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"But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."

St. Matthew 6:33
“We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights: that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

The Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people: whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign states; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes. I therefore believe it is my duty to my Country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its Flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

“Menaced by dictators abroad and by collectivist trends at home, we must seek revival of our strength in its spiritual foundations which are the bedrock of our republic. Democracy is the outgrowth of the religious conviction of the sacredness of every human life. On the religious side, its highest embodiment is the Bible; on the political, the Constitution. As has been said so well, 'The Constitution is the civil book of Americans'. Next to the Bible, the best book on the Constitution should be in every home, school, library and parish hall.”

Herbert C. Hoover, Alfred E. Smith, James M. Cox, John W. Davis, Alfred M. Landon, Mrs. William H. Taft, Mrs. Calvin Coolidge, Mrs. Benjamin Harrison, Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr. (Mrs. Grover Cleveland.)
PREFACE

“For by thy sorceries were all nations deceived.”
—REVELATIONS 18:23

In 1775 North Carolina declared its independence from Great Britain. Of the colonies under the despotic heel of a tyrant three thousand miles away, North Carolina was the first to throw down the gauntlet of freedom. On May 31st a committee representing the militia companies of Mecklenburg County passed a series of resolutions declaring that the “royal commissions” in the several colonies were null and void, that the Constitution of each colony was suspended, and that the legislative and executive powers of each colony were vested in its provincial Congress subject to the direction of the Continental Congress. The Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence (May 20, 1775 by act of the North Carolina legislature) electrified free men throughout the colonies and supplied the spark that kindled a fundamental element in Americanism.

One hundred and sixty-six years later the General Assembly of the sovereign State of North Carolina was to pass another resolution. On March 13, 1941, with the endorsement of Governor J. M. Broughton, the legislature of this proud old state adopted the so-called “Humber” resolution, calling for world government! This retreat to tyranny was written and sponsored by one Robert Lee Humber of Greenville.

“There exists an international community,” declared the lawmakers of North Carolina. This international community encompasses the entire world. “All human beings,” they continued, “are citizens of this world community, which requires laws and not treaties for its government.” And, so declared the Legislature, “The Treaty of Peace must be written in terms of the Constitution of the Federation of the World!”

What had happened to North Carolina in one hundred and sixty-six years? What had become of that sublime sense of freedom and independence that had written and adopted the Mecklenburg resolutions? Whence had fled the courage of the men of May 20, 1861 who voted to secede from the Union it had helped form rather than surrender the sovereignty and independence it had fought for and died for? Where now the uncompromising spirit of North Carolina’s Vances who fought the Union on the one hand and Jeff Davis on the other to secure the right to sovereignty and independence? Where, where, indeed!

Quietly, unobtrusively, and without the benefit of disturbing publicity, the California State Legislature in 1949 adopted a resolution more baffling and shocking than the Humber resolution of
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North Carolina. Unanimous in the Assembly, and with but eight dissenting votes in the Senate, the resolution passed. Its sponsors spoke of “peace”, and every member of the Legislature was enthusiastically in favor of “peace”. No one questioned; few read the proposal. Eight senators read, understood, and, true to their oaths of office, voted “no”. The resolution memorialized Congress, under authority of Article V of the Constitution of the United States to call a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of amending the United States Constitution to expedite and insure United States participation in a World Federal Government!

The “One World Resolution” immediately became known as the “California Plan”, and the advocates of “World Government” were enabled to move from state to state influencing other legislatures to adopt the “plan”. The prestige of California was impressive, and well meaning, but uninformed legislators were persuaded to sponsor the resolution in their own bodies. Connecticut, Florida, Maine, New Jersey, and, of course, North Carolina, followed the precedent set by California.

Several California senators attempted to rescind the 1949 resolution in that same session of the legislature, but they were able to secure but one vote for passage in the senate committee that considered the proposal. Their efforts, however, served to publicize the issue, and patriotic organizations were aroused to indignation action. Foremost in the California struggle to rescind were the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and many women’s civic and patriotic organizations. The few embattled senators who failed to rescind the resolution in the 1949 session made a further attempt at a special session called later that year by the Governor. While this effort also failed, the rescinding resolution received two committee votes, which was at least encouraging.

On March 6, 1950 Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 was introduced in the California Senate. The resolution was entitled: “Relative to withdrawing the application to Congress made by Assembly Joint Resolution No. 26 of the 1949 Regular Session, to propose a constitutional amendment for American participation in a World Federal Government,” and reads as follows:

"WHEREAS, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 26 was passed at the 1949 Regular Session of the Legislature of the State of California; and

"WHEREAS, That Assembly Joint Resolution urged an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting this Country’s participation in a World Federal Government; and

"WHEREAS, It has come to the attention of certain mem-
bers of the Legislature that not all the pertinent facts relating to that subject were available and presented when this resolution was passed; and

"WHEREAS, Said resolution was not a mere memorialization of the Congress but an application by the Legislature of this State, pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States that the Congress of the United States call a convention for the sole purpose of proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution to expedite and insure the participation of the United States in a World Federal Government; and

"WHEREAS, If similar application to the Congress is made by the legislatures of two-thirds of the states, the Congress shall have no choice but to call a convention for such purpose; and

"WHEREAS, Said resolution, if acted upon and fulfilled by the Government of the United States, would entail the surrender of our national sovereignty, nullify our Constitution, bring into being a form of law whereby American citizens would be tried by citizens of other countries and imprisoned in foreign jails; and

"WHEREAS, In order to provide financial support for this world government it would be necessary to give such government the power of taxation or to require contributions from member nations, and in either event the principal source of funds required for the support of such government would of necessity be the United States, with a resulting heavy burden on the American Taxpayer and lowering the American standard of living; and

"WHEREAS, The establishment of such World Federal Government would require the creation of a world army to maintain peace, and such army would be composed in a large part of soldiers from other nations, and would be subject to the control of a world legislature, with the result that the American people would be in danger of losing their liberties, their free institutions, and their freedom of action; and

"WHEREAS, The creation of such a world army would result in the abolition of the independent military establishment of the United States and the surrender of the Panama Canal, with consequent imminent peril to our national safety; NOW, THEREFORE BE IT

"RESOLVED BY THE SENATE AND THE ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, JOINTLY, That the proposal in said Assembly Joint Resolution No. 26 be withdrawn; and be it further
“RESOLVED, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives from this State, and to the presiding officer of each of the legislatures of the several states.”

The struggle that ensued for the passage of the rescinding resolution was long and difficult. Members of an organization known as UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS, INC. made their first appearance in the corridors of the State Capitol. One Alan Cranston, later to become President of UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS, INC., was active throughout, attempting to hold the members of the legislature in line. At crucial moments, however, the Capitol was filled with patriots from every part of the State, and determined, grim-faced women worked incessantly with members, who, either from a sense of stubbornness or fear of looking foolish, refused to retreat from their former position and admit that they had been deceived. After defeat on the floor of the Senate and a motion to reconsider, the rescinding resolution passed the Senate without a vote to spare. The fight continued in the Assembly and finally was won with only two votes over the required majority.

California had redeemed itself and the “world government” resolution’s march to two-thirds of the states was suddenly halted. “The flag was still there.” The long debate with its diversionary arguments passed into history, but the UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS, INC. believed that it had only lost a battle, and that the war was yet to be won, and that they would win it.

Mr. Robert Lee Humber, who humbled North Carolina, is a Rhodes Scholar. He lived sixteen years in Europe, and returned to the United States when the Nazis conquered France. He was a Vice-President of UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS, INC. Cecil Rhodes established the scholarships that bear his name for the purpose of bringing the United States back into the British Empire through the education of Americans in England.

It may appear to be a far cry from North Carolina and the State Capitols of the United States to the little town of Benicia, California, but in its picturesque peacefulness it is typical of thousands of small communities scattered throughout the country. What happens in the Benicias of America ultimately determines the freedom of men and women everywhere.

Benicia, except for its colorful history, differs but little from its sister cities throughout the United States. Once the capitol of California, it stands on the north bank of Carquinez Straits, in Solano County. Its past is closely woven with the history of the men and women of California, who, with faith in God, carried the
Cross and Christian civilization into the West. The County in which Benicia nestles derived its name from the noted Franciscan missionary, Father Francisco Solano, whose name was given in baptism to an Indian Chief when the latter embraced Christianity. Benicia was named after General Vallejo’s wife, Francisca Benicia. Two great military installations in Solano have contributed to the defense of the United States and the freedom of its people for over a hundred years—the shipyard at Mare Island and the Arsenal at Benicia. The bay, the inlets, the coves, the low-lying hills; the tranquility of lapping waters; the yellow gold of strong sunlight, the amethyst of sunset; yes, and even the fogs from the rivers and the bay that hide the twinkling myriad of stars—this is the peace and beauty of Benicia. More important than its loneliness, more deeply ingrained by the gift of God than the serenity of its moon-lit, diamond-encrusted nights, is the glory of the crimson and white and the star-studded field of blue that keeps it free.

It was Niccolo Machiavelli who wrote that force alone rarely suffices for the attainment of political objectives, whereas cunning alone oftimes succeeds. It would appear that the advocates of world domination and totalitarianism are masters of Machiavellian philosophy, and are particularly adept in the art of cunning. The **UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS** had stealthily attempted to pass its “world government” resolutions through the several legislatures and failed. These great “advocates” of “democracy” might have admitted that the people had spoken, dissolved their movement and abided by the will of the majority, but it is not in their nature to practice the alleged virtues of their own propaganda. Like the Fabian socialists of England, they have time. What you cannot push over with brute strength you may undermine so that it falls of its own weight.

Where may political undermining be better rewarded than in the schools?

