion as all other impartial investigators, and **wrote, "In my opinion we, without sufficient thought, guaranteed Palestine as a home for the Jews despite the fact that 700,000 Arab Moslems live there and own it ...** The Jews seemed to be under the impression that all England was devoted to the one cause of Zionism, enthusiastic for it in fact; and I told them that this was not so and to be careful that they do not tire out our people by *secret importation of arms to fight 700,000 Arabs ... There will be trouble in Palestine . . . people dare not tell the Jews the truth here. They have had some from me*".

By stating this truth, Lord Northcliffe offended *twice*, he had already entered the forbidden room by demanding "inquiry" into the origins of the *Protocols*. Moreover, he was able to publish this truth in the mass-circulation newspapers

owned by him, so that he became, to the conspirators, a dangerous man. He encountered one obstacle in the shape of Mr. Wickham Steed, who was editor of *The Times* and whose championship of Zionism Dr. Weizmann records.

In this contest **Lord Northcliffe** had an Achilles heel. He particularly **wanted to get the truth about Palestine into *The Times*, but he was not sole proprietor of that paper, only chief proprietor.** Thus **his own newspapers published his series of articles about Palestine but *The Times*, in fact, refused to do so.** **Mr. Wickham Steed**, though he had made such large proposals about the future of Palestine declined to go there, and **denied publicity to the anti-Zionist case.**

These facts, and all that now follows, are related (again, with surprising candour) in the *Official History of The Times* (1952). It records that **Mr. Wickham Steed "evaded" visiting Palestine when Lord Northcliffe requested him to go there;** it also records Mr. Wickham Steed's **"inaction" following Lord Northcliffe's telegraphed wish "for a leading article attacking Balfour's attitude towards Zionism".**

In what follows the reader's attention is particularly directed to *dates*.

**In May 1920 Lord Northcliffe had caused publication of the article about the *Protocols* in *The Times*.** Early in 1922 he visited Palestine and produced the series of articles above mentioned. On February 26, 1922 he left Palestine, after his request, which was ignored, to the editor of *The Times*. He was incensed against the incomppliant editor and had **a message, strongly critical of his editorial policy, read to an editorial conference which met on March 2, 1922.** Lord Northcliffe **wished that Mr. Wickham Steed should resign** and was astonished that he remained after this open rebuke. **The editor, instead of resigning, decided "to secure a lawyer's opinion on the degree of provocation necessary to constitute unlawful dismissal".** For this purpose he consulted *Lord Northcliffe's own special legal adviser* (March 7, 1922), who informed Mr. Wickham Steed that Lord Northcliffe was "abnormal", "incapable of business" and, judging from his appearance, "unlikely to live long" and advised the editor *to continue in his post!* The editor then went to Pau, in France, to see Lord Northcliffe, in his turn {p. 297} decided that Lord Northcliffe was "abnormal" (March 31, 1922), and **informed a director of *The Times* that Lord Northcliffe was "going mad".**

**The suggestion of madness thus was put out by an editor whom Lord Northcliffe desired to remove** and the impressions of others therefore are obviously relevant. On May 3, 1922 Lord Northcliffe attended a farewell luncheon in London for a retiring editor of one of his papers and "was in fine form". **On May 11, 1922 he made "an excellent and effective speech" to the Empire Press Union and "most people who had thought him 'abnormal' believed they were mistaken".** A few days later Lord Northcliffe telegraphed instructions to the Managing Director of *The Times* to arrange for the editor's resignation. This Managing Director saw nothing "abnormal" in such an instruction and was not "in the least anxious about Northcliffe's health". Another director, who then saw

him, "considered him to have quite as good a life risk as his own": he "noticed nothing unusual in Northcliffe's manner or appearance" (May 24, 1922).

On June 8, 1922 Lord Northcliffe, from Boulogne, asked Mr. Wickham Steed to meet him in Paris; they met there on June 11, 1922, and Lord Northcliffe told his visitor that he, Lord Northcliffe, would assume the editorship of *The Times*. On June 12, 1922 the whole party left for Evian-les-Bains, a doctor being secreted on the train, as far as the Swiss frontier, by Mr. Wickham Steed. **Arrived in Switzerland "a brilliant French nerve specialist" (unnamed) was summoned and in the evening certified Lord Northcliffe insane.** On the strength of this Mr. Wickham Steed cabled instructions to *The Times* to disregard and not to publish anything received from Lord Northcliffe, and on June 13, 1922 he left, never to see Lord Northcliffe again. **On June 18, 1912 Lord Northcliffe returned to London and was in fact removed from all control of, and even communication with his undertakings (especially *The Times*; his telephone was cut).** The manager had police posted at the door to prevent him entering the office of *The Times* if he were able to reach it. **All this, according to the *Official History*, was on the strength of certification in a foreign country (Switzerland) by an unnamed (French) doctor.** On August 14, 1922 Lord Northcliffe died; the cause of death stated was ulcerative endocarditis, and his age was fifty-seven. He was buried, after a service at Westminster Abbey, amid a great array of mourning editors.

Such is the story as I have taken it from the official publication. **None of this was known outside a small circle at the time;** it only emerged in the *Official History* after three decades, and if it had all been published in 1922 would presumably have called forth many questions. I doubt if any comparable displacement of a powerful and wealthy man can be adduced, at any rate in such mysterious circumstances.

For the first time, I now appear in this narrative as a personal witness of events. In the 1914-1918 war I was one participant among uncomprehending millions. and only began to see its true shape long afterwards. **In 1922 I was for an instant in, though not of the inner circle;** looking back, I see myself closeted with Lord

{p. 298} Northcliffe (about to die) and quite ignorant of Zionism, Palestine, Protocols or any other matter in which he had raised his voice. My testimony may be of some interest; I cannot myself judge of its value.

**I was in 1922** a young man fresh from the war who struggled to find a place in the world and had become **a clerk in the office of *The Times*. I was summoned thence, in that first week of June when Lord Northcliffe was preparing to remove Mr. Wickham Steed and himself assume the editorship of *The Times*, to go as secretary to Lord Northcliffe who was at Boulogne.** I was warned beforehand that he was an unusual man whose every bidding must be quickly done. Possibly for that reason, everything he did seemed to me to be simply the expression of his unusual nature. **No suspicion of anything more ever came to me, a week before he was "certified" and, in effect, put in captivity.**

I was completely ignorant of "abnormal" conditions, so that the expert might discount my testimony. Anyway, **the behaviour I observed was just what I had been told to expect by those who had worked with him for many years.** There was one exception to this. **Lord Northcliffe was convinced that his life was in danger and several time said this; specifically, he said he had been poisoned.** If this is in itself madness, then he was mad, but in that case many victims of poisoning have died of madness, not of what was fed to them. If by any chance it was true, he was not mad. **I remember that I thought it feasible that such a man should have dangerous enemies,** though at that time I had no inkling at all of any particular hostility he might have incurred. His belief certainly charged him with suspicion of those around him, but if by chance he had reason for it, then again it was not madness; if all this had transpired in the light of day such things could have been thrashed out.

I cannot judge, and can only record what I saw and thought at the time, as a young man who had no more idea of what went on around him than a babe knows the shape of the world. When I returned to London I was questioned about Lord Northcliffe by his brother, Lord Rothermere, and one of his chief associates, Sir George Sutton. The thought of madness must by that time have been in their minds (the "certification" had ensued) and therefore have underlain their questions, but not even then did any such suspicion occur to me, although I had been one of the last people to see him before he was certified and removed from control of his newspapers. I did not know of that when I saw them or for long afterwards. **In such secrecy was all this done that, although I continued in the service of *The Times* for sixteen years, I only learned of the "madness" and "certification" thirty years later, from the *Official History*.** By that time I was able to see what great consequences had flowed from an affair in which I was an uninitiated onlooker at the age of twenty-seven.

**Lord Northcliffe therefore was out of circulation, and of the control of his newspapers, during the decisive period preceding the ratification of "the mandate" by the League of Nations, which clinched the Palestinean transaction {p. 299} and bequeathed the effects of it to our present generation. The opposition of a widely-read chain of journals at that period might have changed the whole course of events.** After Lord Northcliffe died the possibility of editorials in *The Times* "attacking Balfour's attitude towards Zionism" faded. From that time the submission of the press, in the manner described by the *Protocols*, grew ever more apparent and in time reached the condition which prevails today, when faithful reporting and impartial comment on this question has long been in suspense.

**Lord Northcliffe was removed from control of his newspapers and put under constraint on June 18, 1922; on July 24, 1922 the Council of the League of Nations met in London, secure from any possibility of loud public protest by Lord Northcliffe, to bestow on Britain a "mandate" to remain in Palestine and by**

**arms to install the Zionists there** (I describe what events have shown to be the fact; the matter was not so depicted to the public, of course).

{end of quotes}

### **13. More on the Ousting of Lord Northcliffe from *The Times* of London**

Lord Northcliffe returned in February 1922 from a world trip. He had kept a diary, which was published in 1923 as *My Journey Round the World*; extracts are included below.

An opponent of Zionism, he recorded in that book:

"{p. 275} **There will be trouble in Palestine. ... {p. 276} ... I see trouble, much trouble between 70,000 Jews and 700,000 Canaanites and Christians. ... {p. 277} People daren't tell the Jews the truth here. They've had some from me. I didn't come uninvited. The size of our Army here is not known to people at home. Why is the Army necessary? Because of the Moslem-Christian *versus* Jew feeling.**"

Quite rational objections, but at odds with the Zionist policy of the Government (administered in Palestine by Allenby) and of his own editor at *The Times*, Henry Wickham Steed.

#### **13.1 *The History of The Times, Volume 4***

*The History of The Times,  
Volume 4, The 150th Anniversary and Beyond : 1912-1948;  
Part II: 1921-1948*

Written by Stanley Morison;  
publisher: London : The Times, 1952.  
AMICUS# 2476782

{p. 504} XV AFTER NORTHCLIFFE'S WORLD TOUR

**For the creator of the most powerful single engine of publicity ever known, and for the architect of the most spectacular political career in modern history, 1922 was a year of fate.** Northcliffe and Lloyd George, parties to one of the most significant of all wartime alliances which had become one of the bitterest peacetime antagonisms, never met after the Armistice. ...

**Northcliffe always felt braced by the first of January. The present was no exception. The combination of a new year and his being nearer home gave him immense**

{p. 505} **vitality.** Landing at Colombo, the Chief was quickly on the mainland investigating, **challenging, arguing with all in reach, and planning or deciding for the future.** ... He was at Beirut on February 11, Port Said on the 13<sup>th</sup>. He arrived at Marseilles on the 18<sup>th</sup>. ...



**The Editor**, having in mind the events of the previous spring, **suspected** that a **coup** of some sort was being engineered. The suspicion was presently seen to be well-founded. **In February Lord Rothermore**, who had been campaigning against Lord Allenby in the columns of the *Sunday Pictorial*, **sent *The Times* a fierce denunciation of Lord Allenby's policy**. It was designed to occupy a whole page advertisement in the paper, and was dramatically opposed to the current policy of *The Times*, but

{p. 506} since it was offered as an advertisement was not necessarily subject to the editorial pencil. The Editor believed that the Middle East would erroneously interpret *The Times* as having expressed an editorial view, and not as having merely published an advertisement. In Palestine the imputation to the paper of a statement that Allenby had been discredited would be serious. Either the wording of the advertisement must be altered, or it could not appear. **Rothermore, told of the Editor's decision, at once complained to his brother. Northcliffe took the matter seriously. Had not the Editor evaded visiting Palestine at his personal insistence? Had he not already had reason to complain of Steed's inaction following his telegraphed wish for a leading article attacking Balfour's attitude towards Zionism?** This was the sort of independence *The Times* people always thought they could claim with impunity, and he was not going to put up with it any longer. The Editor was always making him look foolish. He must act.

The Editor, the man who had travelled with him to Washington little more than six months ago, was now to be discredited before his own staff.

{p. 509} Now Northcliffe's attitude towards the Editor was equivocal. He had, to all appearances, said and done nothing more to secure Steed's resignation.

{p. 520} The agreement of January 1, 1913, was thus endorsed on June 15:

{quote} **I the within named John Walter acknowledge that the within named Viscount Northcliffe has purchased from me the whole of my 215,000 ordinary shares in the within named Times**

{p. 521} Publishing Co., Ltd. ... {end quote}

Walter had sold his shares and in doing so, had necessarily sacrificed his option. **It was a catastrophic act.**

{the last sentence indicates a pro-Steed, anti-Northcliffe, bias}

{p. 547} It was impossible to say the same of Northcliffe's condition, or of Steed's editorship. **The Editor had known for weeks that Northcliffe's critical condition was not only of the physical order. He knew that his tenure of the editorial chair was subject to a moment's notice.** He knew on June 9 of Walter's sale of shares and surrender of the option. He had been summoned to Paris to meet Northcliffe on June 11.

{p. 551} Meanwhile there was infinite consternation at Printing House Square and Carmelite House. **At midnight on June 12 Hubert Walter called on Ralph and informed him that he had heard indirectly from Paris that Northcliffe was**

**insane** and there was a queer story about a revolver. At last it seemed pretty clever to both Hubert and Ralph Walter that **Steed had not been as far wrong on the point of insanity**, and that **the sale must not go through**. Ralph and Hubert Walter breakfasted together on Tuesday, the 13th, and **telephoned his bankers, telling them not to hand over the share certificates** without further instruction. ... The Deputy Editor had with him the Editor of the *Literary Supplement*. The latter suggested that **in the event of Northcliffe's death some suitable person should purchase the property** and control the paper. ...

{Note that the above actions were taken on the basis of an "indirect" message from Paris, from an un-named source; further, that French authorities had no jurisdiction in Britain}

Walter decided that no step could be taken until the crucial question of Northcliffe's state of mind was definitely settled. There was

{p. 552} still no proof that Northcliffe's mind was unhinged or his health beyond repair. That, too, was Sutton's opinion. ...

On Wednesday morning Steed and Sutton arrived in Paris and met Lints Smith with whom they went on to London, after Steed had used his influence with the French Government to **save Northcliffe from action by the local authorities of Savoy against a person certified, as Northcliffe had then been** {no evidence of this is provided in this book}. **The Editor's instructions to London had already been acted upon**. The directors of the *Daily Mail* had met and decided that **nothing was to be published over the name of Northcliffe unless by the written authority of George Sutton**. A statement about Northcliffe's health was published in the *Daily Mail* on Wednesday, June 14.

{Why deprive Northcliffe of the opportunity to publish his own version of events, in his own paper? If he was insane as claimed, this would then have been apparent to all. Is this not, rather, a dirty tactic in a political fight?}

{p. 553} Five minutes later **Northcliffe rang Steed** at home. He began by

{p. 554} cursing him for having broken faith with him; he had not gone back to Evian, not had he awaited him in Paris; he had not even gone to Victoria to meet him. **Steed was no longer Editor**. Northcliffe would send the police to turn him out of the office if he ever dared go back to Printing House Square. **Steed's answer was that there was one thing** and one thing only **that Northcliffe had to do and that was to keep quiet and get well; and that "Until you do get well I will continue to look after things at this office."** ... He possessed ... four telephone lines. He now used them one after the other to tell members of the staff of *The Times* and the *Daily Mail* that they were sacked. ... On Monday, June 19, **three of his telephone lines were cut**, but he continued to use the fourth.

John Walter, with or without scares, with or without option, was not powerless. He was still chairman. **The medical report that Northcliffe's health was "entirely recoverable" but that it "will take many months,"** was made on the 17th when

Walters received notice of a meeting of the Directors called for Monday afternoon the 19th, for the passing of the transfer.

{p. 555} **After 3.50 pm on June 20 Northcliffe's medical advisers cut off his last telephone.**

{this seems a strange action for *medical* advisers: depriving him of outside communication is a *political* act; and he was still Proprietor}

{p. 565} **The climax came on the morning of August 14, when the following notice was issued:**

**VISCOUNT NORTHCLIFFE DIED AT TWELVE MINUTES PAST TEN THIS MORNING. THE END WAS PERFECTLY PEACEFUL.**

P. SEYMOUR-PRICE

HERBERT FRENCH

The Chief was fifty-seven years and one month old when he died from ulcerative endocarditis.

{end quotes}

Northcliffe died less than six months after returning from a trip around the world.

## **13.2 Alfred Viscount Northcliffe, *My Journey Round the World***

*My Journey Round the World (16 July 1921 - 26 Feb. 1922)*, By ALFRED VISCOUNT NORTHCLIFFE, Edited by CECIL & ST. JOHN HARMSWORTH, London, John Lane The Bodley Head Ltd., 1923.

{p. vii.} INTRODUCTION

This is the Diary of Lord Northcliffe, kept by him during his journey round the world in 1921-1922.

{p. viii.} A sad truth revealed in the Diary is that the long holiday - perilously overdue - in quest of health and recuperation for a mind and body exhausted by the labours of many years, developed from the first on lines that were calculated to defeat rather than to promote, the all-important object in view. The holiday became an arduous tour of exploration into the problems

{p. ix} of the Empire, and there is no doubt that Lord Northcliffe arrived home in February of last year less fit to resist the ravages of a serious illness than when he set out on his travels, with so much happy confidence, in July, 1921. ...

Lord Northcliffe's companions at different stages of the world tour were -

HARRY GARLAND MILNER, his brother-in-law.

WICKHAM STEED, then Editor of The Times ...

{Note: Northcliffe's diary, written only months before he was accused of insanity, seems full of not "tiredness" but relish for involvement in political issues.

Further, *The History of The Times, Volume 4, Part II: 1921-1948* (above), records:

"{p. 504} Northcliffe always felt braced by the first of January. The present was no exception. The combination of a new year and his being nearer home gave him immense {p. 505} vitality."