In a small city, such as Benicia, the citizens are hospitable, warm-hearted, and friendly. The teachers of its public schools come from various educational institutions, and, in addition to being allegedly qualified to teach, are assumed to be loyal Americans, steeped in the traditions of our basic freedoms and independence. And for the greater part, American teachers fulfill most of these qualifications. But in the Benicias of the United States there has been appearing a new sort of teacher. This modern educator is a product of “progressive” education, and appears to suffer from a great inner sense of inferiority, and, in addition to indoctrination courses for the unsuspecting student, engages in assorted extra-curricular activities, such as organizing inter-racial groups and chapters of the **UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS**. Some of these teachers manifest an almost rabid repugnance for
such things as committees for Americanism, and anti-communistic groups. They are often heard to refer to such organizations as “fascist”, “red-baiters”, and even “anti-Semitic”. Most of them appear to be more concerned with the “integration” of the races and aptitudes of collective living than they are with the old fashioned ideas of reading, writing and arithmetic.

Benicia had such a teacher. She became very active in the community life of the town. She became president of the EMPLOYED WOMEN, and a member of the INTERRACIAL organization, thereby proving that she was not any better than anyone else. She was a great advocate of equality, fraternity and democracy. There were those in Benicia, by the grace of God, who did not quite agree with all of the “progressive” views of the teacher’s INTERRACIALS, and though these good citizens were greatly in the majority, they did not fall within the democratic philosophy as interpreted by Benicia’s new “progressive” teacher.

In June of 1949 the teacher appeared before the Benicia Chamber of Commerce, requesting funds to finance a trip of a group of students from the Benicia High School to Washington, D. C. in order that they might take part in the WORLD FEDERALIST PEACE MOVEMENT. The members of the Benicia Chamber of Commerce, like most law-abiding citizens, are enthusiastic about peace, and they were willing to stake thirty dollars on the efforts of the High School group to secure a little of it. That is, they were —until some one started asking questions. When some of the answers started coming in, the members (proving they were better qualified to legislate than those who acted for them in Sacramento) adopted a resolution, which reads as follows:

“RESOLVED: That the Board of Directors of the Benicia Chamber of Commerce declares itself unalterably opposed to the organization known as ‘World Federalists’ and hereby requests the Board of Trustees of the Benicia Unified School District to take whatever action is necessary to eliminate the teaching or participation in, by either the faculty or students, in any organizations which have doubtful loyalty to our American precepts.”

In spite of the protest of the members of the Benicia Chamber of Commerce (merely a group of tax-payers) a chapter of the UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS was launched officially at the Benicia High School, permission having been obtained to make the chapter a regular school organization. Thirty students enrolled. Lectures, films, and “one-world” propaganda followed. Panel discussions on world government, conferences on UNESCO at Stanford University, and appearances before the local Kiwanis Club, quickly “internationalized” Benicia interests. A scheduled panel discussion before the Benicia’s Women’s Club was cancelled after the passage of a resolution by the District FEDERATION OF WO-
MEN’S CLUBS in San Francisco opposing the UNITED WORLD FEDERALIST movement.

The PARENT-TEACHER ASSOCIATION held out a welcome sign for the world-government-teacher, but denied patriotic citizens the right to appear and speak against her contention that the United States should surrender its independence. The pseudo-intellectuals who mentally bow and scrape before the bizarre and the absurd, welcomed the “new” and “progressive” views of the teacher of their children, and conjured up visions of a well organized universe with everything in its place, law and order everywhere and the dawn of eternal peace. They could have found such a paradise a few miles away on San Francisco Bay—either at San Quentin or Alcatraz—but it is doubtful that any of them would have exchanged their disordered, unruly and war-torn existence for the peace and quiet of either of those places.

Some of Benicia’s citizens could not sit idly by and watch the Pied Piper from the Ivory Towers of John Dewey lead the children of Benicia into the dark caverns from which there is no return. Where to go? What to do? Who to see? How stem the incomprehensible flood that seemed sweeping over Benicia? And what was more important in the beginning was the nagging suggestion that one might be out of step with the march of progress; that there might be new standards and values at large in the world that one did not quite understand or fully appreciate. After all, what really is wrong with world government? Did not the founding fathers of our great country conceive a union of sovereign states eternally bound together by a Federal government? If thirteen separate states might accomplish such a miracle, why not the nations of the world? What are the answers to these questions? Where, in common sense, is the measuring rod of judgment; where, by the delicate scales of history, was the balance of world experience? Where is the road marked by the approval of God; in what direction, by what sign, and to what end?

"The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto Him to shew unto His servants things which must shortly come to pass; and He sent and signified it by His angel unto His servant John: Who bare record of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw. Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein; for the time is at hand. (Revelations 1: 1-3. )"

It is told of the early people that they sought to build a great city and a tower that would reach to heaven, lest they be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth. And they spoke but one language and desired but one world. “And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of men builded. And the Lord said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one
language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be re-
strained from them, which they have imagined to do. Go to, let
us go own, and there confound their language, that they may not
understand one another’s speech. So the Lord scattered them
abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth; and they left
off to build the city. Therefore is the name of it called Babel.”

“They shall deceive the very elect... and shall shew signs and
wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect.”

The time-honored values remain constant; the measuring-roa
of judgment eternal. The lessons of history are ever present for
those who seek, who learn and understand. The road is straight
ahead, narrow and steep and difficult of passage, well marked by
the hand of God, and it alone leads to peace.

Treason is an ugly word and its definition in the Constitution
of the United States it clear and unmistakable. Disloyalty is not
defined in the Constitution; its attributes are interwoven in the
melancholy histories of the world’s Benedict Arnolds. To give aid
and comfort to the enemies of one’s country in time of war is an
act that not only arouses loathing in the heart of the betrayed, but
also stirs emotions of contempt in the heart of the enemy. It is
an act that is discernible; the results of which may be disaster.
What then of the more subtle acts of betrayal? The surrender of
hard earned independence and sovereignty—without a struggle?
Surrender to whom? To what? And for what reason? To avoid
war and the inevitable blast of an atom bomb! This is the stock
answer!

If the British had possessed the atom bomb when the colonists
determined to throw off the oppressive yoke of George III, Patrick
Henry’s voice might have been lost in the clamor for continued
union. The instruments of death launched against Washington’s
ragged armies were just as deadly in their day as the atom bomb
is today. A well placed slug from a flint-lock killed as surely and
as completely as an atomic blast will kill today. True, an atom
bomb properly placed will kill more men with one blast than a
flint-lock, but it is equally true that the cannon of the Red Coats
also might simultaneously kill more men than the flint-lock.

The words of Patrick Henry seem directed at today’s generation.
“It is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope,” he de-
clared March 28, 1755. “We are apt to shut our eyes against a
painful truth, and listen to the song of that syren, till she trans-
forms us into beasts. Is this the part of wise men, engaged in a
great and arduous struggle for liberty? Are we disposed to be of
the number of those who, having eyes, see not, and having ears,
hear not, the things which so nearly concern their temporal salva-
tion?... I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided; and
that is the lamp of experience... What is it that gentlemen wish?
What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty, or give me death!

Here is a constant value; one that has not changed, and will not change, as long as men and women stand straight, in the midst of their kind, with the dignity of God-given freedom in their hearts. To such men and women the crash of ordnance or the blast of an atom bomb is preferable to the peace of slavery. As long as such men and women exist there will be freedom.

The United States of America became possible because its thirteen colonies were populated with a homogeneous people. They were Caucasians, Christians, spoke a common language, and they possessed a common tradition and shared the same culture. It is obvious that the converse is true of the nations of the world today. All the sinister efforts of the advocates of world government to create a brown world-race of robots without religion or sense of difference must still conquer the God-ingrained sense of freedom that pulsates vigorously in the hearts of men. These internationalists may be successful in rewriting the world’s history and destroying the evidence of the truth, but the inborn inquisitive passion for facts cannot forever be eliminated from the minds of men. Each must seek its kind as God has ordained and, though depravity and licentiousness may achieve mongrelization, the products thereof must perish. The hybrid may be created but it soon becomes a dead twig on the tree of life. This is a lesson of history; the story of every great civilization that has appeared on the theatre of the world. This is a measuring-rod to take the stature of judgment and plumb the depths of common-sense.

What of the material considerations? What of the American people—our families, our friends, our neighbors? Increased taxes. Lowered standard of living. The loss of our Constitution and the junking of our Bill of Rights. The loss of our army and navy. The negation of individuality and the triumph of collectivism. The negation of God and the era of materialism. The ultimate rebellion, and the long struggle back to freedom. This is the treacherous road to and from world government. It is not the road that free men and women will consciously select.

So the questions are answered and the course is clear. What to do?

The Benicia School Board? They did not know. The Governor was too busy planning his campaign for the Supreme Court. Anyway, the matter was not in his jurisdiction. The State Superintendent of Schools wanted all questions reduced to writing. Ultimately he ruled that such matters were in the hands of the local school board. A vicious circle; a dizzy merry-go-round. It took a
lot of running just to stay in the same place. The alarmed citizens of Benicia had gone through the looking-glass and had joined Alice in her incredible wonderland.

At a meeting of the Benicia School Board in 1950 representatives of the Chamber of Commerce, veteran’s organizations, and other civic and patriotic groups were denied permission by the Board members to discuss the loyalty views and the activities of the teachers to be employed for the coming school term. As a result a mass meeting of the citizens was called. The Commander of the local Post of the American Legion presided. He declared that four million veterans would fight to preserve the government of the United States. He read a resolution adopted by the veterans opposing any movement that called for the surrender of the sovereignty of the United States in favor of world government. A representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars—an organization that had done valiant service in Sacramento in helping rescind the resolution for world government—expressed the determination of its members to preserve American independence. A representative of the Young Men’s Institute echoed the patriotic stand of the veterans. Representatives of organization after organization followed with similar statements.

Benicia was a long way from world government.