Vitality, not exhaustion; now for Northcliffe's diary, written in 1922, but published in 1923, after his death}

{p. 270} Sunday, February 5th, 1922.  
Cairo.

A brilliant Egyptian morning at seven o'clock, bracing, lovely sunshine. The gum trees outside are from Australia, and for one brief moment I thought I was out in tropical Queensland again; not that I want to be there, for we've had enough of wet clothes and topees<sup>2</sup> to last us for some time, and long for a fog or drizzle. ...

Monday, February 6th, 1922.  
Gaza- Ludd- Jerusalem.

In train, Gaza, Palestine,

I had my first peep - after thirty years at the Holy Land at 6.15 a.m. - very green, with Bible figures moving in the dawn. I don't suppose anyone except a stone image can enter the country of Christ without deep emotion. I, for one of millions, cannot.

The private car provided for us was excellent. I had Graves, the Correspondent of *The Times*, with me.

**At Gaza**, which is smashed to pieces by the great battle, **came the first Arab deputation** to see me. **For days, even as far back as when we were in Ceylon, we've been receiving telegrams from Arabs, Jews, Christians, asking that the "King of the Press" - and the rest of the Oriental Flub Dub (American) - should hear the grievances which are, briefly, that (in my opinion) we, without sufficient thought, guaranteed Palestine as a home for the Jews despite the fact that 700,000 Arab Moslems live there and on it. Arabs and Christians have now joined up against the Jews. There is hatred and there has been bloodshed.**

At Ludd came another deputation. There was to have been a demonstration of some thousands, but it had been wisely stopped. Demonstrators in these countries always carry sticks, and trouble is sure. Churchill had some last year. The deputation alleged that all the Government offices were in the hands of the Jews, which I proved to be untrue. Both sides are Oriental liars.

At Ludd we were met by bundles of telegrams, an armoured car escort (why?), Sunbeam cars, and an aeroplane overhead.

{p. 271} On to Jerusalem, motoring through the Bible hills, mostly stony ("some fell on stony ground"), or reddish with scarlet anemones, and plenty of cyclamen in clumps under overhanging rocks. Road winding, mountainous, and surface good. Cold, cold, cold - - and sleet in the high hills. Down in the valleys are orange

---

2 CH: topi = sun-helmet (Hornby 1974, 930a).

groves smothered in fruit and almond blossom by the mile. **Arabs and donkeys and camels; Fords packed with queer-looking Jews**, the males, old and young, with hanging side-locks. After the tropics the cold, which is really a bracing March at home, is such that I am frozen through and through.

You begin to be in Jerusalem before you know it, very suddenly round a corner, and in a minute there is before you the City set on a hill, like many another Oriental grey stone city. **Seventy-five thousand people** in it - **and some mighty queer ones**. ...

My host, Sir Herbert Samuel, who occupies one of the thorniest Governmental seats I've struck yet, was ill ...

I was in for a big luncheon paltry at once, and then went off to a Jewish "Colony," an hour-and-a-quarter's journey by fast motor.

I am picking up views all the time. British officials, with few exceptions, don't like working under and with Jews, though everyone says that Samuel is as fair as he is courageous; and it requires courage to hold a very poor job like this when you might be a snug Cabinet Minister at home, which, at the age of forty or less, he was.

After a long and exhilarating spin through the cold spring sunshine, we come to where we take to cords and go over primeval American-like roads such as British motorists have never seen, to a long hamlet where we are led off by the Mayor, a long-established Russian Jew. There are speeches in French and I have to give my reply in French. It has to be translated into Hebrew

{p. 272} and Yiddish for the rest of the crowd. **Hebrew is being revived by the Jews**, just as Irish is by the Irish. **They seemed to be under the impression that all England was devoted to the one cause of Zionism, enthusiastic for it, in fact; and I told them that that wasn't so, and to be careful that they didn't tire out our people by any more secret importation of arms to fight 700,000 Arabs.**

We went to the offices of the "Colony," which makes excellent wine of many kinds. Forty years ago these Jews, financed by the French Rothschilds, came here to a series of sand dunes and made this fine vineyard and settlement. ...

To-day I went to the Mosque of Omar {**Dome of the Rock**} and the Holy Sepulchre, the place where Christ's body lay, and I believe that it did lie there. It is the most holy place, the holy of holies in the Christian world. **The Mosque of Omar where the wily Moslems had gathered their big men, muftis and others, to meet me, is the third most holy place of the 250,000,000 Moslems**, now educating and organizing, which form so strange a force. ...

I have busy times here in Jerusalem where, en passant, more institutions, such as missions and hospitals, are kept up, by every nation, than anywhere else in the world. In many ways the town must be a town of cosmopolitan parasites; doctors, nurses, and the rest, including Jewish remittance men from many lands.

{p. 273} Wednesday, February 8th, 1922. Jerusalem.

Most of the morning was spent in receiving **Arabs, Christians, Zionists, and Orthodox Jews**. All tried hard to get me to express an opinion on their cause. I declined, except to express the belief that the immigration of new Jews, unused to liberty and plenty, should be done with great care. All lie profusely; the Moslems outrageously, the Zionists artistically. The Orthodox Jews seem bitterest of all. I have now seen and questioned over two hundred of the various disputants. I am to see some of the newest Jewish arrivals on Thursday on my way to the sea. ...

After lunch, I went again with Storrs to see the Pool of Bethesda and the Jews' wailing-place, and to walk through the busy, narrow, often over-arched streets. Pekin, Fez, Cairo, Canton the back streets of any Eastern town, are all much of a muchness. Here were squatting Jews, selling carpets or oranges, or turning sewing machines. The spectacle of the Jews' wailing-place, where men and women poke their faces into cracks in the city wall and pray, is a queer one. They stand up, of course.

Government House has behaved very generously in providing me with accommodation to see deputations. Only one yesterday was in their favour. The Government is fair, enthusiastic, and ignorant of immigration.

Graves, *The Times* Near East Correspondent, is my secretary and correspondent *pro tem*.

{p. 274} Another huge dinner-party. I heard spoken around me, by the strangely assorted Bishops and Patriarchs, Greek, Armenian, Turkish (by my Christian neighbour married to a Moslem), Asiatic French, and English. Hebrew is also spoken.

The methods of Zionism arouse antagonism. Can Jews rule? ...

Yesterday a day of motoring from the shimmering sunshine, cold and crisp, of the Mount of Olives, through Jerusalem, which white cupolaed city with its great walls stands four square, though it is beginning to straggle into new suburbs. ...

I haven't time to deal with **Palestine as the great battlefield of the Religions, which it has always been since Crusaders' times, and is to-day.** ...

{p. 275} The valley of the Jordan is almost tropical; bananas grow there well. ...

There was a swarm of sheikhs and their followers waiting to be introduced to me - Beduins - "Beddoes," as the British officers called them. It was an interesting and primitive picture. Nearby, across the hills, is the Arabian desert and then Mesopotamia. I wish I could have gone there, but the *Egypt* will be at Port Said on the 12th for Marseilles, and I must catch her.

We said good-bye to these wild men, all of them, through the Amir, in British pay, and made the long ride back to Jerusalem. It really did look like Jerusalem the Golden in the sunlight.

I made two calls, one American, one Moslem, and heard **the usual tale of the fear of the Jews and the Zionist Council.**

Early to bed, thank goodness.

**There will be trouble in Palestine.**

{p. 276} Friday, February 10th, 1922.

Beirut, Syria.

WAS a long day yesterday. We rose at six o'clock and were on the road from Jerusalem to the seaside town of Haifa by 7.30. ...

I looked back at grey **Jerusalem, the most faction-ridden city in the world** ... At Jerusalem a film was taken of my departure, amidst the proffering to me of **a gift which I couldn't refuse - a jewelled Old Testament in Hebrew, from the Jews.**

If only all the Jews were sane and moderate like Ben Avi, editor of the Hebrew *Daily Mail* here, I should feel less anxious about Palestine. As it is, despite the protestations of Government officials, **I see trouble, much trouble between 70,000 Jews and 700,000 Canaanites and Christians.**

We stopped at two "Colonies," where young Lithuanian and Galician Jews were very slackly at work on road-making. Fine young fellows, many. We entered the eating tent and huts of

{p. 277} some of them. They are rude people. If you make them stand up, which they don't otherwise, **they go on eating in your face, with their hats on the backs of their heads**, and put their hands in their pockets. **The Dyaks of Borneo are better behaved. If they do that to us**, whose coming they have waited for hours, **what do they do to the natives? I spoke my mind to their leader, much to the pleasure of British officers with me. People daren't tell the Jews the truth here. They've had some from me.** I didn't come uninvited.

**The size of our Army here is not known to people at home. Why is the Army necessary? Because of the Moslem-Christian *versus* Jew feeling.**

Our Palestine developments, roads, railways, and the rest have been not a little the fruit of our Sudan Egyptian Civil Services, all represented here. This is a new country superimposed on an old - even more difficult, perhaps, than colonising, say, Australia though that task is full of "snags."

{end of quotes}

**13.3 Carroll Quigley discloses more information** about the eviction of Lord Northcliffe from *The Times* in his book *The Anglo-American Establishment*.

The war against the Arabs and Islam is run by two conspiracies, an Anglo-American one (the whale, because it controls the oceans), and a Zionist one (the elephant, the one you can't see in the china shop until you join up the dots).

Some people can't see the whale; some can't see the elephant. Chomsky and the Trotskyist Left see the whale but not the elephant.

The Balfour Declaration marked the joining-up of two conspiracies, the British one (now Anglo-American) and the Zionist one: [balfour.html](http://balfour.html).

The British one had wanted to get the US back into the Empire, even if that meant transferring the capital to the US. In the end, they were only able to do that with the assistance of Jewish middlemen.

Before the Balfour Declaration, the two conspiracies were working against each other. It was in the Zionist interest to keep the protagonists in World War I as evenly balanced as possible, i.e. keep the US out of the war, until the fall of the Tsar, their hated enemy. Then they auctioned their support to the protagonists.

Suppose that the U.S. had entered the war earlier, and mobilized its troops and sent them to the front. Then Britain would not have made the Balfour Declaration, as "a contract with World Jewry", whereby Zionists got Palestine in return for getting the U.S. into the war - because the U.S. would already have titled the balance.

The catch was this: the Zionist one knew about the Anglo one, because Cecil Rhodes had invited Lord Rothschild to join it; but the Anglos did not know about the Zionist one.

Quigley is unaware of the Zionist conspiracy, but is very revealing of the Anglo one. The following material begins with the role of Lord Esher (Reginald Baliol Brett, also known as Viscount Esher) at *The Times*. Lord Northcliffe's name by birth was Alfred Harmsworth.

Carroll Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment: From Rhodes to Cliveden*, Books In Focus, New York 1981

{p. 42} **Esher's** reasons for refusing these positions were twofold: he **wanted to work behind the scenes rather than in the public view**, and his work in secret was so important and so influential that any public post would have meant a reduction in his power. ... **This opportunity for influencing decisions at the center came from his relationship to the monarchy.** For at least twenty-five years (from 1895 to after 1920) Esher was probably the most important adviser on political matters to Queen Victoria, King Edward VII, and King George V. ... **in 1908, when a purchaser known only as "X" acquired control of *The Times*, Esher visited Lord Northcliffe on behalf of "a very high quarter" to seek assurance that the policy of the paper would not be changed. Northcliffe, who was 'X,' hastened to give the necessary assurances, according to the official *History of The Times*. Northcliffe and the historian of *The Times* regarded Esher on this occasion as the emissary**

{p. 43} of King Edward, but we, who know of his relationship with the Rhodes secret society, are justified in asking if he were not equally the agent of the Milner Group, since it was as vital to the Group as to the King that the policy of *The Times* remain unchanged. As we shall see in a later chapter, **when Northcliffe did adopt a policy contrary to that of the Group, in the period 1917-1919, the Group broke with him personally and within three years bought his controlling interest in the paper. ...**

{p. 101} Accordingly, the real efforts of the Milner Group



{p. 102} were redirected into more fruitful and anonymous activities such as *The Times* and The Round Table.

**The Milner Group did not own *The Times* before 1922, but clearly controlled it as far back as 1912.** Even before this last date members of the innermost circle of the Milner Group were swarming about the great newspaper. In fact, it would appear that *The Times* had been **controlled by the Cecil Bloc since 1884** and was **taken over by the Milner Group** in the same way in which All Souls was taken over, **quietly and without a struggle**. The midwife of this process apparently was George E. Buckle (1854-1935), graduate of New College in 1876, member of All Souls since 1877, and editor of *The Times* from 1884 to 1912. The chief members of the Milner Group who were associated with *The Times* have already been mentioned. **Amery was connected with the paper from 1899 to 1909.** During this period he edited and largely wrote the Times History of the South African War. **Lord Esher was offered a directorship in 1908.** Grigg was a staff writer in 1903-1905, and head of the Imperial Department in 1908-1913. B. K. Long was head of the Dominion Department in 1913-1921 and of the Foreign Department in 1920-1921. Monypenny was assistant editor both before and after the Boer War (1894-1899, 1903-1908) and on the board of directors after the paper was incorporated (1908-1912). Dason was the paper's chief correspondent in South Africa in the Selborne period (1905-1910), while Basil Williams was the reporter covering the National Convention there (1908-1909). When it became clear in 1911 that Buckle must soon retire, **Dawson** was brought into the office in a rather vague capacity and, a year later, **was made editor**. The appointment was suggested and urged by Buckle. **Dawson held the position from 1912 to 1941, except for the three years 1919-1922.** This interval is of some significance, for it revealed to the Milner Group that **they could not continue to control *The Times* without ownership**. The Cecil Bloc had controlled *The Times* from 1884 to 1912 without ownership and the Milner Group had done the same in the period 1912-1919, but, in this last year, **Dawson quarreled with Lord Northcliffe (who was chief proprietor from 1908-1922)** and left the editor's chair. **As soon as the Milner Group, through the Astors, acquired the chief proprietorship of the paper in 1922, Dawson was restored** to his post and held it for the next twenty years. Undoubtedly the skillful stroke which acquired the ownership of *The Times* from the Harmsorth {Northcliffe} estate in 1922 was engineered by Brand. During the interval of three years during which Dawson was not editor, Northcliffe entrusted the position to one of *The Times*'s famous foreign correspondents H. W. Steed.

{end quotes}

More from Carroll Quigley on The Anglo-American Establishment: [quigley.html](http://quigley.html).

## **14. Lloyd George explains why Britain made "a contract with Jewry"**

David Lloyd George, *Memoirs of the Peace Conference*, Volume II, New Haven, Yale University Press 1939; (ch. XXIII).

{p. 722} **The next factor which produced a momentous change was the decision to come to terms with Jewry**, which was clamouring for an opportunity to make Canaan once more the homeland of their race. There are more Irishmen living outside Ireland than dwell in the old country. Still, Ireland is the homeland of the Irish people. No one imagined that the 14,000,000 of Jews scattered over the globe could find room and a living in Palestine. Nevertheless this race of wanderers sought a national hearth and a refuge for the hunted children of Israel in the country which the splendour of their spiritual genius has made forever glorious.

**It seems strange to say that the Germans were the first to realise the war value of the Jews of the dispersal. In Poland it was they who helped the German Army to conquer the Czarist oppressor** who had so cruelly persecuted their race. They had their influence in other lands - notably in America, where some of their most powerful leaders exerted a retarding influence on President Wilson's impulses in the direction of the Allies. {before the Balfour Declaration} The German General Staff in 1916 urged the Turks to concede the demands of the Zionists in respect of Palestine. Fortunately the Turk was too stupid to understand or too sluggish to move. The fact that **Britain at last opened her eyes to the opportunity afforded to the Allies to rally this powerful people to their side** was attributable to the initiative, the assiduity and the fervour of one of the greatest Hebrews of all time: **Dr. Chaim Weizmann. He found his opportunity in this War of Nations to advance the cause to which he had consecrated his life. ...**

{p. 723} Propaganda on both sides probably played a greater part in the last war than in any other. As an illustration I might take the public declarations we made of the Allied intention to liberate and confer self-government on nationalities inside the enemy Empires, - Turkey, Germany, and Austria. These announcements were intended to have a propagandist effect, not only at home, but also in neutral countries and perhaps most of all in enemy countries. ...

{p. 724} **The Balfour Declaration** represented the convinced policy of all parties in our country and also in America, but **the launching of it in 1917 was due**, as I have said, **to propagandist reasons. I should like once more to remind the British public, who may be hesitating about the burdens of our Zionist Declaration to-day, of the actual war position at the time of that Declaration.** We are now looking at the War through the dazzling glow of a triumphant end, but **in 1917 the issue of the War was still very much in doubt.** We were convinced - but not all of us - that we would pull through victoriously, but the Germans were equally persuaded that victory would rest on their banners, and they had much reason for coming to that conclusion. They had smashed the Roumanians. The Russian Army was completely demoralised by its numerous defeats. The French Army was exhausted and temporarily unequal to striking a great blow. The Italians had sustained a shattering defeat at Caporetto. The unlimited submarine campaign had sunk millions of tons of our shipping. **There were no American divisions at the front, and when I say at the front, I mean available in the trenches.** For the Allies there were **two paramount problems** at that time. **The first was that the Central Powers should be broken by the**

**blockade before our supplies of food and essential raw material were cut off by sinking of our own ships. The other was that the war preparations in the United States should be speeded up** to such an extent as to enable the Allies to be adequately reinforced in the critical campaign of 1918 by American troops. **In the solution of these two problems, public opinion in Russia and America played a great part, and we had every reason at that time to believe that in both countries the friendliness or hostility of the Jewish race might make a considerable difference. ...**

{p. 725} The support of the Zionists for the cause of the Entente would mean a great deal as a war measure. Quite naturally **Jewish sympathies were to a great extent anti-Russian, and therefore in favour of the Central Powers.** No ally of Russia, in fact, could escape sharing that immediate and inevitable penalty for the long and savage Russian persecution of the Jewish race. In addition to this, the German General Staff, with their wide outlook on possibilities, urged, early in 1916, the advantages of promising Jewish restoration to Palestine under an arrangement

{p. 726} to be made between Zionists and Turkey, backed by a German guarantee. The practical difficulties were considerable; the subject was perhaps dangerous to German relations with Turkey; and the German Government acted cautiously. But the scheme was by no means rejected or even shelved, and at any moment the Allies might have been forestalled in offering this supreme bid. In fact in September, 1917, the German Government were making very serious efforts to capture the Zionist Movement.

Another most cogent reason for the adoption by the Allies of the policy of the declaration lay in the state of Russia herself. **Russian Jews had been secretly active on behalf of the Central Powers from the first; they had become the chief agents of German pacifist propaganda in Russia; by 1917 they had done much in preparing for that general disintegration of Russian society, later recognised as the Revolution.** It was believed that **if Great Britain declared for the fulfilment of Zionist aspirations** in Palestine under her own pledge, **one effect would be to bring Russian Jewry to the cause of the Entente.**

**It was believed, also, that such a declaration would have a potent influence upon world Jewry outside Russia, and secure for the Entente the aid of Jewish financial interests.** In America, their aid in this respect would have a special value when **the Allies had almost exhausted the gold and marketable securities available for American purchases.** Such were the chief considerations which, in 1917, **impelled the British Government towards making a contract with Jewry.**

Men like Mr. Balfour, Lord Milner, Lord Robert Cecil, and myself were in whole-hearted sympathy with the Zionist ideal. The same thing applied to all the leaders of public opinion in our country and in the Dominions, Conservative, Liberal, and Labour. There were only one or two who were not so favourably inclined to the policy. {end of quotes} More at [l-george.html](http://l-george.html).

Robert John on *Behind the Balfour Declaration*: [balfour.html](http://balfour.html).

Benjamin Freedman's speech *The Hidden Tyranny*: [freedman.html](http://freedman.html).

## 15. Marranism and Universalism

(Marranism is the hiding of Jewish identity)

The *Jerusalem Post* of Tuesday, January 12, 1999 reported:

{quote} **Balfour Declaration's author was a secret Jew**

By DOUGLAS DAVIS

<http://www.jpost.com/com/Archive/12.Jan.1999/News/Article-9.html>

LONDON (January 12) - Leopold Amery, the author of the Balfour Declaration - the 1917 document from British foreign secretary Arthur Balfour to Lord Rothschild which laid the groundwork for the establishment of the State of Israel - was a secret Jew.

This has been disclosed in just-published research by William Rubinstein, professor of modern history at the University of Wales, who says Amery hid his Jewish background. {end quote}

**Amery, co-author of the Balfour Declaration, was a senior figure in the British Establishment. He was in the "Milner Group", set up by Cecil Rhodes as a brains trust to formulate policy for the Empire: [quigley.html](http://quigley.html).**

**Robert J. Scally, *The Origins of the Lloyd George Coalition*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1975:**

{p. 75} ... **the Webbs and Leo S. Amery, a Milner disciple, a former Fabian, and the *Times*' military correspondent in South Africa, conceived the idea of forming the "Coefficients Club" in November of 1902.**

{p. 78} **The criteria applied by Amery and the Webbs in choosing the personnel of the "Brains Trust" arose directly out of these goals.**

{p. 79} ... it seems possible that the club was originally imagined as **the "Brains Trust"** of Rosebery's National Efficiency program. ...

Thus **the twelve original Coefficients constituted a kind of non-party Shadow Cabinet of experts**, roughly paralleling the general structure of departmental functions as follows: **Sidney and Beatrice Webb** (Local Government and Labor); **L. S. Amery** (Army); **Sir Edward Grey** (Foreign Policy); R. B. Haldane (Law); Sir Clinton Dawkins (Finance); W. A. S. Hewins (Economy); **Bertrand Russell** (Science); W. Pember Reeves (Colonies); Commander Carlyon Bellairs (Navy); **Halford J. Mackinder** (Empire); Leo Maxse (Press); and **H. G. Wells** (a kind of Cultural Minister without Portfolio).

{p. 84} **The Coefficients were not, like the Webbs' past proteges, fresh graduates who might one day sit on royal commissions, but politicians, economists, and intellectuals, most of whom had already gained some foothold in one of the corridors of power.**

Together with Russell, **H. G. Wells** was somewhat out of tune with the dominant mood of the club. ... He apparently **took up the Coefficients idea as a possible foundation for one of his most cherished oriental fantasies** ... He proposed the remodeling of the Fabian Society into what he called an "Order of the Samurai" which should "embody for mankind a sense of the State." That eccentric project would appear again in various guises in Wells' later works, but in the back of his mind at this moment was **the wish to create a "constructive social stratum" which would become the new directive element of the empire** ...

In *The New Machiavelli*, a pseudonymous autobiography in which **the Coefficients appear as the "Pentagram Circle,"** he recorded their enthusiasm on the subject in language closer to their own:

{quote} The more complicated and technical affairs become, the less confidence will the elected official have in himself. **We want to suggest that these expert officials must necessarily develop into a new class**

{p. 85} and a very powerful class in the community. We want to organise that. It may be the power of the future. They will necessarily have to have very much of a common training. **We consider ourselves as amateur unpaid precursors of such a class.** ... {footnote 26: Wells, *The New Macchiavelli*, London, 1911, p. 317}

{Djilas later applied Wells' term *new class* to the *nomenklatura* of the USSR; but it applies equally to the rationalists running the West}

Wells' penchant for amplifying language does not obscure the harmony of sentiment behind the "Samurai" idea and the **Webbs' recently refined "missionary" role of the expert.**

{p. 226} **Lloyd George had himself read Wells' book in February**, possibly on Garvin's high recommendation, **and seems to have been greatly impressed. "He is the only writer whose opinions on politics interest me in the least," he confessed to a close friend.** {end quotes}

It was in such an eminent group of universalist-minded "Leftists" that Amery, a Fabian and secret Zionist, performed as a back-seat driver. Israel Zangwill, Jewish Zionist, and advocate that the League of Nations should be a World Government, was another influential Fabian, and influenced Wells' formulation of his ideas: [wells-lenin-league.html](http://wells-lenin-league.html).

Wells' "universalism" amounted to Marxism, despite his attempt to disguise it. His prescription for Marriage and the Family shows Trotskyist pedigree:

"Socialism, if it is anything more than a petty tinkering with economic relationships is a renucleation of society. **The family can remain only as a biological fact.** Its economic and educational autonomy are inevitably doomed. **The modern state is bound to be the ultimate guardian of all children** and it must assist, place, or **subordinate the parent as supporter, guardian and educator;** it must release all human beings from the obligation of mutual proprietorship, and it must refuse absolutely to recognize or enforce any kind of sexual ownership. It cannot therefore

remain neutral when such claims come before it. It must disallow them."  
(*Experiment in Autobiography*, Gollancz, London, 1934, vol. ii, p. 481).

Likewise Bertrand Russell. He wrote, in *In Praise of Idleness* (London, Unwin Books, 1973):

{p. 35} All this would be changed if it were the rule, and not the exception, for married women to earn their living by work outside the home. ... {p. 36} The problem is to secure the same communal advantages as were secured in medieval monasteries, but without celibacy ... {p. 37} The separate little houses, and the blocks of tenements each with its own kitchen, should be pulled down. ... There should be a common kitchen, a spacious dining hall ... All the children's meals should be in the nursery school ... From the time they are weaned until they go to school, they should spend all the time from breakfast till after their last meal at the nursery school ... {end quote}

With such sentiments among "universalist" intellectuals, the family is under siege.

## **16. Israel Zangwill on Zionism, the Peace Conference and the *Protocols***

Zangwill, a Fabian socialist, advocate of World Government, and Zionist publicist, ridicules those arguing the Jewish Conspiracy. His arguments were later taken up by Herman Bernstein.

Zangwill here welcomes the Bolsheviks; yet, despite his profession of socialism, he regards Lord Rothschild as a benefactor, confirming, in effect, that there is no real opposition between Rothschild and the Bolsheviks.

**Israel Zangwill, *Speeches, articles and letters of Israel Zangwill*, London 1937.**

{p. 102} **THE JEWISH BOGEY**

[July 1920]

Nothing, in fact, is - to believe the anti-Semite - too colossal for **the Jew** to have achieved. He **has at once made the world-war and pulled the strings of the peace-traps.**

{p. 103} But, despite the momentary charge of Bolshevism, and the more permanent charge of Poverty - for it is as an invading pauper horde that Jewry more frequently figures to the Christian legislator - Capitalism is destined to remain the chief of the criminal stigmata by which the Jew may be known.

But not Capitalism merely for profit's sake. **Capitalism for Jewry's sake. The Jew bankers of the world - that notorious intercatenation of super moneylenders - are engaged in the old Biblical business of exploiting the rest of mankind** as a prelude to its extermination. I suppose nobody is in a better position than I to give the lie to the charge of Jewish solidarity, **I**, whose life has been half wasted in the effort to bring it about, who for twenty years **toiled to unite the Jewish millionaires in the quest for a Jewish State**, and whose supremest triumph lay in

assembling three of them, a British, a Russian, and an American, in one Committee-room to promote - emigration from a Jewish centre!

{p. 104} As for the press being in the hands of the Jews, let us bring this question, too, into the open. I know only two daily papers in London of Jewish editorship or proprietorship, *The Daily Express* and *The Daily Telegraph*, and it is difficult to decide which is the more radically British.

{p. 198} THE EAST AFRICA OFFER

[Speech delivered at Derby Hall, Manchester, April 1905.]

{p. 199} To this policy of 'Lie low and say nothing' comes Zionism, with a trumpet-cry of 'Fly high and say everything'. **Zionism means the end of the Marrano period and the revival of the Maccabean.** {what of Leo Amery?}

{p. 136} TRIBUTE TO LORD ROTHSCHILD

[From 'The Jewish Chronicle,' April 9th, 1915.]

'Public life !' I well remember the almost rasping vehemence with which Lord Rothschild conveyed to me his remedy for anti-Semitism.

{p. 138} **Rothschild tells me** that he cannot see where the money for a Jewish Colony is to come from, and I elaborately expound to him the sources of revenue inherent in a population of thirteen millions. **'It is so difficult to get Palestine,' he once said to me, wistfully.**

**TRIBUTE TO JACOB SCHIFF**

[Letter to 'The American Hebrew', January 12th, 1917.]

Your cable reminding me of the seventieth birthday of **my friend Jacob Schiff** comes just before the departure of the American mail ...

{p. 139} If the Talmudical fancy is true that our good deeds create angels, **by what a shining host must Jacob Schiff go attended!**

{p. 331} THE BALFOUR DECLARATION

[**Speech delivered** at the Thanksgiving Meeting held at the London Opera House, December 2nd, 1917, **Lord Rothschild being in the chair.**]

**IN my capacity of President of the Jewish Territorial Organization** I have been honoured with an invitation to appear on your platform on this momentous occasion.

{p. 332} But it is **not only a Jewish national home** that our people needs. There is **the further**, and not less momentous, principle which Jewry has of late united in demanding - **equality of rights with their fellow-citizens in every country for all Jews** who may be unable or unwilling to take up the new citizenship in Palestine. This principle is the more important, inasmuch as, out of our thirteen or fourteen million Jews, only a small minority can possibly return to Palestine in any foreseeable period. Indeed, but for the fact that **the Russian Revolution has in all probability brought freedom to the six**



{p. 333} **million Jews of Russia**, I should still consider Palestine an utterly inadequate territory, and Galveston as still the one gate of hope.

{p. 336} I say that **without the vision of a League of Nations the whole world will perish**. And this vision is no mere dream of poets or dilettanti. It is the sober aspiration of statesmen like Mr. Asquith, like Lord Bryce, like Lord Lansdowne, like President Wilson, like the greatest personality the war has revealed, I mean General Smuts. But **this aspiration** was not originated by General Smuts or his fellow-statesmen. It is the vision of our own Isaiah: '**They shall beat their swords into plowshares**, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, **neither shall they learn war any more.**' In such a world, if it emerges, would it matter if we Jews did have a single nationality, if within all these leagued nations there was this still finer core of comradeship?

{p. 337} Let us rather make a great act of faith, and instead of disavowing the brotherhood of Israel **let us proclaim - from our Jerusalem centre - the brotherhood of man**. {what of the Palestinians?}

Palestine is not yet ours, and even when it is, our work - despite the pioneers we shall always honour, despite even Baron Edmond de Rothschild, to whom Palestine stands eternally indebted - will only begin.

{p. 338} And though our goal be yet far, yet already well I recall how our small nation sustained the mailed might of all the great empires of antiquity, how we saw **our Temple in flames** and were scattered like its ashes, how we endured the long night of the Middle Ages ... the seer who foretold his people's resurrection was not less prophetic when he proclaimed also **for all peoples the peace of Jerusalem**.

{p. 339} **BEFORE THE PEACE CONFERENCE**

[February 1919]

WITH the arrival in France of President Wilson, the champion of the League of Nations, the most momentous episode in all human history begins, the true 'War for the World' ...

**If mankind thus builds a brotherhood**, the immeasurable slaughter and suffering of the war will be redeemed, and **the prophetic gospel of ancient Judea will come to its own at last**: 'They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.' But Judaism stands to gain also a minor traditional hope from the Peace Conference: **the repossession of Palestine** And if this secondary consummation could be united with **the setting up of Jerusalem as the seat of the League of Nations**, instead of the bankrupt Hague, **the two Hebraic dreams**, the major and the minor, would be fused in one,

{p. 340} and **the Hebrew metropolis** - that meeting-point of three world-religions - would become at once **the centre and symbol of the new era**.

{p. 343} **PALESTINE REGAINED**



[Review of Sokolow's 'History of Zionism', vol. I. June 1919.]

{p. 345} Long before the first Colony was founded, **Lord Shaftesbury had been memorializing Palmerston to set up the Jews in Palestine ...**

{p. 346} As if **the six hundred thousand Arabs already on the soil** did not form a **sufficient obstacle to the creation of the 'Jewish National Home'**.

{p. 352} THE BALFOUR DECLARATION

[Letter to 'The Times', May 13th, 1922.]

{p. 353} It is true that **in promising Palestine to the Jews our statesmen exhibited as reckless a disregard of the existence of the six hundred thousand Arabs ...** {end of quotes}

**Israel Zangwill, *The Voice of Jerusalem*, Macmillan, New York, 1921.**

{p. 9} **The soul of this "peculiar people" is best seen in the Bible**, saturated from the first page of the Old Testament to the last page of the New with the **aspiration for a righteous social order, and an ultimate unification of mankind.**

{p. 13} **"That men form one universal brotherhood**, that they spring from one common origin, that their individual lives, their nations and races, interbreed and blend and go on to merge again at last in one common human destiny upon this little planet amidst the stars," is, according to Mr. Wells, the conclusion which science and history alike reach by their investigations. But, as he admits, all the world-religions had reached it by inspiration and insight. This conclusion was in fact the starting-point of Hebrew literature, declaring as it did that we are all sons of Adam, and that the colour-varieties sprang equally from the sons of Noah ...

{what, then, of the exhortation to avoid the goyim, i.e. non-Jews?}

{p. 50} These "little things" which "upset Jehovah" are scarcely the way to **"the kingdom of God," of which Mr. Wells is the eloquent evangelist**, and one constituent of which he specifically defines as "the progressive enlargement and development of the racial life." For, as Mr. Wells warms to his theme, we learn to our surprise that **his own "Invisible King"** {Wells wrote a book of this title} **demands nothing if not ethical service.** For him clergymen are to throw up their livings, barristers their briefs. "It is plain that he can admit no divided control of the world he claims. He concedes nothing to Caesar." Evidently then "a monopolist," between whom and Jehovah there is little to choose. Samuel himself was not more jealously republican for his God, than Mr. Wells for his. "God is to be made and declared the head of the world" and even the symbols on stamps are *lese-majeste*. **And when we learn that the future is not to democracy but theocracy, and that the trinity is doomed, we are back in the derided Old Testament.** The fact is, that **Mr. Wells has all the "stigmata" of Hebrew prophecy** - lips touched with the burning coal can in fact speak no otherwise.

{p. 51} **Mr. Wells even unconsciously accepts in principle the dietary and sexual regimen of Judaism**, which in an earlier chapter is contumeliously rejected. For "the believer owes all his being, and every moment of his life to God, to keep

mind and body as clean, pure, wholesome, active, and completely at God's service, as he can. There is no scope for indulgence or dissipation in such a consecrated life." The fact that in orthodox Judaism the guidance is not left to individual ignorance does not affect the essence of the conception, which has been illustrated in contemporary life by the embargo on alcohol in America.

The sole difference between Mr. Wells's God and the ancient Hebrew's - as that God was apprehended in the best Semitic minds - is that **Mr. Wells's God is finite**. In His unity, invisibility or incorporeality, righteousness, jealousy, and unreserved and exclusive claim for service, He is identical with Jehovah. And it is extremely interesting to witness the re-formation of ancient conceptions in an ultra-modern mind. Nor is the point of difference of supreme importance, for it is merely metaphysical, and the Hebrew genius in its palmy days had - I have already pointed out - no philosophy. Sufficient to obey and adore the unknowable Creator.