The question of subversiveness arose in connection with the efforts of the United World Federalists. Was the movement prompted by the Communists? Was it subversive?

It is well known that communism is essentially an international movement. The essence of its totalitarian doctrine is oneness—a collectivism that tolerates no diversity of political viewpoint. Its objective is a one-world order, politically, socially and economically. It has but one god—Karl Marx—and its prophets and saints find mummified repose in the walls of the Kremlin or in the show-cases on Moscow’s Red Square. Its ideological schisms have revolved about the dogma of its international character. Bronstein (Trotsky) became an exile from the “worker’s paradise” because he insisted on immediate world conquest over Stalin’s determination to build “communism in one country.” The distinction is not important, as the differences are minute. Stalin desired a base of operation—an arsenal for the soldiers of international communism. The Communist Third International (the Comintern) still existed—and still exists under one guise or another.

Subversion is defined as an act of subverting, or state of being subverted; overthrow from the foundation; utter ruin; destruction; as subversion of a government or of despotic power; subversion of the constitution. Subversive is defined as tending to subvert; having a tendency to overthrow, upset or destroy.

The citizens of Benicia learned that the United World Federalists, Inc. had not been listed by any official agency of the state or Fed-
eral governments as communistic or subversive. It was learned, however, that many of the members of the organization had been credited by official governmental groups with records of communistic sympathies, communist-front organizations, and kindred activities. This fact, standing alone, proves very little, as it is well established that many patriotic citizens have been induced to join simon-pure communist organizations by being sold a bill of goods on some particular point of interest, such as “peace” and “warm milk” for the school children of central Africa. The communist propagandists are past-masters in the art of window dressing and there is always an abundant supply of American “do-gooders” with pronounced blind-spots for the proper approach.

Is the United World Federalist, Inc. subversive? In order to be “subversive” must there be a declaration of that status by an official agency of government? The answer to the first question must be an emphatic “yes”, and the answer to the second an equally emphatic “no”. Does the United World Federalists, Inc. advocate the overthrow of the sovereignty of the United States? It does, but its activities are perfectly legal and within the provisions of the Constitution of the United States itself. It advocates an amendment to the Constitution by constitutional methods, which, if adopted, would, of course, destroy the Constitution and all that it stands for. In a sense the movement is in the category of national suicide by legitimate means, and there is not much that anyone can do about it. It becomes, quite obviously, a vehicle of great importance to the enemies of the United States. Under its shield the communists and other internationalists may work safely without incurring any particular danger to themselves. The movement could accomplish what the might of foreign armies and navies with all their terror of atomic weapons might never achieve. Yet, the organization is subversive in that it tends to subvert, and has a tendency to overthrow both the Constitution and the sovereign government of the United States.

The confusion that exists in the minds of the most intelligent is not accidental. It was planned that way. There are but few Americans who realize that a communist is only a socialist in a hurry and with a club. The socialist and the communist take their text from the same socialist bible, and Marx is their final authority. For some unaccountable reason few Americans appear capable of reading the houx that is concealed in the initials of the official name of Communist Russia—Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Because the land of communism is generally referred to as “Soviet Russia,” or the “U. S. S. R.,” the term “socialism” is seldom, if ever, associated with the single political party that controls it. Hence one may be an American “socialist” without incurring too much public scorn, whereas to be known as a communist in recent years is something else again. The American Socialist, however,
rarely publicizes the fact of his political orientation. He poses as a “liberal”, an “economic planner,” or some such equivalent. Many embryo socialists actually do not acknowledge themselves as such, and, while advocating the policies of socialism, heartily criticize socialism and strongly oppose communism. In the chaos that results the communist successfully disguises his character, denies his party affiliation, and hides his activity under the legal umbrella of some group traveling in his direction.

No less an authority than Lenin has carefully explained “socialism” and “communism”. “The scientific differences between socialism and communism is clear,” he writes in *State and Revolution*. “What is generally called socialism was termed by Marx the ‘first’ or lower phase of communist society... The great significance of Marx’s explanation lies in that here, too, he consistently applies materialist dialectics, the theory of development, and regards communism as something which develops out of capitalism. Instead of scholastically invented, ‘concocted’ definitions and fruitless disputes about words (what is socialism? what is communism?), Marx gives an analysis of what may be called stages in the economic ripeness of communism.”

Understanding is frequently confounded by the simplicity of a question which excludes essential elements. Inquisitiveness is often satisfied by a ready answer that actually is no answer at all. Thus one generation may be satisfied with the proposition that the world is supported by the shoulders of Atlas; another with the explanation that Atlas stands on the back of a turtle, and total satisfaction thereafter. The turtle becomes the end of the matter. It will not do, therefore, to merely say that the phenomenon of a movement for world government is simply a manifestation of the internationalist aspect of communism; nor may we be satisfied with the explanation that communism is merely the product of the industrial revolution. All reasoning clamors for solid ground somewhere, and common sense establishes the existence of the fact, if it cannot immediately locate and describe it. A search for the common denominator becomes imperative if the puzzle is to be solved.

It may reasonably be said that three social institutions have persisted since the beginning of recorded history—the Family, the Church, and the State. The instinct of family cohesion is undoubtedly the deepest God-ingrained instinct in the fiber of mankind. The religions of the ages, for the greater part, have found their strength in the hearts of their adherents in direct proportion to the degree that their doctrines have supplemented the cement of family relationships. Judaism not only supplemented the cement of the family relationships of Abraham and his seed—it congealed them. Christianity alone of all religions not only sanctified the family, but extended its solicitude into a spiritual
brotherhood such as the world had never known. The brothel and
the harem are incapable of producing family relationships in the
common acceptance of the meaning of the term, because the basic
element of the family unit is missing. Brotherhood in the spiritual
sense is equally impossible unless there exists a spiritual unit.
The attributes of brotherhood are possible only where there is
a spiritual fatherhood; a common tradition, culture, and com-
munity of ethical and spiritual principles. The State, in its normal
development, is an extended family-church unit, characterized by
a homogeneous people with a common tradition, culture and re-
ligion. Its normal growth and development follows the laws of
nature—which is to say the plan of God—and this growth and
development is as certain and as sure as that of plant and animal
life. Each kind seeks its own kind with the same tenacity of
purpose that water seeks its common level.

The State normally reflects the tradition, culture and religious
doctrines of its people, and, in spite of politics, the ambitions of
native rulers and conquering despots, it persists in doing so. Alien
elements become analogous to tainted food and, where completely
indigestible, they are regurgitated, often with great unpleasantsness
and violence. Compatible elements are quickly absorbed.

It is true that few states have enjoyed normal development.
Invaders, conquerors, and ambitious natives have continuously
disturbed the rhythm of growth. Hordes of barbarians and foreign
armies have rolled over nation after nation, leaving havoc and
ruin in their wake. History records but comparatively few in-
stances, however, where the invader has completely obliterated
the native tradition, culture and religion, and then, only where
the conquered were emerging from barbarism and ignorance.
Usually the conqueror is absorbed by the conquered. This is
particularly true where there exists a basic field of agreement
in the realm of culture and religion. Where no such common
ground existed the conquered rebelled and eventually overthrew the
conqueror. The foreign ruler must either assimilate with the
tradition, culture and basic religious principles of his people, or
utterly destroy them. And, paradoxically, if he destroys them, the
growth and development of the State he establishes follows the
normal pattern.

There have been many wars between states having a common
tradition, culture and religion. The causes of such wars are often
lost in the mists of time and bitterness, and, even when clearly
remembered, offer but little justification for the blood spilled. One
certainty remains, however, after weighing all the alleged reasons
for such wars, and that is, that those assigned were rarely the
actual causes. In the cases of wars between states of hetero-
geneous peoples, cultures and religions, the natural antagonisms
are clear and obvious, and such wars, in addition to the motives
of plunder, have been distinguished by a proselyting fervor that included the sword as an instrument of conversion. Most of the conflicts in these two categories sought either the settlement of a political dispute, loot and plunder, or the imposition of a foreign culture and religion on another people. It would be impossible, of course, to assign a single, clear-cut motive in any given instance, and it is, therefore, more than probable that a combination of motives always existed.

With the exceptions of Alexander the Great, the Roman Empire, and international communism as exemplified in the Soviet Union, few individuals and movements have actually sought the conquest of the entire world. It is true that conquerors such as Napoleon sought domination on a large scale, but complete control of the population and territories of the earth, while a propaganda dream of intriguing interest, can hardly be said to have been an actual objective. Colonial systems, such as perfected by Great Britain, have encompassed many people and territories, but in no single instance have these systems tended to develop into a single governmentally controlled homogeneous people. As a matter of fact the converse is true. Colonial people invariably develop a deep sense of nationalism which erupts in a patriotic explosion that ultimately expells the non-assimilable elements of the ruling power. India is a recent case in point. Colonial America is an illustration of a people who developed a sense of nationality and independence in spite of the fact that there existed between themselves and the people of Great Britain bonds of tradition, culture and religious principles.

The movement for world government is, therefore, contrary to human nature, and is not supported by the natural instincts of ordinary men and women. Its origin must be found in the basic instinct of some unusual breed of mankind; in the deep ingrained mental motivation of a peculiar people who, first, believe that they are destined to control the world and that it is to their particular advantage to do so; second, that they are a special people, apart from and superior to all mankind; and finally, that all mankind must be reduced to a homogeneous mass without special distinction or individuality; a robot, passive multitude that will serve the master-race without thought or question. Such a people would necessarily be characterized by a passionate instinct of exclusiveness in their relationships with each other, and an aggressive internationalism in their relationships with all others. They must present one face for their own people and an entirely different face for all others. Most of all they must have and continue to nourish a deep contempt and hatred for all people other than their own. They must have, as a cornerstone to their religion, an abiding sense of destiny in their mission. They must exercise a dual morality in which the right or wrong of things is determined
only by the purpose to be served. Where their mission becomes unattainable by the sword and the engines of war, it must become not only proper and right, but mandatory, that they continue on their course with stealth and cunning. Ideas and ideologies become weapons of war to be used and discarded, and their strongest allies must be recruited from among their intended victims. Such a breed must be capable of the most complex treachery. They must possess the ability to appear to be all things to all men, and yet be only themselves. An indestructible nation, they must destroy all other nations. And moreover they must possess a patience that sets the immortality of nation and race above any concept of individual immortality and personal salvation.