{p. 55} Nor ought I to complain that Mr. Wells's thought has "moved on" yet once more - it is like a muddy stream that purifies itself by force of going on - for he has now grown to understand the breadth of Jewish theology better, as well as the value of a "jealous" Jehovah. "Neither Gautama nor Lao Tse nor Confucius had any inkling of this idea of a jealous God, a God who would have 'none other gods,' a God of terrible Truth, who would not tolerate any lurking belief in magic, witchcraft, or old customs, or any sacrificing to the god-king or any trifling with the stern unity of things. **The intolerance of the Jewish mind did keep its essential faith clear and clean.**" And again: "**We have already noted the want of any progressive idea in primitive Buddhism. In that again it contrasted**

{p. 56} **with Judaism. The idea of a Promise gives to Judaism a quality no previous or contemporary religion displayed; it made Judaism historical** {historicist} and dramatic. It **justified its fierce intolerance** because it pointed to an aim. ... Because of its persuasion of a promise and of a divine leadership to serve divine ends, it remained in comparison with Buddhism bright and expectant, like a cared-for sword." Oddly enough, it is only when contrasting Judaism with Buddhism or Hellenism or with the doctrines of Lao Tse or Confucius that Mr. Wells is able to appreciate its claims to be **the one sane central religion of humanity**; when compared with Mohammedanism or Christianity it is accused of exclusiveness ...

{p. 58} It is in the chapter on the rise of Christianity that Mr. Wells shows himself least able to override his conscious prejudice against Judaism and his unconscious prejudice in favour of Christianity. Like most modern thinkers, **he makes up for the denial of divinity to Jesus by divinising his doctrine and his life ...**

{p. 61} **These six hundred and thirteen precepts of the Mosaic code**, though they doubtless embrace some **survivals of primitive taboos** and totems, are in the main only **an attempt at a practical idealism, a sanctified sociology**, an order in human affairs, which no one has demanded with more insistence - even unto pedantry and Philistinism - than Mr. Wells himself.

{more on Judaism as a "sanctified sociology" at p. 146 below}

{p. 120} **The alternative Woodrow Wilson set up of the world as commonwealth or the world as cockpit** was not clearly faced even by himself.

{p. 121} Had President Wilson returned home heart-broken at his defeat by the dark forces of Europe, he would have been the greatest success in human history. But that he should have triumphantly waved scraps of paper from which **the Fourteen Points** have been practically erased, here is the true tragedy of his downfall.

{p. 122} **Not only is the League not a League of Nations, nor the Peace Treaty a Treaty of Peace**, but President Wilson's tenaciously achieved embodiment of the first in the second was a triumph as hollow as the rest. For the whole point of the incorporation of the League in the Peace Treaty was that the co-existence of **this covenant of co-operation, this new world-order**, would react enormously upon the nature of the settlement, substituting as it must **goodwill** for hate, and reducing racial frictions to a minimum by **the world-policy of the open door** and free and equal access to ports, harbours and railways. In particular, **boundary questions could be denuded of their significance**, for the security of the individual frontier would depend not on its fortresses nor its geographical barriers but on the joint protection of the peoples.

But **instead of the new world-order** influencing the Peace Settlement, **that Treaty is drawn up on the assumption of the constancy of the bad old world-order, and security of frontier** has been pursued even to the sacrifice of the vaunted "**principle of nationality.**"

{if we want to do away with nations, why begin with creating Israel as a new nation?}

{p. 123} **It is not, in fact, a League of Nations that has been brought forth, but a League of Damns.** ... In diminishing and crippling Germany to the utmost possible and in building up against her resurrection a barrier of new nations ...

{p. 124} **Instead of a pact to guarantee one another's territorial integrity, the leagued nations should have undertaken to re-adjust one another's frontiers according** to the variations of **populations or their economic situation.**

{p. 126} There is no need at all of strong nations inside the League, so long as there are no strong nations outside. Their union is strength, and all the strength necessary.

{p. 130} A Peace purporting to aim at a World-Unity ...

**Bolshevism may be good or bad, but the United States of Russia would be in greater congruity with World-Peace than a swarm of conflicting nationalities;** and if the Bolsheviks can succeed in re-uniting them, they will to that extent be promoting the larger and truer ideal.

{p. 132} To increase the number of new nations without the preliminary creation of a real League of them, was merely to multiply the chances of conflagration. It was to add new denizens to the jungle.

{p. 133} This sullen resistance to the League has much in common with **the super-millennial refusal of Israel to universalise the prophetic teaching and be absorbed in its diffusion.** {A theme echoed by Wells; and yet Zangwill remained a staunch Zionist, combining his universalism with dispossession of the Palestinians} ... **In vain Paul cried: "There shall be neither Jew nor Greek." ... As if "Sovereign rights" were in any case unrestricted!** As if they were something **absolute** and antinomian, immune from the claims of reason or justice!

{p. 143} As a body, **Jews were the great agents of the Middle Ages** - the wandering Jews, a human network of inter-communication. They carried literature and folk-lore; they brought science from Arabia to Europe by way of Spain; **they invented the mechanism of commercial exchange, and, less creditably, were the chief slave-dealers.** Medieval Israel was mainly an intermediary.

It is only through isolated individuals that Israel has influenced the world at first hand. Through Spinoza it affected the whole course of modern philosophy; **through Ricardo it founded political economy; through Karl Marx and Lassalle it created socialism;** through its financiers and politicians it has time and again shaped European politics; through a host of poets, scientists, actors, artists, musicians and journalists - of whom *longum et dicere* - it has been in the van of the world. To-day, in spite of two thousand years of suppression, and though but a small fraction of the population of the world, it looms large in the arts and letters and Bourses of every capital of civilisation.

But now we are confronted with the curious fact that **the individuals through whom Israel has influenced the world** have been for the most part divorced from the body proper. They **have been heretics; caring little or nothing about "The Mission of Israel,"** and not immediately concerned about Righteousness. They have been "racial," not "religious," Jews, and even their race they have sometimes disavowed.

{p. 145} By the positive side of Judaism, I mean simply the conception of life which is its essence. **There is more in Judaism akin to the modern spirit than there is in any other religion, for the modern spirit is really akin to that of the Old Testament.** The God of the Old Testament, invisible and incorporeal and incomprehensible, in whom is no variableness {on the contrary, he is partisan and vindictive}, neither shadow of turning, whose thoughts are not our thoughts, nor His ways our ways, **who visits the sins of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generations,** and who yet, on the whole, makes for righteousness and happiness, **that terrible yet tender Father,** who is still the God of Judaism, has more in common with the unity which we apprehend behind phenomena than the god of any other creed.

{p. 146} **This Mosaic code, with its Rabbinical Commentaries,** became the nucleus of a poetic domesticity that sweetened poverty and persecution; it made Israel cohere and be one in **a brotherhood of obedience,** despite dispersion to the four corners of the earth. **This sanctified sociology** made the sensuous sacred equally with the spiritual. **Judaism sanctified the sensuous,** Christianity was an

abolition of the sensuous. In the result Christianity succeeded only in abolishing it from religion, not from life. No priestly pitchfork has ever expelled human nature.

{ what of those Jews who tried to destroy the family in Bolshevik Russia? }

{ more on Judaism as a "sanctified sociology" at p. 61 }

{ p. 147 } **For Judaism the centre of gravity is here and now** { i.e. Earth, not a future life in Heaven }.

{ p. 167 } As some such grotesque notion of **the ancient Jews and their bloodthirsty Jehovah** is constantly cropping up (though in less surprising environments than a Congress of Races), it may be worthwhile to examine it in some detail, more especially as **it shadows even the modern Jews in the guise of a suspicion**, real or feigned, **that they too cherish the dream of exterminating or at least conquering the heathen.**

{ Zangwill himself provides plenty of evidence of that }

{ p. 180 } The absence of a territory of their own in which new national history could be made forced them to cling to Zion in idea ... Thus Palestine soil clung still about the roots of Judaism,

{ p. 181 } Where existence could be achieved legally, yet not without social inferiority, **a minor form of Crypto-Judaism** was begotten, which prevails to-day in most lands of Jewish emancipation, among its symptoms being **change of names, accentuated local patriotism**, accentuated abstention from Jewish affairs and even anti-Semitism mimetically absorbed from the environment. Indeed **Marranoism**, both in its major and minor forms, may be regarded as **an exemplification of the Darwinian theory of protective colouring.**

{ p. 182 } The notion, with which I shall presently deal in detail, **that Jewish interests are Jesuitically federated or that Jewish financiers use their power for Jewish ends** is one of the most ironic of myths.

{ p. 190 } Nothing in fact is - to believe the anti-Semite - too colossal for the Jew to have achieved. ... **It was Jews who murdered the Czar, an accusation actually incorporated in the British White Book**, and still exploited by *The Times* and **the reactionary Russians** { Note Zangwill's use of the word "reactionary", Bolshevik jargon for their opponents }, despite that even the Minister of Justice under Koltchak's Government has certified "that, among the number of persons proved by the data of the preliminary enquiry to have been guilty of the assassination of the late Emperor Nicholas II. and his family, **there was not any person of Jewish descent.**"

{ Yet J. L. Talmon admits the contrary: [talmon.html](http://talmon.html); and Robert Wilton, the *Times'* correspondent in Moscow, attests the Jewish control of the Revolution: [wilton.html](http://wilton.html) }

{ p. 201 } **There is no Sanhedrin now extant, no "Learned Elders of Zion"** exist **whose meetings can be recorded in "Protocols,"** and "Nilus" seeming to have discovered this by the time his book reached a third and enlarged edition in

1911, **substituted for his original melodramatic mendacities** the story that his documents - described in the first edition as stolen from French Freemasonry - were simply the secret reports of the **Zionist Congress at Basle in 1897**. Unfortunately for "Nilus," **I happened to be at all the sittings of that Congress**, which was the first, and which I have described in my "Dreamers of the Ghetto." Nothing could be less like the operations of a Jew-

{p. 202} ish Jesuitry than this gathering, which laid the foundations of the Zionist movement and formulated its programme as "the acquisition of a publicly, legally recognised home for the Jewish people in Palestine." As this was an absolutely new movement in Jewry, initiated in spite of great public opposition by a few more or less impecunious publicists, it seems indeed a strange manifestation on the part of the secret Semitic gang that ran - and runs - all the papers, parliaments and banks of the world, and in whose iconoclastic propaganda Charles Darwin was a prominent puppet! We have to do in fact with **the forgery of a pious Russian**, passionate for the Church and the Czar, **edited in 1905 by an agency bent on drowning the Revolution of that year in Jewish blood**. Such forgeries invariably appear in troubled periods, they are a stock historical weapon; though rarely has a forger admitted in more Irish fashion than the author of "The Jewish Peril" that he cannot prove the authenticity of his documents, for - he gravely explains - the essence of this criminal plot is secrecy!

It was like the journal which published the Pigott forgeries to take this **grotesque fabrication** seriously and thus encourage Count Reventlow and the reactionary monarchist parties in Germany, in whose platform anti-Semitism is a plank. Count Reventlow solemnly declared that he, for his part, had never credited the report that Lord Northcliffe was a Jew. The humourless Fatherland was flooded with a legend of a Jewish combination to destroy it, in which **the gentle and venerable philanthropist, Jacob Schiff, figured side by side with Trotsky**.

**But it is impossible for even *The Times* to take "Nilus" seriously after the scathing scholarship of Mr. Lucien Wolf, who, in a letter to the *Spectator*, dissected the tangled threads of self-contradiction and, with a fascinating erudition, traced back the theory of the all-destroying Jew to the literature of Anti-christ that has been forged in successive centuries and in various blood-curdling shapes to explain the Lutheran Reformation, the Cromwellian Revolution, the French Revolution and**

{p. 203} the Revolutions of '48 as all due to that same Semitic "hidden hand."

{Yet Benjamin Disraeli, writing in 1844, said that a Revolution led by Jews was about to break out in Europe: [disraeli.html](http://disraeli.html)}

**{Here and in the following pages, Zangwill sets out the arguments later used by Herman Bernstein in his 1935 book *The Truth About the "Protocols of Zion"*. Given the parallel passages, and Bernstein's unacknowledged debt to Zangwill, might he be accused of plagiarism? But this is the very charge levelled against Nilus or the Okhrana: fabricating the *Protocols* by plagiarising Joly. Note**

Zangwill's repetitive use of emotive words, *fabrication*, *imaginary*, *fantastic etc.*, a trait copied by Bernstein}

The latest version of "The Jewish Peril" appears to be largely a **plagiarism** from the earlier **fabrication** by a German named Hermann Goedsche, who had actually been dismissed from the Prussian Postal Service for *forgery*, and it also borrows considerably from the pre-existing literature of the great Jewish conspiracy, e.g., Gougenot des Mousseau's "Le Juif, le Judaïsme et la Judaisation des Peuples Chrétiens."

To these contemporary **forgeries** may be added the **imaginary** speech of a Rabbi of Jaffa promising the Jews the conquest of the world (printed by Catholic newspapers in Holland), **the letter to the same effect found in the pocket of a dead Bolshevik soldier**, the utterance of the late Szamuely annexing Hungary as a Jewish land, the deliberations of the "Workers of Zion" at Kieff, and the circular recommending Bolshevism "disclosed" by a German paper as sent to the heads of the Alliance Israelite in Russia (a country where no branch of the Alliance exists or is permitted). There should also be noted the repetition of the libel on Zionism in the Brazol "revelations" that became the laughing-stock of America. Brazol had been assistant attorney for the Russian Government in the notorious Beilis case, and being in the States on Russian business, took occasion to publish a work with twenty-five apocryphal resolutions passed by an imaginary secret sitting of the First Basle Congress. Under examination, these schemes for the Bolshevisation of the world were found to be merely **clumsy reproductions** of existing anti-Semitic creations in Russian, German, or Rumanian. All these **forgeries** are, however, but the expression of a state of mind in the public, and doubtless sometimes in the forger too, who feels **more like a champion putting his truth in artistic form than a malicious liar and a deliberate cheat** {might not this also apply to Jewish missionaries like Zangwill?}. Hence, the danger of these **fictions** does not evaporate at their exposure, for the public credulity that inspired them persists and gives the breath of life to fresh embodiments of panic. For the fear, as well as the wish, is father to the thought. Note, as Renan said to Salomon Reinach, how uninventive is human malignity. "*Elle tourne éternellement dans le même cercle d'accusations.*" And the ascription of calamities to a "hidden hand" already hated is one of the most familiar workings of the mass-mind.

It is not even necessary that the accusation should come by the complex channel of forgery. A bouncing assertion suffices. Since I began this paper, the evidence has become overwhelm-

{p. 204} ing of **a world-plot worked** {i.e. a conspiracy revealed} **by a little gang of exiles from Bolshevik Russia** in the favourable atmosphere of a world-concordat of sentiment amongst **the militarist and monarchical classes** of all countries {note the Bolshevik jargon}, fomented by the chauvinisms of war, and finding vent in this same **fantastic** charge. **According to the President of the Independent Order B'nai B'rith** {note Zangwill's quoting of this peak body of Jewish Freemasonry}, a circular entitled "Jewry Ueber Alles" has been sent out

by **the gang** "to American publicists and men of affairs, charging the Jew with the responsibility for the world war and with a vast conspiracy to control the economic world," and the same group "has been **distributing throughout the American Legion** posts a large amount of literature of the same general nature, urging ex-soldiers to arm themselves against 'the Jewish peril.'" The latest manifestation comes, as I write, to lift into notoriety the unknown *Dearborn Independent*, the personal organ of Henry Ford, the car manufacturer, who, after visiting Germany in a Peace Ship, turned into a rabid militarist when America's own tocsin sounded. An anonymous article in this journal, entitled "Germany's Reaction Against the Jew," brings the case against the world's whipping-boy to its **comic** culmination. For it declares that "**the sole winners of the war were Jews.**" Early in the war, in my book, "The War for the World," I had predicted that **the time would come when the Jews would be gibbeted as its sole starters**, but even my cynical prescience did not foresee that they would grow into its sole winners. Poor Jews, whose bones bleach on every battlefield in Europe, Asia, and Africa! However, **the *Dearborn Independent* deserves our gratitude, for, in reproducing the German case**, it naturally reproduces the factor omitted from the British edition of "The Jewish Peril," and **England reappears as the Jew's ally or tool** in the conquest of the world. Pan-Juda - "the only State exercising world-government, since all the other States can and may exercise national government only" - had before the war its Capital in London. Strange that I should have been born in this city and lived most of my life therein, and have never heard till this day of the "wonderfully organised All-Jewish Government" whose web radiates thence: the Government "**whose fleet is the British fleet which guards from hindrance the progress of All-Jewish world-economy**," and in return for which, "**Pan-Juda assures Britain an undisturbed, political and territorial world-rule**," and has recently "added Palestine to British control." What was Tamburlaine with his chariot drawn by bitted and harnessed kings to His Imperial Majesty,

{p. 205} Judaeus, who "is willing to entrust the government of the various strips of the world to the nationalistic Governments, and **only asks to control the Governments**"? It is a gesture that would have left even Beaconsfield breathless. This **marvellous Jewish Super-Government** "whose citizens are unconditionally loyal, wherever they may be, and whether rich or poor," and which "can make peace or war, anarchy or order," at its own financial will, "having wreaked its revenge on anti-Semitic Germany, will now go forth to conquer other nations. Britain it already has." Such is the chivalry of **Germany to its Jews who, through Ballin and Rathenau**, did more than any other section of its citizens to stave off the disaster which its fatuous generals and light-headed admirals brought upon it. It is, of course, these same monarchist elements that, learning and forgetting nothing, **attribute to Jewish intrigue and purpose the Revolution which dethroned Junkerdom**, and that see in their own inability to effect a counter-revolution the infallible evidence of the "hidden hand." Poor Ballin, one remembers, committed suicide, unable to survive the literal wreck of all his hopes for his Fatherland. But in the Junker version he apparently shot himself for joy at



the revenge he had helped to wreak on Germany! To those who know that the Jews are, as John Davidson once wrote to me, "a race of ungovernable individuals," - still further broken up by geography and history - the humour of representing them as an army of ants with but one will and purpose, is of the last extravagance. Travesty can no further go. It is the very sublime of the ridiculous!

The clue to the great Jewish conspiracy is, we have already seen, to be sought less in the nature of the accused than in **the psychology of the accuser**. The Jew takes on the Protean shapes created by ever-changing panic. But beneath it all lies the same apprehension of mysterious power, of uncanny success, without which the legend of the advancing conqueror would lose its thrill. And this power in the last resort is money. Not to be exfurficated even by the charge of Bolsheism, lies **the morbid sense of the Jew's money**. It is by **the criminal stigmata of £.s.d.** that the Jew will be known when the accusations of to-day have vanished like the dew of the morning.

{p. 222} {Note Zangwill's efforts below, to deny Jewish control of Bolshevism; yet Benjamin Ginsberg admits the contrary: [ginsberg.html](#). **The same people who deny the Jewish leadership of the Bolshevik Revolution, also deny the authenticity of the *Protocols***}

... the first generator of Bolshevism was the fleet at Kronstadt, into which not a single Jew was admitted {but the Kronstadt sailors were massacred at Trotsky's order, a little later: [kronstadt.html](#)}; **the second was the proletariat** {note Zangwill's use of this Bolshevik jargon} **of Petrograd, a town into which only a rare Jew could find entry**. From these two centres it spread to Great Russia, **where the Jews constitute less than 1 per cent. of the population**. Victor Kopf, the Bolshevik Commissary at Berlin, complains that only one Jewish party in Russia - the Poale-Zion - welcomed Bolshevism, that the Jewish trading and shop-keeping classes are its greatest enemy, and that although they are massacred in pogroms organised by the counter-revolutionaries, they will not fall in with the Socialist regime.

A friend of my own, returning from Moscow, reported that the question: "Is there a God?" was raised in a public debate by Lunatscharsky, the Bolshevik Commissioner for Public Instruction. The only debater on the affirmative side was Rabbi Mase of Moscow. Not a single Russian pope, in that religious capital of Russia with its swarm of churches, dared to emulate this Jewish courage. In a letter to *The Times* I had ventured the above interpretation that **the comparative preponderance of Jewish Commissaries was merely due to the Jews being an educated folk in an illiterate land**. I see that Captain Peter Wright, in his official report on Poland, discussing the same question, says:-

{quote} Bolshevism requires a vast administration and propaganda, which in turn require that men shall at least be able to read and write. But in the proletariat of Eastern Europe only the Jews possess these accomplishments, and therefore the administrators and propagandists of Bolshevism must necessarily be Jews. So much so that Bolshevism appears at times to be almost purely a Jewish movement. But

the Commission had the opportunity of studying it very close at hand on the Eastern frontier, and in that part of the world at least this was certainly not the case.  
{end quote}

Indeed, the Chief of the Commission, Sir Stuart Samuel, reports that "the Bolsheviks publicly complained that only 1 per cent of their army were Jews."

{But Trotsky was the leader}

The attempt to represent Jewishness and Bolshevism as synonymous, naturally does not fall short of my own person, and persists in face of rectifications. ...

Mr. Bertrand Russell seems to have had to go to Russia to perceive these obvious implications of the communistic ideal ...

{Yet Russell admitted the Jewish control of Bolshevism: [russell.html](#)}

{p. 233} **The mere existence of the Jew to-day has been a triumph of idealism;** it marks a dissent for the sake of an idea from the dominant forces of Asiatic or European civilisation, a protestantism persisted in despite the ceaseless persecution of all the centuries of Pagan or Christian supremacy. The real story of "The Wandering Jew" remains, when every deduction has been made, the story of camps of **idealists entrenched everywhere in enemy's country, practising** (*inter se* at least) **those Hebraic principles of human brotherhood** which are **now only beginning to work their way from the creed to the life of Christendom**, and organising existence round the synagogue and the Talmudical college so democratically that the beggar considered himself the equal, if not the benefactor, of the philanthropist he helped heavenwards.

{p. 236} Another **American poet, Mr. Samuel Roth**, has excoriated "Europe" with the same large utterance. Thus saith the Lord, he, too, dares to begin in the antique phrase, though his message is ultra-modern. And with the same sublime assurance he exclaims: **"The face of Israel will shine with power when Europe will be a name difficult to remember."** The voice of Jerusalem re-echoes from France, where in language of a Semitic sublimity M. Edmond Fleg in his "Le Mur des Pleurs," gives utterance to "Le Cri des Hommes," and proclaims his execration for that God of Battles who would resuscitate the very dead only to renew the slaughter:

"Sois maudit: a ton cri, nos os ressuscites, S'entre-tuent dans le temps et dans l'éternité!"

Perhaps this is **the real uneasiness of Christendom** in the presence of the Jew. **Israel's emancipation has served, as Stevenson said of marriage, to "domesticate the Recording Angel."** But **the Jew is not content to record the crimes of Christendom.** For him criticism is only the negative aspect of creation. He is out for victory. He will verify the legend of the Conquering Jew. With the sword of the spirit he will extirpate the heathen. He will overrun the planet. **He will bring about a holy League of Nations, a Millennium of Peace.** For the words of the Babylonian Isaiah still vibrate in his soul:

"I have put My spirit upon him, He shall make the right to go forth to the nations, He shall not fail or be crushed Till he have set the right in the earth, And the isles shall wait for his teaching."

The God whose spirit is thus interpreted, **the God who uses a people to make the right to go forth to the nations**, and who

{p. 237} through faithful followers **labours to establish His Kingdom on earth**, may be only a national working hypothesis, a divine dynamic. But the conception at least makes the worship of any lesser or rival God impossible, and justifies that jealousy for His service which inspired the anonymous medieval poet whose verses are still sung in the synagogue: -

"All the world shall come to serve Thee And bless Thy glorious Name, And Thy righteousness triumphant The islands shall acclaim, And the peoples shall go seeking Who knew Thee not before, And the ends of earth shall praise Thee And tell Thy greatness o'er.

... the uttermost peoples, hearing, Shall hail Thee crowned King."

{p. 324} THE GOYIM

(*The Venturer*, October, 1920)

**BEWARE of the *Goyim***, his elders told Jacob,  
In the holy peace of the Sabbath candles,  
They drink Jewish blood:  
They are fiercer than flame,  
Or than cobras acoil for the spring.  
They make mock of our God and our Torah,  
They rob us and spit on us,  
They slaughter us more cruelly than the Shochet our cattle.  
Go not outside the Ghetto.  
Should your footsteps be forced to their haunts,  
Walk warily, never forgetting  
They are *Goyim*,  
Foes of the faith,  
Beings of darkness,  
Drunkards and bullies,  
Swift with the fist or the bludgeon,  
Many in species, but all  
Engendered of God for our sins,  
And many and strange their idolatries,  
**But the worst of the *Goyim* are the creatures called Christians.**

{p. 333} **MR. LEONARD WOOLF**, the presiding genius of the Fabian Society's scheme for a League of Nations, having started a much-needed *International Review* to keep us informed - despite the newspapers - of what was going on abroad, I duly ordered the first number from my bookseller.

{end of quotes}

Zangwill's influence on H. G. Wells:

**"When Wells finished his work, he and Israel Zangwill exchanged several visits and letters about his ideas and Zangwill sent copies to the Chief Rabbi in England for discussion."** (David C. Smith, *H.G. Wells: Desperately Mortal*, Yale University Press, New Haven 1986, p. 230). [wells-lenin-league.html](http://wells-lenin-league.html)

## 17. Herman Bernstein for World Government

Bernstein here records his **interviews with "celebrities", many of whom are Jewish** (e.g. Kerensky, Trotsky, Krassin, Rathenau), **although Bernstein does not mention that.**

Note that **Trotsky is included among the "celebrities".**

Bernstein is revealed here as a person of discernment, but with a sympathy for the Jewish Bolsheviks.

**Herman Bernstein, *Celebrities of Our Time: Interviews*, New York, Joseph Lawren, 1924.**

{p. v} **{Dedication to Colonel House, advocate of World Government}**

To

EDWARD M. HOUSE

The liberal American statesman  
Who is intimately familiar with  
American and Foreign affairs  
and deeply interested in their betterment  
This volume is inscribed us a token of friendship and admiration.

HERMAN BERNSTEIN.

{p. 186} ALEXANDER KERENSKY

Petrograd, 1917.

{Bernstein does not mention that Kerensky was a Jew}

{p. 192} Among all the Russian leaders here Alexander Kerensky is beyond doubt the most picturesque and dramatic figure. On the crest of the wave of the Russian revolution he rose to dizzy heights and became the favorite of the Russian people immediately after the collapse of the Romanoff dynasty.

I met him as Premier, when he was in his glory; I met him several times since then, and now I find him in his modest little room in Paris, where he lives in seclusion.

I asked him about Russia, about the Allied policy toward Russia, about the recognition of the Soviet Government. {installed by the Bolshevik Revolution which deposed Kerensky}

There was a tinge of bitterness and a certain degree of cynicism in his comments on the Allied attitude, but it was clear that his love for Russia was as profound as his confidence in the eventual readjustment of Russia as a great and powerful country.

"America," he said, "had the greatest opportunity to save Russia, but she lost it. Immediately after the overthrow

{p. 193} of the Romanoff dynasty Germany supported the Bolsheviki, while England and France supported the monarchists and reactionaries in Russia. Then America had the greatest opportunity, and we Russians hoped that she would help the democratic elements that sought to rebuild Russia.

"The Wilsonian peace policy was patterned after the policy of the Provisional Government of which I was the head. We outlined it first immediately after the revolution, but it was a policy distasteful to England and France. So they did everything they could to undermine us. They did not want us to participate in the liquidation of the war along the lines of our peace program. And we would not have been puppets at the Peace Conference.

**"When President Wilson proclaimed his fourteen points the Allies maintained silence. They were glad that President Wilson created such sentiments. They **knew what effect his speeches must have on the morale of the German people**, and upon certain elements of the people in the Allied countries. But the Allied statesmen themselves did not regard President Wilson's statements seriously. They plotted to carry out their own program.**

"Before President Wilson arrived in Europe the first time, a prominent British official said to me: 'We are not afraid of Wilson. He is not sufficiently familiar with European affairs. Lloyd George will be able to accomplish whatever he pleases.' And so it actually happened. Lloyd George has done whatever he pleased.

"England is now pursuing with regard to Russia the same policy that Germany pursued. England is now eager to dismember Russia, almost along the lines of the Brest-Litovsk treaty, and England will soon recognize and help the Bolshevik government, as the Germans did in 1918.

{One might have thought that Kerensky, whose Government was overthrown by the Bolshevik Revolution, would have opposed recognition and aid for them}

{p. 204} LEO TROTSKY

Petrograd, March, 1918.

I WENT to Russia to see what the Russian people thought of Bolshevism.

I interviewed a large number of representatives of factions, groups and parties of every political shade of thought in Russia.

**I was particularly eager to meet Leo Trotsky, the cleverest among the Bolshevik leaders.** {and one of the cruelest: [worst.html](#)}

I sent a card to him by messenger, stating that I wanted to interview him for the American newspaper which I represented. The messenger returned to my hotel saying:-

"Comrade Trotsky asks you to meet him tomorrow at eleven o'clock in the morning at the Smolny Institute."

Next morning on my way to the Smolny Institute, the Headquarters of the Bolsheviks, I read in the newspapers a dispatch from Moscow stating that Trotsky had arrived in the new capital of the Bolsheviks, together with the other Commissaries, to be present at the conference of the Council for the ratification of the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty. I hesitated awhile, then decided to go to Smolny, notwithstanding the report that Trotsky had left the city.

The Smolny Institute, guarded by troops, with machine guns in front of the huge buildings, was almost deserted. The corridors were dirty. No one seemed to know anything about the departments that still remained in the Smolny.

{p. 203} Then the Bolshevik leader remarked:

"I must say that though Germany is employing methods of violence she deals after all with the realities of life, and that is why Germany is successful. The Allies, on the contrary, deal with appearances, with dreams rather than realities. Besides, they are six months too late. Any one who tells me that Japan is pursuing unselfish interests in Siberia is using a wretched diplomatic phrase. Japan is striking at Russia while we are organizing an army to resist German domination."

I looked at Trotsky in amazement. He was making this statement on the day the Bolsheviks were ratifying the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty.

"How long do you think your peace with Germany will last" I asked.

"We are continuing the war against Germany in the Ukraine right now," answered Trotsky. "Neither we nor Germany consider our peace of long duration."

"May I know how you expect Bolshevism to work out in Russia side by side with German imperialism" I asked.

"The Russia of Soviets and militaristic Germany are absolutely incompatible," replied Trotsky. ... {"}

{p. 212} In Christiania the captain of **the vessel on which Leo Trotsky left New York** last year described to me how he was **taken off by the British authorities at Halifax, who suspected that he was going to Russia to carry on a campaign for separate peace.** Trotsky refused to leave the vessel when the officers asked him to follow them ashore. He was carried off by several men.

**"Who knows" said one of the British officers to me at Halifax. "If we had kept Trotsky here perhaps the war would have been over long ago and history might have taken a different course. We wanted to hold him, but Milukov and Kerensky insisted upon our releasing him."**

{p. 239} ROBERT CECIL.

{p. 240} I asked Lord Robert for his views concerning the terms of the peace treaty of Versailles. He said:

"The territorial arrangements affecting Germany as stipulated in the treaty are not so bad. The territorial arrangements with Austria are of course much worse. But the economic arrangements with both are utterly indefensible. It is only right to say

that the device adopted - the undefined indemnity - was not an American invention."

"Could not the United States, then, exert sufficient influence at the peace conference to prevent this device from being embodied in the treaty" I asked.

Lord Robert Cecil answered:

"Of course strong efforts were exerted, but in the end a compromise was made."

"Would you say, on the whole, that you are pleased with the outcome of the war" I asked.

To which he answered:

"Of course it was better to win the war than to have been defeated by Germany."

"That goes without saying," I remarked. "What I meant was whether you are pleased with the outcome of the peace as worked out in Paris."

"I certainly am not," he replied. **"The economic arrangements of the German peace treaty are an insane policy. In effect the Allies have said to the Germans: 'However hard you work, you cannot count on reaping any**

**{p. 241} benefit from your exertion. The more money you make the more will we take from you by way of indemnity.'** This has contributed to the demoralization of the will and energy of the German people which so many observers report. It has helped to render a section of them **desperate and hopeless, ready for any adventure which may change their lot.** It has been I am convinced one of the greatest incentives to German Bolshevism. It has also made it difficult if not impossible for Germany to obtain outside credit. **Who would lend to a debtor the whole of whose assets are already pledged to others?** Finally, by keeping alive in the minds of some of the belligerent nations a hope of receiving very large indemnity it has prevented them from making the efforts and sacrifices required by their financial position."

"Do you think there will be any changes in the terms of the treaty with Germany?" I asked.

"Yes, I believe there will be changes," he answered. "Our Prime Minister has recently asked Germany to submit new economic proposals and has promised to consider them favorably if at all reasonable. Strangely enough, the most important questions were not those that attracted most attention at the Peace Conference. The questions that were most widely discussed - for instance, as to what shall be done with Danzig and the Saare Valley, were comparatively unimportant. The really vital matters were economic. The result was deplorable and some way out will unquestionably have to be found. It may be that the Reparation Commission will make a drastic use of its powers in modifying the terms of the indemnity. It may be the Treaty itself will have to be amended. But whatever is done, no time should be lost. The economic

{p. 242} position in Europe is steadily getting worse and may become past remedy. What a pity we have not the full influence of the United States to prevent the threatened disaster."

The following letter from Lord Robert Cecil is characteristic:

"Foreign Office,

"October 7th, 1915.

"Dear Mr. Bernstein:

"I am much obliged to you for your letter from Rotterdam, as well as that from Berne. I am sorry that I did not reply to the Berne letter; I quite thought that I had done so, but I suppose I must have overlooked it.

**"I am most grateful to you for sending me the further information about the position of the Jews in Russia.** Everyone must sympathize with them in the sufferings which they have endured. Indeed, quite apart from any other cause, the mere evacuation of the conquered territories both by Jews and Russians has entailed, I am afraid, terrible hardships. Great efforts are, I understand, being made to assist these poor people, both by sympathizers outside Russia, and by the Russians themselves. It is incidents of this kind which make one realise what really lies underneath the glories and glamour of war, and the man who is responsible, whoever he may be, for having loosed upon the world this terrible series of calamities, is surely one of the greatest criminals in the world's history.

"Your sincerely, ROBERT CECIL.

In response to a letter of mine, accompanied by my

{p. 243} article entitled "In Sackcloth and Ashes," depicting the tragedies of Belgium, Poland and the Jewish people in the World War, Sir Edward Grey sent me the following remarkable note:

"Foreign Office,

"June 5th, 1916.

"Dear Mr. Bernstein:

"I am much obliged for your letter enclosing a pamphlet which you have written and which has safely reached me.

"As regards the questions which you asked in the last two paragraphs of your letter, since the latter was written I made a speech in the House of Commons with regard to terms and prospects of peace. There is really nothing I can add to this when it is taken in conjunction with the other pronouncements made both by the Prime Minister and myself on the subject. In case what I said has not been reported fully in the United States press, I enclose a copy taken from the official records of the House of Commons in case you care to have it.

"I believe the best work neutrals can do for the moment is to work up opinion for such an agreement between nations as will prevent a war like this from happening again.



"If nations had been united in such an agreement and prompt and resolute to insist in July, 1914, that the dispute must be referred to Conference or to the Hague and that the Belgian Treaty must be observed there would have been no war.

"Yours very truly,

"E. GREY."

{p. 244} LEONID KRASSIN

London, 1920.