World government is not merely a movement to be understood and stopped. It is but a single manifestation of a deep laid and cleverly designed onslaught against the foundations of freedom and Christian civilization. Its achievement conceivably might effectually blot out the sunlight of liberty and smother the culture of Christianity for ages to come. Its strength is in the seductiveness of its arguments and the ignorance of its converts. They have seen to it that their opponents are effectively gagged and that their voices may not be heard for lack of the media of communication. It is difficult to attack the fallacious arguments of the demagogue who couches the results of this ideological fixation in terms of diversionary appeal to popular fancy. The truth is often too deeply buried in the complexity of the half-concealed and the secret. The art of propaganda successfully colors the thinking processes of the people and strange mental taboos effectually block the openings to hidden facts. Before the sinister forces that direct the conspiracy against freedom and Christianity can be routed they must be known.

The Benicia story is being repeated everywhere throughout Christendom. The struggle is for the minds of men. The vehicles of propaganda are under the direction of those who would control the parliament of the world. The terrible power of the purse and sanguine revolution are tethered on the same leash ready for simultaneous release. The subservient politician does the bidding of the masters who may make or break him at will. The failure, the frustrated, the dissident, and the lost are willing tools ready at hand for the purposes of the makers of mental fetters. Totalitarianism marches forward on a thousand fronts, wearing a different face for every point on the compass. And nowhere does its insidious seduction make such progress as within the halls of education.

Nearly all the avenues of escape from the closing net of slavery have been closed and they are carefully guarded. Mere approach by the least courageous sounds a thousand alarms. He who dares is cut down in his tracks by those he would succor. He who would
tell the truth is ridiculed and scorned by those who most need to know the truth. Those who know or guess the truth are made to appear “mentally ill.” No martyrs! Martyrs become heroes, and heroes beget leaders and followers! Had Joan of Arc been declared “mentally ill” and confined to an institution for the insane, France would have suffered her chains for the sake of her sanity. Those who are repelled at the thought of a collectivist society and a one-world government are disposed of as members of the “anti-social crack-pot fringe”—and the less courageous will accept both ideas rather than join the society of “screw-balls”. In short, it is dangerous to fight for freedom; for independence—for the Constitution of the United States!

Man has been endowed by his Creator with the faculty of reason, and has been given the power to exercise his will as his reason and conscience dictate. He is blessed at birth with an instinctive sense of self-preservation which extends to the preservation of his family, his church and his country. Only the most powerful and sinister influences are capable of blunting these God-given virtues, and it is doubtful if all the powers of evil may do so for any length of time. The new born child soon learns that fire burns, and it would take considerable persuading to convince him to the contrary so long as he carries the scars of his primary lesson. Mankind, unfortunately, does not carry the scars of the lessons of history and it is the lot of each generation to suffer old hurts and bruises anew. History teaches different peoples different things about the same condition. Those who seek power through domination of nations, learn of the mistakes of those who tried and failed, and such errors are carefully noted and their repetition avoided. Those who would not be dominated may find and learn the methods of those who resisted and succeeded, and apply them in their own efforts to be free. As history continues to stretch into an ever expanding panorama, the mistakes of the power-mad are reduced to a single term—method. The power-mad men of history failed because the people they would enslave could see their swords, their troops, their cavalry, and their ordnance. They understood, and knew how to fight back. Conquered people, after all, do not make good slaves, because they remember freedom. Such slaves have always rebelled when the opportunity came—and it always came. What then is the lesson for those who would dominate? Is there a new, a different method by which men may be conquered?

If mankind can be convinced that evil is good and that slavery is freedom, no one will henceforth desire to be good or free. If, by mass hypnotism, it is enlightened and a sign of intelligence to be a mere cog in a collectivist machine rather than an individual endowed with human dignity, then everyone will be a cog in a collectivist machine. If the highest religious concept is the nega-
tion of God, and the worship of materialism the greatest religion, then everyone will become a pious atheist. If the meaning of the old terms remain while the condition or status they describe are gradually reversed, mankind may be coerced into fighting for his chains. 

It takes a lot of doing to reverse the established thinking of the masses of people, but it has been going on at a rapid pace, and it could be accomplished. Within a comparatively short few years, the people of the United States, after refusing to become part of the League of Nations, now find themselves an important factor in the United Nations. Since 1917, after refusing to become entangled in the intrigues and wars of Europe, the United States has forged to the front as the “world leader”. Its former policy of minding its own business is now slurringly referred to as “isolationism”. Unprecedented heavy taxing of its people for the support of foreign nations has become an accepted function of American government in spite of the fact that our forefathers went to war with Great Britain over a tax on imported tea. A list of all the apparent reversals of the thinking of the American people would require a book of many pages.

Children, of course, being impressionable, are the obvious victims of the propagandists. Children, moreover, constitute the voters of tomorrow. As their thinking is directed so will be their political bent. The children with whom they play at school today are the men and women they will marry tomorrow. If they are compelled to go to school with children of all races and creeds, they will marry men and women of all races and creeds. Within good time there will cease to be various races and creeds—just one mongrel-ized race without a creed. The leveling of intelligence to the common average and the glorification of the “collective” over individuality must result in the triumph of mediocrity. The abolition of competition not only means that there are no winners, it also means that there is no effort. Where there is no effort there is no achievement. And where there is no creed there is no God. Without God there is no morality, and without morality there can be no family. Only the state remains and the best kind of a state for faceless, raceless and Godless humanity is World Government.

What of those who have schemed these things? How will they escape the fate they have planned for the rest of mankind? Are they not building a monster that must ultimately destroy them also? They are not afraid. They are the master race. They believe they have planned well. They have carefully avoided the pit-falls they have dug for others. They have an inbred faculty that makes it impossible for them to practice what they preach to others. While they spend millions of dollars advocating racial integration, they meticulously avoid intermarriage with any others than their own kind. They preach international doctrines, but practice the
most narrow type of nationalism. They publicize the vices of racial superiority and yet proclaim that they are the master race and the Chosen of God. They decry persecution, intolerance and war, and, when they have the power, are the most implacable of persecutors, the most intolerant, and the most warlike. They are the destroyers of religion and holy things, yet they pose as the most persecuted of men. They launch revolutions, but seldom die on the barricades. They finance wars that they do not fight and always emerge as the only victors. They seldom are popular with the people but they usually run their governments. They preach communistic and collectivist theories but remain the bankers of the world. For two thousand years they have have been a single nation within nations, without a flag or a country of their own. Though disappointments, reverses, and the open antagonism of the peoples among whom they have lived have humbled and humiliated them, they have remained steadfast to the fixed star of their supposed mission. As a peculiar and exclusive race, the chosen of God, they are fully convinced of their exalted destiny. They believe that they and their seed are to be the ultimate rulers of the world. Moreover, they have faith that the time is now.

This work of research and study began with the Benicia story. It has led into some of the buried and almost inaccessible recesses of history. The result is an amazing and shocking story, but its truth cannot be controverted. Its telling has become a Christian and American duty. It is not written with any intentional sense of ill-feeling or animosity against any person, race or creed. It is factual and it is documented. That it will be repressed by every possible means is a foregone conclusion. Every effort will be made to destroy it, to keep it from being distributed and read; to ignore it. Should these efforts fail or partially fail, every means of communication will be utilized to discredit the author. All of the established tactics of smear and ridicule will be brought into use, and it is quite possible that these efforts will be successful. One thing will not be done. No one will attempt to refute its facts or meet its challenge in open, public debate.

Peace and tranquility are to be found only in the hearts of men. Artificial boundaries, expanded to include the world or narrowed to confine a few acres, have never brought, nor can they possibly bring, peace and brotherhood. Without the Fatherhood of God through His blessed Son Jesus and the Holy Ghost there can be no brotherhood of man. When the beasts of the Apocalypse have been destroyed, then, and only then, will God’s eternal peace settle over the land.

“If any man have an ear, let him hear. He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints.”
BEASTS OF THE APOCALYPSE

BOOK I - PART ONE
“We Jews, we, the destroyers, will remain the destroyers for ever. NOTHING that you will do will meet our needs and demands. We will for ever destroy because we need a world of our own, a God-world, which is not in your nature to build.”

— “You Gentiles,” by Maurice Samuel
WHEN Abram was ninety-nine years old Jehovah appeared before him and, after changing his name to Abraham, established a covenant which was to be everlasting between Jehovah and Abraham’s seed: “And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all of the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God.”

Thus it was that the Jews came to believe that they were the Chosen People of God and that all other peoples were outcasts. “The forces of the Gentiles shall come to thee... and the sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and their Kings shall minister unto thee... Thou shalt suck the milk of the Gentiles... ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles, and in their glory shall ye boast yourselves... and the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and Kings to the brightness of thy rising... Therefore thy gates shall be open continuously... that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their Kings may be brought. For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted... and strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and the sons of the alien shall be your ploumen and your vine dressers....”