{ Krassin, a Bolshevik leader, was Jewish, but Bernstein does not mention this }

SEVERAL days after Leonid Krassin's arrival in London in 1920 I met him and discussed with him the problems which stirred the whole world at the time. He was in the midst of conferences with the British Foreign Office and was besieged by interviewers representing the leading newspapers of the world. He refused to give any interviews for publication. Finally I succeeded in meeting him at midnight and secured the following important statements from **the ablest and most reasonable representative of the Soviet Government abroad**:

{quote} You ask me to describe contemporary Russia. Soviet Russia is the State of the working people and the peasants who have taken away the land from the estate-owners and made it the property of the laboring people, who have expropriated the factories and the shops and given over their management into the hands of the workers themselves and to the organs of the Government which they have established. {endquote}

{p. 254} CHAIM WEIZMANN.

April, 1921.

{p. 256} I asked Dr. Weizmann to describe the beginning of the work on the Balfour Declaration. He answered:

"When the war broke out, the Zionist organization was concentrated on plans of work in Palestine, with no political horizon, with indifference on the part of the Powers, and opposition on the part of Turkey. The war divided our forces, as we were separated by gulfs and trenches. Russian Jewry was practically broken up. **The pale of settlement became the theatre of war**, and in the wake of the contending armies came ruin and misery.

"There was a small band of our workers in England who thought it their duty to utilize their position to save what could still be saved. We were a small, unofficial, unrecognized band of workers, but we knew that we voiced the sentiments of the great masses of the Jewish people, and we set out to create a political position for the Zionist movement.

{p. 257} **"We reasoned thus:- 'It is possible that as a result of this war Turkey will disappear.** It is therefore possible that **the territories** constituting the Turkish empire may be considerably **readjusted and recast**. The whole political structure of the Old World will go by the board. Therefore, the **Jewish claims must be**

**clearly formulated, and we must secure the recognition of these claims by the Allies.** We further thought that the war was really a duel between Germany and England.

"We felt that if we could get England to understand the achievements of the Jews in Palestine and thus secure England's support for Zionism, half the battle would be won. That was our theory. I agree it was a gamble, but a gamble worth taking. We had strong opposition. We were a small band of foreign Jews and against us were the might and prestige and bank accounts of the established leaders of the British Jewish community.

"But we were inspired by the righteousness of our cause, and **we said to the British statement:- 'The Jews will get Palestine, whether you want it or not. There is no power on earth that can stop the Jews from getting to Palestine.** You gentlemen can make it easy for them, or you can make it hard for them, but you cannot stop them.'

"They asked us how many Jews there were in Palestine, and what they had accomplished there. We opened our books to them. It is true, we had very little to show as yet. We said, 'All that you see has been achieved under most trying circumstances, always in the teeth of opposition on the part of the Turkish government, and also of your rich Jews who tell you that the Zionist movement is merely the fancy or hope of a few enthusiasts.

{ Yet the Balfour Declaration was addressed to Lord Rothschild as head of world Jewry }

"We tell you we have behind us the millions of Jews

{ p. 258 } who are inarticulate now and we speak on their behalf.'

**"It took at least two thousand interviews with British statesmen to get them to understand Zionism. I myself made more than a thousand visits to British statesmen** in order to familiarize them with the true meaning of Zionism. Of course, we had the great support of American Zionists, which was most helpful. People have criticised me because I asked only for a national home for the Jews and not for a Jewish state. They said **the Balfour plan** did not mean a Jewish state. **It certainly did not mean a Jewish state.**

"The Jewish colonists who went to Palestine years ago and who have done there such wonderful work really prepared our political claim for Palestine. They were the real political leaders of the Zionist organization. We only supplemented their work."

In answer to my question whether it was true that the British military authorities in Palestine were at that time more sympathetic to the Arabs than the Jews, Dr. Weizmann said:

"It may seem strange, but it is true that **almost all Englishmen, after visiting Jerusalem, were at first unsympathetically inclined to the Jews.** But I can easily understand the reasons for that. The first reason is due to the appearance of the

Jews in Jerusalem. **The Englishmen saw long-coated, long-bearded, old Jews, with earlocks - the so-called Chalukah Jews. They had expected to find there the Jews of the Bible.** So the officers and soldiers asked themselves, 'Is it for these Jews that we were called upon to make so many sacrifices, and shed our blood that they shall have Palestine?'

{p. 259} **"The Arabs, on the contrary, seemed to them to fit much better into the scenery of the Orient by their picturesque garb.**

**"The second reason is that the British officials found the Jews more difficult to deal with than the Arabs, who obeyed their orders. They found the Jews intellectually their equal, and they resented it.**

**"The third reason is a personal one. Among the British troops there were clerks and businessmen who naturally looked for future opportunities, and some of them regarded Palestine as a good field for their activities after demobilization. Some of them had their eyes on certain concessions, but when the Zionists stopped these concessions, the British soldiers did not realize that it was done for the purpose of preventing speculation and exploitation. They simply attributed that to the eagerness of the Jews to grab everything in Palestine.**

**"I can understand the reasons why they liked the Arabs better than the Jews. But, then, I am not pleased with Jerusalem as it is, either. Jerusalem must be cleaned up. The Chalukah Jews, the Jews depending upon alms from abroad, must be changed. I know it is difficult to change the old generation. But the young generation can still be changed. We shall build Yeshivahs, houses of Jewish learning, for the younger element, for we must not destroy before we build.**

**"There are so many fine intellectual qualities in these Jews that we cannot afford to lose, now that so many of the important institutions of Jewish learning have been destroyed in Russia and Poland. We must build them new in Palestine. ...**

{p. 262} **"The Jews of America can give not only financial aid, but also some men and experience in the task of reconstruction. We see the beginning of this in the work of the American Zionist Medical Unit.**

**"I am sure that the Jews of this great country will make a glorious contribution to the ancient Jewish Homeland.**

**"Almost a year has passed since the Supreme Council at San Remo made its decision with regard to Palestine. The Jewish people is on trial. We are scrutinized by all the nations of the world, and we must make good, for we have both the forces and the resources necessary for the upbuilding of Palestine.**

**"While opportunities in Palestine are numerous and most enheartening, two-thirds of the Jewish race in Eastern Europe are living at this moment under intolerable conditions.**

**"On the eve of its renaissance Jewry stands wounded and mutilated. It has only one hand free for constructive labor, and with the other it is desperately struggling to**

ward off blows that threaten it with destruction. The Jews of America are providentially the remnant that may now liberate the larger part of Israel."

In 1923 Dr. Weizmann discussed the situation of Palestine and the Arab-Jewish problems in the Holy Land as follows:

"The mandate has been ratified. It has met with the a proval of the civilized world. The resolution of the American Congress will rank with the Balfour Declaration, and to us Jews this is one of the most important documents in the annals of our history. ...

{p. 263} **"We are attempting to build a home in Palestine** and we are conscious that this building **can only be successful if** it will be **done in co-operation with the peoples and population of Palestine**. We are coming into Palestine not as conquerors. **We are coming into Palestine not to dominate anybody**. We are coming to build up Palestine together with the people there, taking our place according to our merits and our achievements. The other people in Palestine, the Arabs and Christians, have to recognize that we have a right to do what we intend to do. Just as we recognize that Palestine is going to be the common homeland for Jews and Arabs, we want the Arabs to recognize that we have a right to come into Palestine to establish ourselves there, not on the back of anybody, but with them, to work and create new values of which Palestine is capable.

**"Palestine has a population of about 700,000 non-Jews**, an overwhelming majority of Moslems, a small minority of Christians and another small minority of Jews. Roughly speaking there are 500,000 Moslems, 100,000 Christians and 100,000 Jews. Since the war and even before the war there has been a striving on the part of the Arab people for a revival, and being anxious for the revival of the scattered Jewish people, we treat with respect and reverence any attempt of revival amongst other people.

"We recognize to-day, that between us and the Arabs in the Near East, and particularly in Palestine, stand many forces - perhaps destructive forces - which try to emphasize this estrangement that has taken place between these two races which are akin to each other. ...

{p. 285} WALTER RATHENAU

Berlin, July, 1922.

One of America's best informed statesmen, who played a most important role during the war and the peace conference {could it be Colonel House, to whom this book is dedicated?} ... discussing the Russian situation and the Rapallo Treaty {negotiated by Rathenau}, said to me:

"It is as sure as fate that Russia and Germany will get together, that the Rapallo Treaty is but a prelude to a military alliance between these two nations in the future, that the Allies have done with regard to Russia and Germany necessarily forced these two nations to combine.

{p. 286} "Such an alliance holds within it the seeds of the gravest consequences, for the Atlantic powers some day will be confronted by a new and formidable combination of powers. The Allies by their action have practically forced such an alliance among all the nations on the other side of the Rhine - Germany, Russia across Siberia, as far as the Pacific, with perhaps Japan and even China, and the Islamic world, against the Atlantic powers. What a regenerated Russia, a readjusted Germany, an aroused and irritated Islam, with Japan and China as their allies, could do in a conflict against the Atlantic powers within twenty-five or thirty years is a situation too terrible to contemplate."

Several days before the assassination of Walter Rathenau, Germany's Minister of Foreign Affairs, and one of Europe's foremost constructive statesmen, I had a long interview with him at the Foreign Office in Berlin. At first he was willing to give me a frank expression of his views, but not for publication. Afterward, however, he consented to my publishing an interview, provided I submitted to him a copy of the manuscript. He revised this interview on the eve of his tragic death. I received the manuscript, with his revisions, at eleven o'clock on Saturday morning at the Foreign Office. About ten minutes before, Rathenau had been murdered by agents of the monarchist organization near his home in Grunewald, on his way to the Foreign Office. His secretary had not received the news of his chief's assassination when he handed me the interview which Rathenau had revised during the previous day.

As **Rathenau was practically the father of the Rapallo Treaty between Germany and Soviet Russia**, I was particularly interested in his views on Russo-German relations. He denied that the Treaty was a step to a military alliance

{p. 287} between these two nations. He was particularly emphatic in denying that the Treaty contained any secret provisions. Then he asked me, with a smile:

"Do you think we would sign a secret treaty with the Soviet government of Russia? The secret would be out in twenty-four hours."

In revising the manuscript, Rathenau changed these words to read as follows:

"We have made no secret treaty with Russia, and we will not make any."

He explained to me his reasons for concluding the treaty with Russia at Rapallo while the Genoa conference was in session, as follows:

"The treaty we signed is a peace treaty between Germany and Russia. It is neither a military, political, nor even a trade treaty. We negotiated it some time before the Genoa conference and could have signed it before. But we did not desire to prejudice the work of the Conference. We signed it during the Conference because **we learned that, according to a memorandum prepared in London before the Genoa Conference, it was planned to make Russia also a creditor of Germany. Russia was to be asked to insist also on reparations** - perhaps not for herself, but for the other powers - she was to be asked that Germany's debts to Russia should be paid to the other powers. Practically all the great nations were our creditors, and Russia was to be added among our creditors. Before the Genoa

Conference this was decided upon by the powers. Germany was the only power that was kept out of a series of secret preliminary conferences held at the Villa d'Alberti. It was then that we resolved to sign the Rapallo Treaty. We were blamed and sharply criticized for having done what we were actu-

{p. 288} ally forced to do. Two other powers did the same thing - they also negotiated treaties with Russia at the same time, only they signed them later, but they were neither criticized nor censured in any way.

"After the Rapallo Treaty we acted as mediators between Russia and other powers, and some of the statesmen of the other powers thanked us for our efforts in that direction. We helped to bring Russia closer to the Western powers. We encouraged the more conservative elements of the Russian government, as is evidenced by the fact that the only criticism in Russia against the treaty came from the ranks of the extreme Left."

In answer to my question whether there was any ground for the opinions that the Rapallo Treaty was but a prelude to a Russo-German military alliance in the future, Dr. Rathenau replied:

**"The Rapallo Treaty is nothing else than a peace treaty, by which we recognized the Soviet Government.** We have no secret treaties of any kind with Russia, and we will not make any.

"Russia's reconstruction can come about only through the united efforts of the powers, and the sooner that is started the better for all. Every day of delay now will cause much more than a day of delay afterward in bringing about such a reconstruction. Germany, knowing Russia well, and having come into closer contact with Russia in the past, will naturally be in a position to do most for Russia's readjustment, through our organization ability, our technical experience and our familiarity with the required methods."

"What is most essential for the purpose of the re-adjustment of Europe and its reconstruction" I asked.

Dr. Rathenau replied:

{p. 289} "First of all it is essential to demobilize the public opinion created during the past seven years. Thus far the demobilization of this public opinion has not yet begun. For seven years the Allied countries and the United States heard only one side of the case. It was not a fair trial. The other side has really not been heard to this day. Whatever was said by us or in our favor was immediately branded as propaganda. As soon as any statement presenting our case appeared in any newspaper outside of Germany, hundreds of other newspapers declared such a statement to be a falsehood inspired by German propagandists.

"We are now going to publish twenty-two volumes of documents relating to the World War. We are throwing open the archives of our Foreign Office to the whole world. It is to be a scientific work, prepared under the supervision of unprejudiced historians. What other government is going to do the same? For seven years our side of the case was not heard. Now the 'criminal' is telling everything, while the

innocent lambs will be taciturn on this subject. They are not going to open the archives of their Foreign Offices which could reveal some very interesting facts. The demobilization of prejudiced public opinion should begin at once, if the world is to be readjusted.

"The United States will have to help in the reconstruction of the world. The United States will eventually discover that it cannot disregard the plight of Europe. I can understand why the United States dislikes Europe now, or why it is disgusted with it, or tired of it, but it will find out that it cannot continue to maintain this attitude of indifference. The United States decided the outcome of the war and the United States decided the peace. ... {"} {end of quotes}

## 18. One World - Utopian or Totalitarian?

During the Cold War there were two camps. Anyone unhappy in one could try to reach the other, or listen to its radio broadcasts, or muggle out information to it, or at least be inspired by it. A "United World", on the other hand, allows no escape if the regime turn bad.

Could the desire for control be the motivator for "One World"? Israel Shahak draws attention to the totalitarian element in Judaism:

**Israel Shahak, *Jewish History, Jewish Religion: The Weight of Three Thousand Years* Pluto Press, London 1994.**

Shahak repeatedly says that Judaism has a totalitarian streak (on pp. 10, 15, 16, 18, 19, 102, and 103). Do a "Find" on the word "totalitarian".

{p. 10} **In May 1993, Ariel Sharon formally proposed in the Likud Convention that Israel should adopt the 'Biblical borders' concept as its official policy.**

There were rather few objections to this proposal, either in the Likud or outside it, and all were ceased on pragmatic grounds. No one even asked Sharon where exactly are the Biblical borders which he was urging that Israel should attain. Let us recall that **among** those who call themselves **Leninists there was no doubt** that history follows the principles laid out by Marx and Lenin. **It is not only the belief** itself, however dogmatic, **but the refusal that it should ever be doubted, by thwarting open discussion, which creates a totalitarian cast of mind. Israeli-Jewish society and diaspora Jews who are leading 'Jewish lives' and organised in purely Jewish organisations, can be said therefore to have a strong streak of totalitarianism in their character.**

{p. 15} This was the most important social fact of Jewish existence **before the advent of the modern state: observance of the religious laws of Judaism, as well as their inculcation through education, were enforced on Jews by physical coercion**, from which one could only escape by conversion to the religion of the majority, amounting in the circumstances to a total social break and for that reason very impracticable, except during a religious crisis.

However, **once the modern state had come into existence, the Jewish community lost its powers to punish or intimidate the individual Jew. The**

**bonds of one of the most closed of 'closed societies', one of the most totalitarian societies in the whole history of mankind were snapped.**

{p. 16} This has also led - again just as in Germany and other nations of Mitteleuropa - to a deceitful sentimental and ultra-romantic Jewish historiography, from which all inconvenient facts have been expunged.

**So one will not find in Hannah Arendt's voluminous writings whether on totalitarianism or on Jews, or on both, the smallest hint as to what Jewish society in Germany was really like in the 18th century: burning of books, persecution of writers, disputes about the magic powers of amulets, bans on the most elementary 'non-Jewish' education such as the teaching of correct German or indeed German written in the Latin alphabet. Nor can one find in the numerous English-language 'Jewish histories' the elementary facts about the attitude of Jewish mysticism (so fashionable at present in certain quarters) to non-Jews: that they are considered to be, literally, limbs of Satan, and that the few non-satanic individuals among them (that is, those who convert to Judaism) are in reality 'Jewish souls' who got lost when Satan violated the Holy Lady (Shehhtnah or Matronit, one of the female components of the Godhead, sister and wife of the younger male God according to the cabbala) in her heavenly abode.**

{p. 19} Historically it can be shown that **a closed society is not interested in a description of itself**, no doubt because any description is in part a form of critical analysis and so may encourage critical 'forbidden thoughts'. The more a society becomes open, the more it is interested in reflecting, at first descriptively and then critically, upon itself, its present working as well as its past. But what happens when **a faction of intellectuals desires to drag a society**, which has already opened up to a considerable extent, **back to its previous totalitarian closed condition?**

{p. 101} Also, **many Jews who appear to be active in defending human {p. 102} rights and who adopt non-conformist views on other issues do, in cases affecting Israel, display a remarkable degree of totalitarianism and are in the forefront of the defence of all Israeli policies.**

{p. 103} It should be recalled that **Judaism, especially in its classical form, is totalitarian in nature.** The behaviour of supporters of other totalitarian ideologies of our times was not different from that of the organised American Jews.

{end of quotes}

**Israel Shahak, *Open Secrets: Israeli Nuclear and Foreign Policies*, Pluto Press, London 1997:**

{p. 139} The bulk of the organized US Jewish community is **totalitarian, chauvinistic and militaristic** in its views. This fact remains **unnoticed** by other Americans **due to its control of the media**, but is apparent to some Israeli Jews. As long as organized US Jewry remains united, its control over the media and its political power remain unchallenged. {end quote}



In this book, **Professor Shahak denies that the Protocols of Zion is authentic, but implies that it might as well be true** (pp. 65, 66, 81, 131, 132, 141). He says that it suits Israel to have others thinking that it rules the US - this belief increases its clout:

{p. 66} Barnea's second conclusion is that **'the great [Israeli] fear that other states may yet realize that the Protocols of the Elders of Zion are after all a myth - that the Jews do not rule the US ... '**

{p. 141} **One of the most prestigious of Israeli commentators, Yoel Markus (Haaretz, 31 December 1993) recently spoke of the 'courtship' of Israel by various states, concluding that 'this courtship has nothing to do with the peace process: its only reason is the entire world's recognition of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion as true.**

{end of quotes}

## **19. Stalin accused of endorsing the *Protocols***

My purpose in dealing with the Jewish involvement in Communism, is simply to get the history correct, free of ideological blinkers. Although I oppose Trotsky, I support and admire Jews like Israel Shamir and Jeffrey Blankfort. With Shamir, I agree on the need for public ownership and management of much of the economy, for the good of the people. And with Shamir, I oppose that kind of socialism which tries to stamp out religion, except the fundamentalist kind that promotes war.

19.1 Jewish lobbies accuse their critics of **"equating"** Jews with Communism.

This overstatement is easy for them to wriggle out of because (a) not all factions of Jews supported the early Bolsheviks (similarly, not all factions of European Christians invaded South America, but the invaders WERE Christians) (b) through Stalin's ascendancy, a non-Jewish (Russian) faction later gained control of Communism, and evicted the Jewish conspirators, congregated in the Trotskyist movement: [zioncom.html](http://zioncom.html).

Judaism has an atheistic variant, which rejects the anthropomorphic depiction of God of the Bible as a human creation, but which nevertheless holds to the Bible-ordained mission of the Jews to "unify" the world and eliminate "injustice": [philos.html](http://philos.html).

The correct statement is that the Bolshevik Government was created by Jews of this non-theistic type - in the name of the "working class". Not being "workers" or "peasants" themselves, they could only hold power by pitting the minorities within the empire against the Russian majority: [convergence.html](http://convergence.html).

This was comparable to "Multi-Culturalism" in the West at present. After Stalin got full power, he reversed this, in the name of "Russification": i.e. all the minorities had to learn and speak the Russian language.

Many other factions of Jews around the world, even if opposed to the Bolshevik Jews, suppress this knowledge from among non-Jews.

Similarly, the Anglo-American war against Islam is largely a Jewish war for Greater Israel and the Third Temple ([tmf.html](#)), disguised - by Chomsky and the Trotskyist Jews - as a war "for oil". On the contrary, in occupied countries the oil pipelines etc. are being sabotaged by the resistance: production will fall, not rise.

There is a strong correlation between **those who deny that the Bolshevik Government was created by Jews**, and **those who denounce the *Protocols of Zion* as a forgery**.

## 19.2 The Bolshevik reality, and its denial

Bertrand Russell says Bolsheviks were Americanized Jews: [russell.html](#).

Dmitri Volkogonov (Director of the Institute of Military History, in the USSR) and Joseph Nedava (a Jewish Zionist) on the Jewish identities of Lenin and Trotsky: [lenin-trotsky.html](#).

Stuart Kahan, a Zionist, wrote a biography of his uncle Lazar Kaganovich, the most senior Jew in Stalin's government, and the man who later orchestrated the murder of Stalin:

*Stuart Kahan, The Wolf of the Kremlin* (William Morrow and Company, NY 1987)

{p. 80} **Although the Church was left intact, its lands were seized. Even prior religious teaching was forbidden in the schools. Of course, word came down that it was the**

{p. 81} **Jews who did this.** After all, wasn't the revolution prepared and fashioned by Jews? Both of Karl Marx's grandfathers were rabbis, and Lenin's grandfather was also Jewish. And **wasn't Yakov Sverdlov, the first chief of state, a Jew, as was Trotsky himself?** But most people believed the Jews could be dealt with, as they always had been dealt with before.

**That Trotsky**, unquestionably the **most outstanding** man among the Bolsheviks, **was a Jew** did not seem an insuperable obstacle **in a party in which the percentage of Jews, 52 percent, was rather high compared to the percentage of Jews (1.8 per cent)** in the total population.

Lazar would have to keep a close eye on this. **Would the people accept the revolution orchestrated by the Jews**, or would they accept only one aspect and discard the other?

{end quotes} More at [kaganovich.html](#).

## 19.3 How Stalin stole their conspiracy

Trotsky regarded himself as equal to Lenin; Trotsky's supporters regarded him as the real leader of the revolution.

Trotsky's arrogance led other Jewish Bolsheviks to form coalitions against him. At one time, Lenin offered Trotsky the succession, but Trotsky wanted to concentrate on writing the historical record (to convert intellectuals abroad).

After Lenin's death, power was vested in a triumvirate (Kamenev, Zinoviev and Stalin), of which Kamenev was considered the head; Stalin was the only non-Jew of the three.

Lenin and Trotsky thought that they could not hold Russia unless they extended the revolution to other countries, especially Germany. The Red Army, under Trotsky, moved into Poland in 1920, but were defeated by the Poles under Pilsudski; this put an end to their hopes of reaching Germany. This failure of the "internationalist" brand of Communism led to support for Stalin's "socialism in one country", gradually shifting power to a developing "Russian" (non-Jewish) faction.

Trotsky failed to attend Lenin's funeral, because he was in the south, recuperating from an illness. Having his own private train with him, and motor cars hauled by it, he could have returned, but accepted Stalin's assurances that they could manage the funeral without him. His absence diminished his reputation among the Bolsheviks.

The Bolsheviks saw themselves as following in the steps of the French Revolution, and were wary lest some Napoleon arise among them, to "end" it. Trotsky, as head of the Red Army, was vulnerable to this accusation. To dis-associate himself from this charge, he did not resist when the triumvirate moved him to another position.

During World War II, Stalin had to reinstate Russian culture, and even the Orthodox Church, to gain the support of the people against the Nazis. The Jewish and non-Jewish factions of Communism united against the invaders.

Towards the end of the war, the Jewish faction, overconfident of Stalin's favour, pushed for a separate Jewish republic to be carved out of the USSR, in the Crimea. It was to be open to Jews from anywhere in the world, and to be funded by Jewish capitalists from the West: [sudoplat.html](http://sudoplat.html).

This so alarmed Stalin, that he turned against the Jewish faction once more.

A little later, the US Government put to Stalin the 1946 Baruch Plan for World Government, drafted by two Jews, David Lilienthal and Bernard Baruch. Lilienthal was head of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Baruch was a Wall Street banker. Stalin's rejection of the plan is one of the markers of the start of the Cold War: [baruch-plan.html](http://baruch-plan.html).

After the creation of the state of Israel in 1949, Jews could choose between two rival centres of government. Stalin was alarmed to see the Jewish allegiance to Israel when Golda Meir visited the USSR. A "Cold War" developed between Moscow and Jerusalem.

The Israeli Government was headed by David Ben-Gurion, an admirer of Lenin but a foe of Stalin - in effect, a Trotskyist. Thus, this unrecognized "Cold War" was between rival visions of Socialism. In Ben-Gurion's version, Eretz Israel was not only part of world socialism, but its centre.

Jews were polarised, split between the two.

In 1953, Stalin was murdered, two months after the "Doctors Plot" was publicised. The coup d'etat was done by a Jewish faction (Kaganovich, Beria), and a "Russian" faction (Khrushchev): [death-of-stalin.html](#).

Beria, of the Jewish faction, took over, and enacted anti-Stalinist measures of the kind Gorbachev implemented later. But the "Russian" faction, sensing the fall of the East Bloc, overthrew Beria: [beria.html](#).

Israel's victory in the 1967 war brought many Communist Jews to its side. The Polish Government, run by Jews, sided with Israel against the USSR, and was forced to step down, being replaced by (non-Jewish) Poles: [poland.html](#).

#### 19.4 The meaning of "Convergence" between East and West

Convergence was a Zionist/Trotskyist idea.

The aim was to seize control of the USSR from the Stalinists, while securing the West for "Marxist" values as enacted in the early Bolshevik period: Gay Rights, Feminism, the abolition of Marriage, cultural revolution, minorities against the majority: [sex-soviet.html](#).

This "Marxist Anti-Communism" in the West attacked the Soviet Union for betraying the "ideals" of Marxism: [kostel.html](#).

**Beria and Gorbachev attempted to return the Soviet Union to "Western" Marxism.** Each emphatically rejected Stalin and looked to a return to early Bolshevism; but this "Western" Marxism is Trotskyism by another name: [convergence.html](#).

**David Ben-Gurion predicted World Government by 1987.** In 1962, LOOK magazine invited him and other leaders to picture the world 25 years into the future, i.e. in 1987. His article published in the issue of January 16, 1962 shows amazing prescience. Despite the animosities of the Cold War then under way, Ben Gurion sees **Eastern Europe being torn from the USSR** - undoing Stalin's "empire" - and joined with Western Europe; and China (even Mao's China) and Japan joining the US in what seems the first published depiction of APEC.

**A World-Government has been created, with regional blocs in Europe, the USSR and the Pacific Rim,** and a Supreme Court for Mankind has been established in Jerusalem, as well as a shrine commemorating the Jewish role in the bringing-together of mankind. **David ben Gurion LOOK magazine Jan 16, 1962:** [bengur62.jpg](#).

**Ben Gurion explained** the thinking behind this prediction, in terms of **Judaism's mission to unify the world.** Note that, **even though an atheist, Ben Gurion derived this vision from the Jewish Bible:** [bengur-bible.html](#).

#### 19.5 The Doctors Plot: Stalin branded a "Nazi"

It is common for Trotskyist and Zionist writers to liken Stalin to Hitler. Norman Cohn and J. L. Talmon depict Stalin this way.

Cohn writes,

**"Stalin in his last years produced a new version of the conspiracy-myth, in which Jews figured as agents of an imperialist plot to destroy the Soviet Union and assassinate its leaders; this was used to secure the execution of Rudolf Slansky and his Jewish colleagues on the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist party in 1952, and it also formed the basis for the story of the 'doctors' plot' in 1953."** (*Warrant For Genocide*, (Penguin edition, 1970, p. 15). More at [cohn.html](http://cohn.html).

Talmon writes,

**"Particularly horrifying is the Soviet-Arab sponsorship of an updated version of the *Protocols of Zion*: the Zionist-American-Imperialist world plot**, operating not only against Arabs, Asians and Africans, but also against all the Socialist regimes, causing economic difficulties, student unrest, Catholic intransigence." (*Israel Among The Nations*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London 1970, p. 188). More at [talmon.html](http://talmon.html).

Edvard Radzinsky, in his biography, depicts Stalin the same way.

Edvard Radzinsky, *STALIN: The First In-Depth Biography Based on Explosive New Documents from Russia's Secret Archives* (translated from the Russian By H.T. Willetts, Hodder & Stoughton, London 1996):

{p. 534} **Professor Vovsi, for instance, one of the Kremlin doctors, was related to Mikhoels.** This prompted the idea of a **proliferating Jewish conspiracy** utilizing the world's most humane profession. **Stalin had vivid memories of the anti-Semitic tracts** devoured by the mob in his youth - **Protocols of the Elders of Zion**, the outpourings of the Union of the Russian People. With his mind always on the Great Dream he knew that there were two emotions which could unite society: fear, and hatred of the Jews.

{p. 535} ... **The storyline Stalin concocted went as follows: the sinister Jewish organization Joint was bent on destroying the Russian people. It had probably begun operations in the days of Trotsky, Zinoviev, and Kamenev.** Later, its agents, Mikhoels and other loyal instruments of American imperialism, had infiltrated everywhere. ...

Zionists had infiltrated even the highest levels of the political elite. ...

**In Czechoslovakia Slansky, the First Secretary of the Communist Party, was put on trial**, and several other senior officials were tried with him. They had one thing in common: **all of them were Jews.** Slansky was shot as an agent of international Zionism.

{p. 565} In 1995 ... Another procession ... **dozens of portraits of Stalin** ... Communists, monarchists, and Russian fascists marched side by side, at one in their devotion to the Boss.

And rightly so. **Was he not a greater national-socialist than Hitler?**

{end of quotes} More from Radzinsky at [radzinsk.html](http://radzinsk.html).

19.6 The "Stalin = Hitler" Syllogism

The syllogism is:

Opposition to Judaism is Evil  
Stalin opposes Judaism  
therefore, Stalin is Evil

Stalin is Evil

Evil is Hitler (Hitler being the personification of Evil)  
therefore, Stalin is Hitler

With regard to the *Protocols of Zion*, the syllogism is:

Hitler believed the *Protocols of Zion* to be genuine  
Hitler was a Nazi  
therefore, anyone who believes the *Protocols* genuine is a Nazi

I admire the Jewish devotion to scholarship; but does it descend to this?

Here is this logic, expressed in an email I received on 8 Aug 2003, with my comments interspersed:

>> you apparently claim the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* were genuine, when their origin with the Czarist Okhranka in 1903, plagiarized from a contemporary French source, is **well documented**.

**comment:** I constantly read this view. Documented by who? Names of authors, books, articles please. Page numbers etc.

>> That certainly **classes you with Hitler**

**comment:** Hitler thought that the earth is round. Since you and I agree, that "**classes us with Hitler**" too. The first people to observe that the Bolshevik revolution was a Jewish revolution, were its victims in Russia. It was they who alerted the rest of the world. Various people in other countries said so, including Churchill and Bertrand Russell. Hitler later said so too; but Russell said it before Hitler did. On your logic, all these people are "**classed with Hitler**".

>> your implication that Trotsky playing chess with a (gasp!) Vienna Jew during his first exile from Russia is proof of some vast Jewish conspiracy.

**comment:** I did not infer such a conspiracy from his chess games; the evidence for that is from other material. And this was not just any "Vienna Jew", but Baron Rothschild. Marx wrote against the Rothschilds, but here's Trotsky playing chess with them. It doesn't imply animosity, does it? It doesn't compare with Trotsky's attitude to the Czar.

>> The moving letter from **1933 Ukraine** that I sent you obviously had no effect upon **your hate-filled mind**.

**comment:** On the contrary, I believe that the Ukraine famine's 6 million victims are just as important as that other 6 million. Can you explain why we hear about one but not the other? At present, the US is like a bully in a school playground. Stalin was a bully too, but perhaps it would be better to have 2 bullies keeping each other



in check, than one. Stalin, at least, had a good side too: one can see that the Russians were better off in the USSR than they have been since.

#### 19.7 Jewish Bolsheviks turn to Neo-Conservatism

*The Fraud of Neoconservative "Anti-Communism"*, by Max Shpak, May 15, 2002:

{quote} Stalin's purges of many of his former Bolshevik colleagues (including Trotsky, who was assassinated while in exile), his 1939 pact with Hitler, and rumors of Stalin's own anti-Jewish prejudices gave many would-be supporters pause. **When Hitler invaded the Soviet Union**, it became clear **the Russian masses would not fight** for the sake of **Bolshevism**, an ideology that brought them so much misery, **but rather for** the sake of **Russian blood and soil**. **From then on, the Soviet leadership had to court** the very **Russian nationalist** elements **that the early Bolsheviks had worked** so hard **to stamp out**. This led to an increasing tolerance towards the Russian Orthodox Church and a **decreased Jewish presence** in the Soviet politburo and KGB. Thus, the USSR was **"betraying"** the very **elements that made it attractive to the Jewish** establishment to begin with.

Perhaps even more significant a factor in the origins of neo-conservatism was the emergence of an independent Israeli state. While many Jewish Marxists eagerly supported the Zionist state, the more intellectually consistent Left opposed Zionism on the grounds that all nationalisms, including Jewish ones, are enemies of global proletarian revolution. Thus, **Jewish leftists who once advocated internationalism for gentile nations were forced to come to terms with** the implications of **this ideology for their own nationalist sentiments**. Thus, **they needed an ideology** which would let them have their cake (**opposing gentile nationalism**) and eat it too (**by supporting Israel**), and they found just such a worldview with **neo-conservatism**. ... {end quote} More at [cia-infiltrating-left.html](http://cia-infiltrating-left.html).

More on Stalin at [stalin.html](http://stalin.html).

## 20. Conclusion

When considering the *Protocols*, one must remember that this book is, in effect, banned from public sale in the West (except by mail-order); and furthermore, that any book arguing its authenticity is also, it seems, banned.

When I first read Joly, I thought that the forgery argument may be correct. I used an A3 monitor to view Joly and the *Protocols* side by side (each as A4 size), to view the parallel passages better, looking for similarities and differences, and doing searches on individual words and expressions. I made notes as I went, and by the time I had finished, I could see that the forgery argument was far from proven.

**Bernstein, Cohn et al set out to define the parameters within which the *Protocols* will be judged, mainly in terms of resemblance to earlier works, and not in relation to events in the future which the *Protocols* seem to be advocating.**

**For example, the push for World Government. Some verses of the *Protocols* says this will be done by coup d'etats; others say by persuasion.**

**After World War I, both of these happened.**

In places conducive to persuasion, this method was used, via the "universalist" arm of the socialist movement - H. G. Wells, Wilson, Colonel House et al, all pushing for World Government in the Treaty of Versailles. There was a strong Jewish presence behind the scenes, via Israel Zangwill, Walter Lippman, Bernard Baruch, Jacob Schiff and others.

In Eastern Europe, coups were used: in Russia, Germany (which failed), and several other countries. These were all led by Jews.

**The think-tanks of the British Empire, clustered around the Round Table, were sold on the idea of World Government as an extension of the British Empire;** sold by Wells, with Lionel Curtis articulating it for the Empire:

[curtis1.html](#)

Lord Alfred Milner and other leaders of the Cecil Rhodes "Round Table" group were in the Coefficients Club, with thinkers like Wells: [wells-lenin-league.html](#)

**Yet when it came to the crunch, the British Empire was being asked to submit to a sovereign body above itself.** Further, Wilson, House, Wells et al wanted Lenin & Trotsky in it, this at the time when they were sponsoring coups in other countries of Eastern Europe, in a sort of domino effect.