The rabbis nourished the theme and created a peculiar people. Despised throughout the world, residents in many countries though citizens of none, cosmopolitan yet self-segregated, international in Gentile affairs and narrowly nationalistic as Jews—orthodox, reformed, agnostic or atheistic—their collective orientation is toward a world government that they are fully convinced they will rule. As the “chosen people” they believe their destiny must ultimately be fulfilled—that all Gentile nations must finally serve the sons of Abraham. Has the Torah not outlawed the issue of a Gentile as that of a beast? Does the Talmud not condemn the Gentiles as “a band of strange children whose mouths speaketh vanity and whose right hand is a right hand of falsehood”? Did not the great Talmudian, Simon ben Yohai, declare that “the best among the Gentiles deserves to be killed”? Certainly, then, the Chosen People of Jehovah must one day rule the world and its stupid Gentile cattle. “Blessed be thou... who hast not made me a goi” is the recommended “benediction” of Rabbi Judah ben Illai.

The faith of the Jews that they, as the Chosen People, will ultimately rule the world, while based on their misconception of the covenant between Jehovah and Abraham, is a manifestation of a race-superiority concept that towers a hundred times over any idea ever advanced by Hitler. It is an amazing concept that divides the world into two classes: the Chosen People and “cattle”.

“For thou art an holy people unto the Lord: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all People that are upon the face of the earth... and thou shall...”

—25—
consume all the people which the Lord thy God shall deliver thee; thine eyes shall have no pity upon them: neither shalt thou serve their gods; for that will be a snare unto thee."

"The Jews are a distinct nationality," declared Justice Louis D. Brandeis of the Supreme Court of the United States. Said Theodor Herzl: ‘I will give you my definition of a nation; and you can add the adjective ‘Jewish’. A nation is, in my mind, an historical group of men of recognizable cohesion held together by a common enemy. Then, if you add to that the word ‘Jewish’ you have what I understand to be the Jewish Nation."

Herzl, the founder of modern Zionism, envisioned a colorful Jewish nation. “Our High Priest will wear imposing ceremonial dress,” he wrote. “Our cuirassiers will have yellow trousers, white tunics. Officers, silver cuirasses... I need the duel, in order to have proper officers... I incline to an aristocratic republic."

"And seeing the multitudes, He went up into a mountain: And when He was set, His disciples came unto Him: And He opened His mouth, and taught them, saying, Blessed are the poor in spirit, for their's is the Kingdom of heaven... Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy... Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for their's is the Kingdom of heaven... Ye have heard that it has been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you... Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them..."

The law of Moses and the jurisprudence of Rome... "What shall we do with Jesus that is called the Christ?"

While Jesus sojourned in Galilee the Great Sanhedrin had no legal jurisdiction over Him. When He entered Jerusalem He came under its control. The Romans, wise in rule of conquered provinces, governed Judaea by a system of modified home rule. The members of the Great Sanhedrin exercised their judicial functions over the Jews, but were denied the right of inflicting the death penalty. The Roman procurator, however, usually ratified the death sentence imposed by the Sanhedrin.

The Great Sanhedrin of Jerusalem under Roman occupation was the supreme council and tribunal of the Jews. It developed out of the municipal council of Jerusalem and consisted of seventy-one members. It had jurisdiction over Jewish religious matters and the more important civil and criminal cases. It met daily except on Sabbaths and festivals. According to the rabbinical tradition, the Great Sanhedrin was presided over by a president, the Nasi
After two days was the feast of the passover, and of unleavened bread: and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take Him by craft, and put Him to death. But they said, Not on the feast day, lest there be an uproar of the people"

The high priests of the Great Sanhedrin were quite confident that they were acting within their jurisdiction when they issued a warrant for the arrest of Jesus, charging Him, most probably, with inciting the riot in the Temple. Under the guise of this legality they were able to obtain from Pilate a cohort of soldiers under command of a tribune to aid the Temple police and to protect themselves in the enterprise. It was the first union of Jew and Roman for the destruction of Christianity and it must last until Constantine defeated Licinian at Chrysopolis. Stealthily the armed group approached the garden of Gethsemane...

"Then the band and the captain and officers of the Jews took Jesus and bound him..."

The examination of Jesus before Annas was illegal as no preliminary interrogatories were allowed. The trial before the Great Sanhedrin was equally illegal, as its convening was not formal, contained a packed quorum of twenty-three, and, in addition, there is considerable doubt whether the day was one on which its action would have the effect of law. Contrary to all the rules of Jewish law, the session was held at night, although the court's decision was rendered at dawn. Jewish law provided that the Sanhedrin must adjourn for a period of at least twelve hours before it might legally impose a sentence of condemnation.

"Now Caiaphas was he, which gave counsel to the Jews that it was expedient that one man should die for the people... Annas had sent Him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest... Then they led Jesus from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgment: and it was early; and they themselves went not into the hall of judgment, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover. Pilate then went out unto them, and said, What accusation bring ye against this Man? They answered and said unto him, If He were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered Him up unto thee. Then said Pilate unto them, Take ye Him, and judge Him according to your law. The Jews therefore said unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death..."

"I find in Him no fault at all," declared Pilate when he had finished questioning Jesus.

Annas and the high priest Caiaphas had blundered. Had they presented Jesus to Pilate charged only with blasphemy—the crime for which the Great Sanhedrin had condemned Him to death, Pilate would probably have ratified the death sentence without inquiry—
blasphemy being one of the ecclesiastical crimes over which the Sanhedrin had full jurisdiction. But a second count was added to the indictment—treason. Pilate was not convinced. Perhaps Annas and Caiaphas did not blunder after all; the penalty in Judea for blasphemy was stoning.

High treason (majestas) was the most serious offense known to Roman law, except the crime of sacrilege. The penalty was either banishment or death. When Pilate refused to ratify the sentence of crucifixion (the mode of death for malefactors and slaves) decreed by the Great Sanhedrin on the basis of the general unspecified warrant, the Jews were compelled to formulate charges in conformance with Roman law. Each count in such an indictment must be tried separately. Therefore, the Jews charged Jesus with three counts, perverting the nation, forbidding tribute to Caesar, and making Himself a King. Pilate found little evidence to support the first two counts and probably would have thrown out the third if he had not been acting under Roman policy of appeasing the leaders of the conquered province.

"Then Pilate entered into the judgment hall again, and called Jesus, and said unto him, Art thou the King of the Jews? Jesus answered him, Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me? Pilate answered, Am I a Jew? Thine own nation and the chief priests have delivered thee unto me: what hast thou done? Jesus answered, My Kingdom is not of this world: if my Kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my Kingdom not from hence."

And still Pilate could find no fault in Him. To the procurator Jesus was a religious man, a philosopher of some kind, and, certainly, no threat to the great Caesar. The acquittal led to an outburst of protests from the mob led by the high priests. The traditions of Rome trembled in the balance. Someone screamed "crucify the Galilian," and Pilate—although he had already acquitted Jesus—illegally referred the case to Herod Antipas, who wanted no part in a charge of majestas. Herod Antipas attempted to appease the priests by compelling Jesus to don "gorgeous apparel"—the purple robes of royalty—and had Him taken back to Pilate.

The proceedings that followed shamed the vaunted Roman justice. The rights of the Accused were utterly ignored. Once acquitted and completely exonerated of all charges, Jesus faced the same charged without a reindictment. For two hours Pilate wrestled with his conscience, his sense of justice, Roman policy, duty, and the fanatical Jews who demanded the extreme degradation of the Man who had taught the Kingdom of God and repudiated Jehovah's covenant with Abraham.
Pilate yielded. The Roman judges pronounced the death sentence and called on the sun to witness the justice of their act. Pilate, to appease his conscience and outraged Roman justice, resorted to a Jewish practice. He called for water, and tossed the responsibility of his verdict on the priests of the Great Sanhedrin. And then in a last desperate attempt to save an innocent Man, he addressed the fanatical Jewish mob. "Ye have a custom," he cried, "That I should release unto you one at the passover: will ye therefore that I release unto you the King of the Jews? Then cried they all again, saying, Not this Man, but Barabbas. Now Barabbas was a robber."

Jewish propaganda would leave the impression that the Diaspora—the great dispersion of the Jews—came with the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. History does not support this general belief. Long before the birth of Jesus the really great centers of the Jews were outside Palestine. And the Jews in these centers had largely abandoned the sacrificial, sacerdotal characteristics of Judaism, and the synagogue had become more important to them than the Temple priests. The fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple did not destroy Judaism; it has been said that it destroyed Jewish Christianity. Instead of the high priest at Jerusalem, the Jews substituted a patriarch at Tiberias. For the political intrigues of the Temple at Jerusalem they established rabbinical schools. The changes were barely felt. But the rabbis kept Jewish eyes on Jerusalem with increasing intensity as the destruction of the Temple more and more receded into the misty glamour of the passing centuries. As Jews they grew more exclusive. The two drachmae per Jew which they had hitherto sent to Jerusalem was now paid to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus and Judaism continued to be protected by Rome. The Flavians and the Antonines dared not yield to the protests of the mobs; Rome needed the Jews for the finances of the Empire.

It has been said that the dislike felt for the Jews by the citizens of the countries in which they resided, and the protection given them by the rulers of those countries for reasons of self-interest, constitute "two of the most permanent features of history."

A strange and peculiar people; a people self-segregated and apart; a people chosen by God over all others; meticulously fair and just with their own, yet crafty and shrewd and unjust with Gentiles; it is little, wonder that the Gentiles would believe poisonous and malicious tales about them. They worshipped the head of an ass, reported Tacitus, because, when dying of thirst in the wilderness, a herd of wild asses led them to water. The Egyptians had run them out of Egypt because of their leprosy. Plutarch reported that the pig was their god, and Juvenal observed that the
hogs never die except of old age in Palestine, because the Jews look upon the flesh of swine as more precious than human beings. And the people believed. Men who spent every seventh day in idleness were incomprehensible to the Romans. They could not understand a people who refused to succor another human being unless he happened to be circumcised. Never before had there been sojourners in Rome who asked for so much and contributed so little; never before an alien people who demanded so much of Roman law and yet so fully despised it. It was said that the Jews who controlled certain districts in Alexandria annually offered a Greek in sacrifice to their God—a libel against the Jews that persisted in one form or another through the centuries. In spite of police and the protection of the rulers, the populace occasionally threw all precaution to the winds and slaughtered the Jews and burned their houses.

The fanatical burning hatred of the Jews for the Christians far surpassed the hatred the Romans felt for the Jews. The synagogues, according to Tertullian were “the sources of persecution” of the Christians—and their synagogues might be found in nearly every province of the Empire. While the greatest number of Jews might be found in Alexandria their societies flourished everywhere. “The customs of this notorious people,” complained Seneca, “have already come into such fashion that they have been introduced into every land; the conquered have given laws to the conquerors.”

The number of Jews scattered throughout the Roman Empire accounted little for their wide-spread influence among Rome’s officialdom. They were then, as they are now, the bankers of the world. They remained Jehovah’s chosen people—a nation in exile which must surely one day control the world. This central theme of their religion was the strongest weapon in their arsenal; the most potent force for offense and defense. It excluded patriotism for the country of their birth or adoption. The world about them was a world to exploit and loot and the Gentile cattle that tolerated them were outside the mercy of Jehovah and the private scheme of things embodied in the covenant with Abraham. After all, was the world not theirs? Had it not been said: “For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted…”

It was the Jews of Rome who convinced the police that the Christians were not entitled to the political and religious privileges which were accorded the Jews. On every occasion thereafter the Jews aroused the authorities against the Christians. “The Jews treat us as open enemies,” said Justin Martyr, “putting us to death and torturing us, just as you heathens do, whenever they can.” For the greater part, however, the Jews acted with oriental subtlety and cunning, continuously stirring up the heathen mobs against
followers of Jesus. They scattered horrible charges about them throughout the Empire. They invented scandals about the birth of Jesus, and spread stories far and wide that Christians sacrificed children during their rituals. And the people believed.

Judaism had been recognized as a *religio licita* by Julius Caesar, who conferre on it and its followers many special privileges. While Tiberius and Claudius made efforts to check the growing Jewish population of Rome, most of Julius Caesar's successors continued his policy, and some of them actually augmented Jewish liberties. While Roman policy granted civil jurisdiction to the people of a conquered province, it was hardly to be expected that such a policy would be extended to an alien people within the empire. But, amazing as it may seem, Rome made an exception of the Jews and granted them civil jurisdiction over their communities. They were exempt from military service—an exemption not granted to conquered tribes. The Jew alone, of all people in the empire, was excused from offering sacrifices to the fortunes of Caesar and Rome.

* * * * *

The obsession of world domination produced a mutinous and fanatical disposition in the Jews. In spite of the hatred they inspired in the pagan populace, they were protected and comparatively well treated under the reigns of most of the Roman emperors. They were particularly well treated under Nerva. There was no gratitude, however, in Israel. Each Jew was a sovereign in his own right and the proud Roman who lorded it over him was his ordained slave. Collectively the sons of Abraham would vanquish the Gentile and rule the world from the new temple they would build on Mount Zion.

The Spaniard, Ulpianus Trajan succeeded Nerva as emperor of the Roman Empire. Jews and Christians were still confused in the popular mind, and, because Christianity had emerged from Judaism, the pagan world in the first century looked upon both as Jewish. Trajan, wise and upright as he was, undoubtedly looked upon the Christian and the Jew as a single product of Palestine and practicers of "foreign superstition." Consequently the insurrections, massacres, and atrocities of the Jews in the Eastern Empire reacted against the Christians.

During the war of Trajan with Parthia the Roman legions were withdrawn from the African provinces. Only a few under-manned garrisons remained to enforce the peace and maintain the authority of the Roman governors. The fall of Jerusalem was fresh in the minds of Jews then living, and the rabbis and elders were aflame with preparation for the day of deliverance and the fulfillment of the Covenant. Jewish couriers quietly carried the message of
insurrection into every Jewish community in the Empire. Great stores of arms were secretly acquired and carefully hidden. “Soon the Temple will be rebuilt” became the pass-word of greeting, uttered with passionate significance, if in guarded tone.

In Judea the conspiracy was led by Julianus and Pappus, both of whom held positions of importance among the Jews. The revolutionary troops mobilized on the plain of Rimmon, or the great plain of Jezreel. In Cyrene the Jews were under the leadership of Andrew and Lucuas (thought by some historians to be the same man under two names). The withdrawal of Roman troops from the provinces was probably the signal for the revolt. In any event, it broke simultaneously with wild fury throughout the heavily Jewish populated provinces of the Empire.

The Greeks, of course, were the immediate victims of Jewish fury. All Egypt, both Alexandria and Thebais, with Cyrene, arose. The Jewish successes in Egypt were immediate. The Greeks retreated before them, falling back to Alexandria. The City fell to the Greeks and most of its Jewish population perished. Headed now by Andrew and Lucuas, the Jewish armies swept over all Lower Egypt, where they were reinforced by additional thousands. They penetrated Thebais and butchered all who stood in their way. The Roman army under Lupus, dispatched to quell the revolt, was defeated. The pagan world, immersed in cruelty, had never witnessed such scenes of horror and barbarity. The Jews, in a frenzy of blood, killed every Gentile within striking distance—“they killed a multitude of people countless as the sands of the sea.” Nor were they content with merely killing. Some of the Gentile leaders were sawed asunder from head to foot. They flayed the Gentile bodies, and clothed themselves with the skins. They twisted the entrails of the slain and wore them as girdles. They anointed themselves with the blood of their victims. The victors, who disdained to eat the flesh of swine, feasted on the bodies of their enemies. Captives were thrown to wild beasts, or forced to fight each other to the death as gladiators in the arenas. 220,000 Gentiles fell in Egypt, while not a single goim of either sex or age was left alive in Cyprus—some 240,000. The populous city of Salamis became a desert.

Lupus, the Roman governor, without troops after his defeat, was helpless to stay the horror about him. Terror, such as had never before been known, swept the land. Meanwhile, Hadrian (afterward emperor) landed his legions on Cyprus and defeated the Jews, whom he expelled from the island. Not even a shipwrecked Jew was ever again permitted to land on the island without inflicting the penalty of death.

Marcus Turbo landed with a considerable force of cavalry and legions on the coast of Cyrene. He soon suppressed the insur-
rection in that province and marched upon Egypt where Lucuas still spread death and terror. Lucuas and his Jewish butchers attempted to force their way by the Isthmus of Suez, and some of them are believed to have escaped into Palestine. It is recorded that the Jewish losses exceeded the number that fled Egypt under Moses—600,000.

With the destruction of the Alexandrian synagogue, “The glory of Israel departed.”

* * * * *

The Jews believe that the idea of their personal Messiah is the natural outcome of the “prophetic future hope.” They look upon Isaiah as the first prophet who gave a detailed picture of the future ideal king. The Messiah is inseparably bound up with their desire of universal dominion. The newly risen Messiah, they believe, will be a scion of Jesse, and he will stand forth as a beacon to other nations, and the world will come to him for guidance and arbitration. The Messiah of Micah will hold dominion over all the nations. He is “a righteous sprout of David,” who will establish just judgment over all the world, and Jerusalem is to be his capitol.

A Messiah of the house of David will arise who will reestablish the greatness of Israel and extend its rule to all nations. His scheduled arrival was expected at the end of the fourth century (Apocalypse of Baruch). He would utterly destroy the world-empire of Rome. The last emperor would be taken alive, after the complete destruction of his legions, and carried in chains to Mount Zion to be judged by the Messiah. After having heard a recital of his long list of iniquities, the emperor would be put to death by the hand of the Messiah himself. All hostile nations not destroyed with the Roman empire, would be conquered. Thereafter the Messiah would rule the entire world until the end of time.

Other Jewish concepts of the Messiah picture a righteous man who will rule the world under the direction of Jehovah. This more spiritual concept contemplates a conquest of the world by divine means for the establishment of universal peace. Violence and physical compulsion, according to this theory, are replaced by love and justice. The conquest of this Messiah is to be accomplished by a change of heart in all humanity at the moment of the instantaneous acceptance of the mission of Israel.

A rabbinical concept holds that the Messiah is already here and that he leads a hidden life. Some assert that he was born at Bethlehem on the day that the Temple was destroyed. It is believed that he may come like a thief in the night, or make his appearance like a flash of lightning. And no one may foretell his coming.

Whatever the Jewish concept may be—whether the Messiah is already born, or is yet to come—the central and constant essence of the idea is that the Messiah will deliver Israel from the Gentiles,
reestablish the glory of Jerusalem, and rule the world from that ancient seat of Jewish power.

There have been an amazing number of equally amazing Jewish characters who have claimed to be either the Messiah himself or the Ephraimitic Messiah—the forerunner of the Davidic Messiah. Many were unquestionably conscious imposters, exploiting for their own self-interest the hopes and beliefs of the Jewish communities. Some of them quite conceivably may have been deluded into believing they were, in fact, what they pretended to be. A few may have assumed the fraud as an aid to a sincere desire to spread some particular doctrine that might not be acceptable if presented by a mere man. Whatever their motives, they all posed as the deliverer of Israel.

* * * * *

Bar Kokba is probably the first in importance among these imposters. He was hailed as Messiah-King by Akiba: "There shall come forth a star out of Jacob, and a scepter shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite through the corners of Moab... I will shake the heavens and the earth and I will overthrow the thrones of Kingdoms..."

The insurrection of the Jews of Cyrene, Cyprus, and Egypt had hardly been suppressed when a new rebellion broke forth in Palestine. Hadrian ascended the throne in 118 with the picture of the horrible massacre of the people of Cyprus by the Jews still revoltingly fresh in his mind. Marcius Turbo had sentenced to death the brothers Julian and Pappus, but the sentence was not carried out. Lucius Quietus, conqueror of the Mesopotamia Jews, was given command of the Roman army in Palestine after the execution of Turbo. Lucius' first act was the siege of Lydda, where the Jews had gathered for a determined stand. He soon took the place by storm and the Jews were either slain or executed—Pappus and Julian among them.