**The hope was that the Trotsky forces in the East would join with the Wells forces in the British Empire, to oust the Tory forces led by Northcliffe and Wickham Steed.**

But Wickham Steed blocked them - narrowly.

H. G. Wells and Bertrand Russell later came to write explicitly about the movement for World Government: [opensoc.html](#)

They confirm the movement, and support it; there is nothing speculative about it. In a sense, their work is more solid than the *Protocols*; and yet, in the light of their work, the *Protocols* is seen to correctly identify a "One World" conspiracy, decades before such documents confirmed it. Prior to the *Protocols*, the conspiracy was pronounced in books by Barruel and Robison: (a) Abbe Barruel, *Memoire pour servir a l'histoire du jacobinisme* (1797) (b) John Robison, *Proofs of a Conspiracy against All the Religions and Governments of Europe*. But the *Protocols* goes beyond them.

How then to deal with the Joly parallels?

Step back; consider other famous cases of parallel documents, such as the Gospels. Most scholars think that there was another document called Q, used by the authors of Mark, Matthew and Luke.

Here are some samples:



(i) Bruce Griffin, WAS JESUS A PHILOSOPHICAL CYNIC? <http://www-oxford.op.org/allen/html/acts.htm>

"Burton Mack, a professor of Claremont School of Theology ... published *The Lost Gospel: the Book of Q and Christian Origins* in 1993. Mack defended Q as the most reliable source for the reconstruction of the historical Jesus. Q in turn was believed to have gone through three different revisions or redactions before it was used as a source for Matthew and Luke. Mack here was relying on the brilliantly argued work of John Kloppenborg who believed that Q originally consisted of a collection of wisdom sayings ..."

(ii) The Search for a No-Frills Jesus, by CHARLOTTE ALLEN, *Atlantic Monthly*, December 1996 <http://www.theatlantic.com/issues/96dec/jesus/jesus.htm>

(iii) David Seeley, JESUS' DEATH IN Q {This article first appeared in New Testament Studies 38 (1992) 222-34 ...} <http://www.bham.ac.uk/theology/synoptic-l/jdeath.htm>

(iv) Mark Goodacre, The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem <http://www.ntgateway.com/Q/>

My argument, then, is that both the *Protocols* and Joly use a document like Q, unknown to us.

How could this be?

**The push for World Government has two guises. At the surface, it casts itself as benevolent, universal; underneath, it is despotic and totalitarian.** Compare the French Revolution.

That means that **there must have been an effort to conceal its true nature from the "universalists" who would propound it. Yet there must have been some way this deception was communicated to those in the know**, so that they would be able to work together for the common cause, whilst maintaining the deception.

Written documents would have been essential for this purpose. And since the plan remained much the same over time, such documents would have been similar too, but with variations in details to deal with events as they unfolded.

At the time of Adam Weishaupt, founder of the Illuminati, the Bavarian Government by chance found written documents on the person of one of the conspirators, which revealed the plot later to break out as the French Revolution, and specifically the way that the "universalist" leaders with their minds on Rousseau were to be subverted to an orgy of destruction and totalitarianism.

Joly's book depicts Napoleon III as the Machiavellian defeating the communist revolutionaries who represent true democracy; the *Protocols* depicts those revolutionaries, and the Jewish financiers behind them, as the Machiavellians.

**Either the author of the *Protocols* used Joly's book, reversing the meaning; or Joly found a document being a forerunner of the *Protocols*, and reversed the meaning.**

The question cannot be resolved either way.

Enough evidence has presented on both sides, to keep the question open. But if the document be genuine, it does not mean that all Jews are conspirators. Most would just be led along, or tagging along; and anyway, Jews are not a monolithic group.

If it be genuine, then the most important feature is its revelation that religion - the Jewish religion - is the key and the motivator. It is not a matter of race.

Mixing the two, but acknowledging the primacy of religion, **Nahum Goldmann** wrote in *The Jewish Paradox* (London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978):

"{p. 13} ... **the Jews saw their persecutors as an inferior race. ... Goy politics were of no concern to them.** ... {p. 14} I have always retained a positive attitude, a blend of veneration and admiration, towards **the Jewish religion. Without it there would be no Jewish people today.**"

Alexander Solzhenitsyn is writing a book about Jews in Russia before and after the Revolution, in which he is reported as saying that although they went too far, he does concede that in some way they may have been the "agent of God". By this, I think he means that Jewish activism did benefit various minority groups.

George W. Bush and Al Gore are each allied with factions of Judaism: the former "Zionist", the latter "Marxist". The assassination of Yitzhak Rabin proves that Jews really are divided into contesting camps.

I do not countenance judging an individual for what a group has done, whether that group be Jews as discussed here, or "white" invaders of the New World, or Japanese in East Asia, or Chinese in Tibet, or one African group against another. In the last analysis, we all have blood on our hands.

The UN idea is surely preferable to war, as launched by Sharon and Bush and their allies in other countries. So, in the end, I must side with those promoting the UN, but I urge it not to discredit itself by allowing its committees to be hijacked - whether by Bush or by extremists pushing Radical Feminism, Gay Marriage and the like - and not to unsettle existing states by pushing for a borderless world when we are not yet ready for it.

## **21. Challenge to Jared Israel and Alexander Baron (November 28, 2002)**

To Jared Israel, at [emperors1000@aol.com](mailto:emperors1000@aol.com):

Jared,

You have argued against the *Protocols of Zion* on your website, at

<http://emperors-clothes.com/antisem/protocols-1.htm>.

Part 2 is at <http://emperors-clothes.com/antisem/protocols-2.htm>.

But within 7 days of 9-11, you were condemning those who thought that Mossad might be behind it.

That would probably mean Sharon's involvement, although Victor Ostrovsky warned that Mossad sometimes acts without authorization. I don't think that Peres would countenance such a thing.

Ostrovsky wrote in *By Way of Deception*:

{p. vii} But it was the twisted ideals and self-centered pragmatism that I encountered inside the Mossad, coupled with this so-called team's greed, lust, and total lack of respect for human life, that motivated me to tell this story. It is out of love for Israel as a free and just country that I am laying my life on the line by so doing, facing up to those who took it upon themselves to turn the Zionist dream into the present-day nightmare.

{p. viii} The Mossad, being the intelligence body entrusted with the responsibility of plotting the course for the leaders at the helm of the nation, has betrayed that trust. Plotting on its own behalf, and for petty, self-serving reasons, it has set the nation on a collision course with all-out war. {end}

And Claire Hoy wrote in her Foreword:

{p. ix} One of the main themes of this book is Victor's belief that Mossad is out of control, that even the prime minister, although ostensibly in charge, has no real authority over its actions ... {end quotes}

[ostrovsky.html](http://ostrovsky.html)

To Alexander Baron, at [A\\_Baron@ABaron.Demon.Co.UK](mailto:A_Baron@ABaron.Demon.Co.UK) and at [ITMA\\_99@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:ITMA_99@yahoo.co.uk):

Alexander,

You have argued against the *Protocols of Zion* on your website, in your Protocols Bibliography, at

[http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Embassy/2634/proto\\_biblio\\_1.html](http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Embassy/2634/proto_biblio_1.html).

To both of you,

How many of those who ridicule the *Protocols*, acknowledge that the Bolshevik Government, prior to Stalin's gaining full power about 1928, was run by Jews?

Not by all Jews, admittedly; the woman who shot Lenin, in an assassination attempt, was also a Jew. There were theistic (religious) Jews who feared the Bolsheviks; I believe some fled.

But it was Jewish, nonetheless.

Bertrand Russell, a supporter of the Revolution in principle, acknowledged such: [russell.html](http://russell.html).

More evidence on this is presented at [zioncom.html](http://zioncom.html).

The Trotskyist forces of the world, and their Fabian dupes, suppress this information.

Here's my challenge to both of you:

I have put the best arguments that the *Protocols* is a forgery, i.e. those by Herman Bernstein and Norman Cohn, including the full text of Bernstein's book and Joly's book, on my website, in the Protocols of Zion Toolkit, at [toolkit.html](http://toolkit.html).

So, while arguing against them, I have put their arguments to my readers, IN THEIR OWN WORDS. The arguments both ways are presented at the above link.

I challenge you to do the same: include on your website, within your articles on the *Protocols of Zion*, a link to my Protocols of Zion Toolkit, so that your readers can see the counter-arguments for themselves.

And when you have done that, please inform me.

Peter {End of Challenge}

**Jared Israel did not reply.**

**Alexander Baron's reply:**

Subject: Challenge to Alexander Baron

Date: Thu, 28 Nov 2002 22:50:52 +0000

From: Alexander Baron <a\_baron@abaron.demon.co.uk>

To: Peter Myers <myers@cyberone.com.au>

Listen you stupid prick; for the past ten years I've had Kosher krazies and scumbags denouncing me as an anti-Semite simply for documenting the truth about Jewish perfidy.

I really don't give a flying fuck at having anti-Semites and nutters - like yourself - doing the same.

If you want to believe in the authenticity of the Protocols or the Book of Revelation for that matter that is your prerogative; just don't ask me to share a padded cell with you.

Now go away and bother someone else; better still, learn a little logic and common sense.

--

Alexander Baron {end}

## **22. Dr. John Coleman on "Colonel" House**

Dr. John Coleman's book *THE CONSPIRATORS' HIERARCHY: THE STORY OF THE COMMITTEE OF 300* (America West Publishers, P.O. Box 3300, Bozeman, MT 59772, 1992) contains valuable material, but his hectoring style and lack of supporting evidence let it down.

Anyone who has read much of Lyndon Larouche's material will note great similarity in this 1992 book by Coleman. Both say that the One-World Conspiracy is British, centred on the Monarchy. They "write out" any specifically Jewish involvement, although a number of Jewish bodies get a mention, e.g. the ADL.

Yet the Jewish Defense Organization calls Larouche a Nazi: "Lyndon Larouche hired Jewish flunkies like Steinberg and Goldstien to do his dirty work. The name of the game is Yockeyism, crypto-Nazism ... " <http://ido.org/gibson.htm>.

So, is there a hidden Jewish theme within Coleman's work?

When one considers the shocking press that the British Royals get (compared to, say, the Japanese or Danish Royals) with the media prying into their troubles, exacerbating them and putting them on the front pages; when one considers that Rupert Murdoch's media, and the Economist, promote the abolition of the British Monarchy; then another force is suspected behind the scenes.

Here's a clue: Coleman writes,

"... **Robert Cecil of the Jewish Cecil family that had controlled the British monarchy** since a Cecil became the private secretary and lover of Queen Elizabeth I ..." (*Conspirators' Hierarchy*, p. 201).

Coleman writes in his article *King Makers, King Breakers: The Cecils* (1985, © Dr John Coleman, W.I.R., 2533 N. Carson St., Suite J-118 Carson City, NV 89706):

{p. 25} The records at Hatfield House show that the Unity of Science Conferences was the brain child of Robert Cecil, as confirmed by the Dutch Jew, Mandell Huis alias Colonel House, who was the controller of Woodrow Wilson and Wilson's personal representative at the Paris peace Conference; and the special representative of the United States Government at the Inter-Allied Conference of Premiers and Foreign Ministers in 1917; U. S. representative at the Armistice in 1918 and a member of the Commission on Mandates in 1919. **Mandell Huis, like the Cecils, professed to be a Christian, but was a Jew by birth and conviction.** He was a firm friend of the Cecil clan, and **it was Huis who forced Wilson to agree to the July, 1915 arrangement made by Arthur Balfour which gave Palestine to the Zionists and brought America into the first world war.** Americans should be taught these things in schools and universities, but so great is the power of the Black Nobility, the RIIA, the CFR and the Eastern Liberal Establishment gang of traitors, that the majority

{p. 26} of Americans will probably never hear the name of the Cecil family, as one of the names which shaped the destiny of our once free great republican America. Before leaving the subject of "Colonel House" (Huis is the Dutch word for house), let me say that in spite of the many important tasks he was given to carry out, "Colonel House" was never a member of the United States government, nor was he elected to hold any of these important offices by the sovereign people of the United States. Therefore I say to you; "Of what use is our present system? We call ourselves a republic and a democracy, yet, no matter who we elect to the White House, the secret government of America continues to enact its policies, without the slightest regard for our wishes. Of what use then, is our electoral system?" ... {end}

So here is **the Jewish theme lurking with the British theme.** Yet, in *Conspirators' Hierarchy* there are only glimpses of this, such as:

**"Cecil John Rhodes, a Committee of 300 member who fronted for the Rothschilds in South Africa ... " (p. 134).**

"Committee of 300 members Cecil John Rhodes, Barney Barnato and Alfred Beit instigated and engineered the war. **Rhodes was the principle agent for the Rothschilds ... " (p. 150)**

This reverses Rhodes' usual priority over Rothschild, and puts Rothschild at the helm. Beit, too, was Jewish. Carroll Quigley wrote in *The Anglo-American Establishment*:

"{p. 134} Even Rhodes ... was not a racist. ... Some of his closest friends {p. 135} were Jews (like Beit), and in three of his wills he left Lord Rothschild as his trustee, in one as his sole trustee." [quigley.html](http://quigley.html)

Here's another important quote from *Conspirators' Hierarchy*, on ties connecting Walter Lippmann, Edward Bernays (both Jewish), with H. G. Wells and the British Fabian Socialists, who, Quigley shows, were linked to the Anglo-American Establishment via the Coefficient Club:

{p. 200} In 1928, Lippmann's compatriot Edward Bernays wrote a book called "CRYSTALLIZING PUBLIC OPINION" and in 1928 a second book of his was published entitled simply "PROPAGANDA." In it Bernays described his experiences at Wellington House. Bernays was a close friend of Master Manipulator **H.G. Wells, whose many quasi-novels were used by**

{p. 201} **Bernays to help formulate mass mind control techniques. Wells was not shy about his role** as a leader in changing lower class society, mainly because he was a close friend of members of the British royal family, and spent a great deal of time with some of the most highly placed politicians of the day, men like Sir Edward Grey, Lord Haldane, **Robert Cecil of the Jewish Cecil family that had controlled the British monarchy** since a Cecil became the private secretary and lover of Queen Elizabeth I, **Leo Amery, Halford Mackinder** of MI6 and later head of the London School of Economics, whose pupil Bruce Lockhart would become MI6 controller of Lenin and Trotsky during the Bolshevik Revolution, and even the great man himself, **Lord Alfred Milner**. One of Well's favorite watering holes was the prestigious St. Ermins Hotel, meeting place of **the Coefficient Club**, a club to which certified gentlemen only were admitted and where they met once a month. All of the men mentioned above were members and also members of the Souls Club. Wells claimed that any nation could be defeated, not by direct confrontation but by understanding the human mind-- what he called, "the mental hinterlands hidden behind the persona."

With such a powerful backer, Bernays felt confident enough to launch his "PROPAGANDA":

"As civilization becomes more complex, AND AS THE NEED FOR INVISIBLE GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN INCREASINGLY DEMONSTRATED (emphasis added-JC), the technical means have been invented and developed BY WHICH PUBLIC OPINION MAY BE REGIMENTED (emphasis added-JC). With printing



press and newspaper, the telephone, telegraph, radio and airplanes, ideas can be spread rapidly, and even instantaneously, across the whole of America."

Bernays had not yet seen how much better television, which was to follow, would do the job. {end quote} More at [british-conspiracy.html](http://british-conspiracy.html).

Is Coleman describing a **Jewish conspiracy lurking within the British one and using it as a cover?**

If so, this Jewish movement is divided into Internationalist ("Socialist") and Zionist wings. What Coleman says about Socialism applies to the former; he says nothing about the latter.

But the Fundamentalists in Israel are waging their own campaign against the former, which they call the "British" conspiracy (ignoring, for example, the Jewishness of Bill Clinton's cabinets).

The CIA is on one side; Mossad on the other.

The Socialist Internationalists (New Left), who can be considered either the Left faction of the "British", or as the Left faction of the "Jewish" block, are led by George Soros and Noam Chomsky. Both are Jewish; both oppose the war. Both support minority causes of the Gay Marriage type; a part of Chomsky's website is devoted to Gay and Lesbian issues.

Michael Higger writes in his book *The Jewish Utopia* that "A Jewish Utopia begins where Wells leaves off" (p. 6). [jewish-utopia.html](http://jewish-utopia.html)

Thus, we now witness a struggle between these two visions of Judaism. Gay Marriage and the World Court are litmus issues that identify the two camps.

**"Colonel" Edward House's "novel"** of 1912, *Philip Dru: Administrator*, a model Woodrow Wilson followed; **Jacob Schiff's campaigns for Zionism and World Government**; and how two Conspiracies, an "Anglo" one and a Zionist one, joined up: [house-schiff.html](http://house-schiff.html).

{end}

## 23. Lenin's Opposition to the Treaty of Versailles

Lenin sent the Red Army to invade Poland in 1920, as a stepping-stone to Germany. He wrote:

**Richard Pipes, ed., *The Unknown Lenin: From the Secret Archive*** (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1996):

{p. 100}. ... somewhere in the proximity of Warsaw lies the center of the entire system of international imperialism ... Poland, as a buffer between Russia and Germany, Poland ... is the

{p. 101} **linchpin of the whole Treaty of Versailles.** ... Poland is such a powerful element in this Versailles Peace that **by extracting this element we break up the entire Versailles peace. We had tasked ourselves with occupying Warsaw;** the

task changed and it turned out that what was being decided was not the fate of Warsaw but the fate of the Treaty of Versailles.

{end quote} More at [wells-lenin-league.html](http://wells-lenin-league.html).

So why invite the Bolsheviks to join the Peace Conference?