For fifteen years the Jews nourished their hatred of Hadrian and again secretly prepared to renew the rebellion. They sabotaged the weapons they were compelled to manufacture for the Romans, so that they were rejected and returned to them. Caves were converted into hiding places and fortifications. Rabbi Akiba traveled to the Jewish communities in Europe and Asia secretly soliciting funds and support from the Jewish populations for the coming rebellion.

Bar Kokba is said to have been preparing for the war in the first years of the reign of Hadrian. He was a very remarkable person. He was able to blow burning tow (rope, or chain) from his mouth, and to hurl back with his knees the stones discharged by the Roman engines. He tested the courage of his soldiers by having them cut off a finger, and ordering every horseman to
torn a cedar up by the roots while riding at full speed. Two hundred thousand soldiers passed the first test, and two hundred thousand horsemen passed the second. Jews residing in foreign countries came to Judea in great numbers to swell Bar Kokba’s army. Samaritans and pagans also participated. It is said that Christians who refused to deny Jesus were tortured, but Jewish writers contend that they were tortured for refusing to assist Bar Kokba in the war.

Rufus, the Governor-General, was unable to withstand the first onslaught of Bar Kokba’s armies. Fifty strongholds and nine hundred and eighty-five undefended towns and villages were lost to the Jews at the beginning of the war. Publius Marcellus, legate of Syria, was sent to Rufus’ aid, but he was soon overwhelmed and defeated. Julius Severus was recalled from Britain by Hadrian and given command. He marched into Palestine from the north, and in a series of battles, culminating in the fall of Bethar, he brought the war to an end. Here, on the walls of his principal stronghold, Bar Kokba was slain. The war had lasted three and one-half years, and Bar Kokba’s failure as a Messiah put an end to Messianic appearance for several centuries. Messianic hopes, however, continued to flourish.

The *Talmud* expected the true Messiah to appear between 440 and 471. Jewish hopes ran high, so that the announcement of Moses of Crete that he was the Messiah was greeted with fanatical fervor. Moses declared that he had come to lead the Jews back to Palestine, and promised that they would walk dry-shod through the sea to their ancient home. His followers, having sold all their possessions, gathered at the sea-shore at the appointed time. At the command of Moses they courageously plunged into the waves, where many were drowned. No one seems to know what happened to Moses. He was never heard of again.

Ishak ben Ya’Kub appeared in Persia at the end of the seventh century. He did not claim to be the Messiah himself. He contended that he was the last of five heralds of the Messiah, and that his immediate mission was to free Israel. Gathering a huge following he rebelled against the Calif, and was slain with his followers at Rai. He is credited with being the founder of the first sect that arose in Judaism after the destruction of the temple.

Yudghan (Al-Rai), a disciple of Ishak, Serene, David Alroy (or Alrui), Abraham Abulafia, Joseph Gikatilla, Samuel, Nissim ben Abraham, Moses Botarel of Cisneros, Asher Lemlehin, David Reuben, Solomon Molk, Isaac Luria, and Hayyim Vital Calabrese, are a few of the more important pseudo Ephraimic and Davidic
Messiahs that raised Jewish hopes of world domination throughout the centuries.

Sabbatai Zebi, the “Messiah” of the seventeenth century, probably made the deepest impression on world Jewry. Certainly his influence was more widespread than that of any of his predecessors. He founded, in a sense, a dynasty of Zebi Messiahs. It was said that each succeeding Zebi was a reincarnation of the first.

Sabbatai was born in Smyrna in 1626. During the war between Turkey and Venice, his father, Mordecai, amassed a fortune as the agent of an English interest doing business in Smyrna. His father’s ambition that Sabbatai become a rabbi was thwarted by Sabbatai’s lack of proficiency in the Talmud. The halakic and pilpulistic studies failed to inspire him with enthusiasm. His entire interest centered on mysticism and the Cabala.

The first half of the seventeenth century saw a great upsurge of Messianic agitation. Some Christians added their voices to the clamor by assigning the “apocalyptic year” to the year 1666. Manasseh ben Israel, in a letter to Cromwell urging the readmission of the Jews to England, did not hesitate to use the certainty of the Messiah’s coming as an argument in support of his plea. “The opinions of many Christians and mine do concur herein,” he wrote, “that we both believe that the restoring time of our Nation into their native country is very near at hand.”

The cabalistic Jews believed that the Zohar set the time of Israel’s triumph through the Messiah for the year 1648. Though he was only twenty-two when the fateful year of 1648 arrived, Sabbatai announced to a selected group of followers that he was the Messiah. He had come, he announced, to overthrow the governments of the world and to restore Israel to Jerusalem. The rabbis of Smyrna, and particularly Sabbatai’s teacher, Joseph Escapa, were not very deeply impressed with the pretentions of the young man, and eventually excommunicated him and his followers. A few years later he and his disciples were banished from Smyrna.

In Constantinople Sabbatai met Abraham ha-Yakini, who, impressed with the hoax, promptly forged a manuscript in archaic characters foretelling the event of Sabbatai’s birth. The document was accepted as an actual revelation, and Sabbatai immediately won many disciples and followers. In Salonica, a strong center of cabalists, he boldly proclaimed himself the Messiah. His celebration of his marriage as the son of God with the Torah, aroused the rabbis and he was banished from Salonica. In Cairo, Egypt, he met the wealthy and influential Raphael Joseph Halabi, who became one of his most zealous disciples.

As the apocalyptic year 1666 approached Sabbatai became concerned lest his Messiah-ship not be firmly established by that time.
He considered Jerusalem as a likely place in which to become a Messiah, and, consequently, journeyed to the Holy City, arriving there in 1663.

A Jewish orphan girl named Sarah had been found by Christians in Poland and sent to a convent, where she remained until she was about sixteen. She went to Amsterdam and later to Leghorn. Here she conceived the idea that she was to become the bride of the Messiah. Sabbatai heard the report during his second stay in Cairo. He immediately confirmed the girl’s story by announcing that such a wife had been promised him in a dream. (At least two wives had already divorced him on the ground that he had refuse to consummate the marriage.) Sarah was brought to Cairo where she was married to Sabbatai at Halabi’s house.

Financed by Halabi, Sabbatai and Sarah returned to Jerusalem. Passing through Gaza, Sabbatai met Nathan Benjamin Levi, who is known under the name of Nathan Ghazzati. Nathan professed to be Elijah, the precurser of the Messiah. Working closely with Sabbatai, Nathan in 1665 proclaimed far and wide that the year 1666 would mark the beginning of the Messianic age. Because the rabbis of Jerusalem threatened to excommunicate Sabbatai, Nathan announced that in the future Gaza would be the sacred city. Sabbatai returned to Smyrna where he made official proclamation of his messiahship. The Jews greeted him with delirious cries of “Long live our King, our Messiah!”

Samuel Primo, Sabbatai’s secretary, addressed the following circular to the whole of Israel:

“The first-begotten son of God, Sabbatai Zebi, Messiah and Redeemer of the people of Israel, to all the sons of Israel, Peace! Since ye have been deemed worthy to behold the great day and the fulfillment of God’s word by the Prophets, your lament and sorrow must be changed into joy, and your fasting into merriment, for ye shall weep no more. Rejoice with song and melody, and change the day formerly spent in sadness and sorrow into a day of jubilee, because I have appeared.”

Meanwhile Nathan was somewhat overdoing his publicity job. He announced everywhere that Sabbatai would soon place the sultan’s crown on his own head. Sabbatai, in search of a miracle, journeyed to Constantinople. The under-pasha, commissioned to receive him as he landed from the ship, welcomed him with a vigorous box on the ear. He was immediately arrested, loaded down with chains, and thrown in prison. Sabbatai bribed everyone he came in contact with, and, as a result, received the best of treatment. When he was transferred to a state prison, he was allowed to have his friends accompany him.

Meanwhile Nathan made capital out of the affair, spreading reports of the miraculous deeds being performed by the Messiah.
in Constantinople. Sabbatai's fame increased everywhere as did the hopes of world Jewry. Money was sent to him from nearly every Jewish community enabling him to live in royal splendor. The Turks finally permitted him to live in the castle of Abydos, where he reigned as a king.

European Jews prepared for their return to Palestine. Sabbatai's initials were posted in the synagogues, and prayers were said for him on Mondays and Thursdays as well as on Saturdays. His picture was printed together with that of King David in most of the prayer books together with his cabalistic formulas. Another imposter named Nehemiah ha-Kohen announced that he was a prophet and proclaimed the coming of the Messiah. Sabbatai ordered him to appear before him, which he did. Apparently the two could not get together and Sabbatai's followers contemplated the secret murder of the "prophet". Nehemiah, however, escaped to Constantinople and became a Mohammedan. Here he reported Sabbatai's treasonable plans to Turkish officials, who, in turn, informed the Sultan, Mohammed IV. Sabbati was immediately removed to Adrianople. The Sultan's physician, a former Jew, advised him that the only means he had of saving his life was to embrace Islam. When he was brought before the Sultan the following day (September 16, 1666), he threw off his Jewish garments and put a Turkish turban on his head. The Sultan was very pleased at this performance, and spared his life. He conferred on him the title "Effendi" and gave him a job as doorkeeper at a good salary. Sarah and a number of Sabbatai's followers went through the same instantaneous conversion. Sabbatia, now being a Mohammedan, was compelled to take an extra wife.

* * * * *

The pseudo-Messiahs accomplished more for the Jews and their fanatical ambition for world domination than is generally conceded. Each hoax made some psychological impression on many Christians. Doubts were instilled in their minds; first, whether Jesus was the promised Messiah; and, second, whether the prophecies of the Old Testament were founded on divine revelation. Many Christians, observing the reoccurring frenzy of the Jews in anticipation of the various comings of their Messiahs, compromised their faith, thereby giving rise to complex theologies that must one day shatter the solidarity of Christianity. Moreover, certain Christian writers and leaders, impressed by the "chosen people" myth and forgetful of the mission of Jesus extending God's salvation to all people, accepted the Jewish claim to ultimate world domination and set about rationalizing and reconciling the paradox.

The suppression by the Romans of the Jewish bid for world power by force of arms was a severe blow to Jewish pretentions in the century that followed the rise of Christianity. The wound
certainly appeared to be mortal, but history records its miraculous healing. The Jewish Rabbis were determined that the drive for the fulfilment of the Covenant would never cease. They were convinced that there were means of conquest yet undreamed, and they were certain that those means would be revealed and relentlessly pursued.

The ever-immediate task was the preservation of the Jewish Nation.

* * * * *

The Jews, although scattered throughout the known world, turned their eyes and hearts toward Tiberias. The solidarity of the race appears to have strengthened in dispersion. Uppermost in their minds was the exalted destiny promised them through Abraham, and the means by which that destiny must be achieved: the sign of the Covenant; the rite of circumcision; their Jewishness, and the purity of the seed of their great Patriarch. The rabbis, who had been hunted down by the Romans as the chief leaders of the atrocities in Africa and Cyprus, gradually emerged from hiding after the death of Hadrian. They were soon encouraged to reestablish their schools and synagogues.

The Great Sanhedrin, which the Jews themselves contended had never ceased to function, reasserted its authority over all Jewry. It ultimately founded its world headquarters in Tiberias, the city that Herod Antipas had built. The town had been erected over an ancient cemetery, and the site was objectionable as being unclean, until, with the aid of cabalistic art, Simon Ben Jochai discovered the exact boundaries of the cemetery and marked them off. With Simon, the son and heir of Gamaliel, acknowledged as the Patriarch of the Jews and Prince of the Sanhedrin, Tiberias became the capitol of the Jewish nation. The courts of law were reestablished with R. Nathan as Ab-beth-din, and R. Meir, Hachim, as Head of the Law. The Jews throughout the Roman Empire turned eagerly toward Tiberias. The orders of the Patriarch became the law of the Jews in Rome, Spain, Africa, and wherever else a Jew might find himself. Origen, a Christian, would later describe the power of the Jewish Patriarch: “Even now,” he wrote, “when the Jews are under the dominion of Rome, and pay the didrachm, how great, by the permission of Caesar, is the power of their Ethnarch! I myself have been a witness that it is little less than that of a king. For they secretly pass judgments according to their Law, and some are capitally condemned, not with open and acknowledged authority, but with the connivance of the Emperor. This I have learned, and am fully acquainted with, by long residence in their country.”

* * * * *

Wherever a Jewish community existed, there existed the syna-
A Legate of the Patriarch (called an apostle) made regular visits to the various synagogues, collecting revenue for the Temple and the Patriarch. These Legates had the power and authority to hear disputes and to regulate the life of the community. The Legates carried the Patriarch’s message of hatred for the Christians throughout the known world, repeating in each synagogue the Patriarch’s solemn curse upon the name of Jesus Christ. Each community was warned against “detested” Christianity, and admonished to do everything within their power to destroy it. These annual visits of the apostles of the Patriarch served to inflame the hatred of the farflung Jewish communities for their Christian neighbors, and drove them to greater zeal in their efforts of persecution. Although they despised the pagans about them, they hated the Christians more, and, whenever occasion arose, they joined the heathen in harassing the followers of Christ. They shouted for the execution of Christian martyrs, and busied themselves, as in the case of Polycarp, in keeping the burning wood close about the body of the expiring martyrs. When, within a few centuries, the physical monarchy at Tiberias had disappeared, the synagogues continued the mental enslavement of the Jewish communities. One people; one nation; a chosen people, destined to rule the world!

Those Jews who would free themselves from the invisible iron chains that bound them to the nation, faced punishments too horrible to contemplate. The Patriarch had the power of life and death over all Jews, and this power was later assumed by the synagogues. The scourging with forty stripes less one was a forceful argument in keeping a recalcitrant Jew in line. Perhaps, more dreadful than the scourgings, was the sentence of excommunication. This sentence had three degrees, the most severe being the _Shammata_—the irrevocable sentence of civil death. All of the curses conceivable by the human mind were heaped upon the excommunicated Jew who received the sentence of _Shammata_: “Let nothing good come out of him, let his end be sudden, let all creatures become his enemies, let the whirlwind crush him, the fever and every other malady and the edge of the sword smite him, let his death be unforeseen, and drive him into outer darkness.” The sentence did not end with death. No one dare mourn the outcast of Israel. His coffin was stoned and a heavy slab placed over his remains.

There was no escape!

Education was under the rigid control and guidance of the rabbis. As soon as a child could speak it learned to repeat basic religious axioms: the covenant with Abraham and hatred for the Gentiles. Between three and four years of age the child learned his letters. By the age of ten years he had been taught to read
the Torah and had learned of his exalted destiny as one of the chosen people. He then began his studies of the Mischna. At thirteen years and one day he assumed the solemn obligation to keep the six hundred and thirteen precepts of the Law. At fifteen, he commenced study of the Gemara. He was married at eighteen and went into business at twenty. There were no recesses or vacations included in this educational program. Every minute of the day and every day of the year had its precise regulation. Every act was molded to fit the tortured interpretation of Scripture, while the most trivial incident of existence was decided by the dialectic mental gymnastics of the men of the Talmud. The rather drab, immoral, and sordid history of the Jewish nation was painted in brilliant colors of magnificence, intermingled with the certainty of the glory of the future. The mind of the Jewish child developed in an ever-present straight-jacket of race-superiority; he was never permitted to forget for a second that he was one of Jehovah's very own. The Temple would be rebuilt; the Messiah would come; Israel would rule the world! And when that day came—woe to the Christian! Woe to the Gentile! "The Jew should rise early in the morning; his first thoughts and prayers should be on the desolation and restoration of Jerusalem. God hears the prayers of those who rise by night to weep for Jerusalem." There was not a single act in the life of the Jew that was not minutely governed in all of its ramifications and possible variations.

Constantine recognized the deep-seated hatred of the Jews for Christianity, and the statutes promulgated by him against them strongly indicate their necessity. The first of these statutes provided that any Jew who should stone, or endanger the life of a Christian convert, would be burned alive. All Christians were prohibited from becoming Jews. Before his death Constantine issued a decree prohibiting Jews from owning Christian slaves. Constantius, the son and successor to Constantine, continued the policies of his father. The Jews, although restricted in their persecutions, remained Roman citizens and exercised most of the special privileges granted them under Constantine's predecessors. Far from being oppressed and servile, as many Jewish apologists would indicate, they were arrogant and pugnacious. They became adept at choosing sides in a political feud, and, as they gained in experience, they became experts in fomenting and exciting such feuds. In Alexandria they insinuated themselves into the disputes of the Arians and Athanasians. They joined the Pagans under the Arian Bishop and committed such horrible atrocities that Athanasius relates them with reluctance and without shocking detail. They burned the Churches, profaning them with un-
thinkable outrages, and violated the consecrated virgins. The realization that a follower of the despised Christ was seated on the imperial throne of the Roman Empire drove them to exasperated fury.

The accession of Julian, the apostate, filled the heart of Jewry with a wild exultation. His first act was a denunciation of the Christians. It appears that Julian was moved by the same political considerations that would move Gentile politicians through the ages that were to come. His wooing of the Jews was designed to buy their support for his party and to thus win the Jews of Mesopotamia to his cause in the campaign against the Persians. In furtherance of this scheme Julian issued an edict for rebuilding the Temple on Mount Moriah. It is said that he was further influenced in this step by having learned that the Jews offered sacrifices, but that they might lawfully do so only on the site of their former Temple. It was Julian's considered opinion that sacrifice was the one certain sign of a true religion.

The arrogance and exultation of the Jews, when informed of Julian's decree to rebuild the Temple, knew no bounds. Some proclaimed Julian as the Messiah. Jews and wealth poured into Jerusalem. The excavations were finished and the foundations prepared. Flames suddenly burst from the hill, accompanied by a series of terrific explosions. It is said that an earthquake shook the mount, and that ashes of fire in the form of crosses settled on the garments of the workers. The Talmud not only fails to record the event, but fails to mention this third attempt to rebuild the Temple. Julian fell in his campaign against the Persians, and the Jews were compelled to postpone the matter until a more propitious time.

The early Church displayed an enthusiastic eagerness in making proselytes and particularly rejoiced in the conversion of the Jews. Such converts were welcomed with open-handedness reminiscent of the prodigal son. Many Jews took advantage of the opportunity thus offered, and traveled from Church to Church, submitting to baptism in each. It is said that many of them did a very profitable business in this trade of deceit. The practice apparently became so widespread that it became necessary to enact a law requiring an investigation and a probationary period before a Jew might be baptized.

* * * * * * *

The celebration of the feast of Purim became a symbolic orgy of hatred against the Christians. It was the one occasion when the entire Jewish community might give wild vent to its smoldering fanatical hate. Under guise of their ancestor's deliverance by Esther from the despised Haman, they made manifest their
intentions against the Christians by ill-concealed mockery and derision of Christianity. What the Jews did to Haman the Jews would do to Christians. Every time the hated name of Haman was uttered, the Jews beat the benches of the synagogue with stones and mallets, screaming and yelling with frenzied zeal. A gibbet was erected for the celebration, on which a figure representing Haman was suspended. Sometimes the gibbet was made in the form of a cross, with Haman's figure suspended in the manner of the Crucifixion. The appearance of this scene during the celebration called for complete audience participation, and the synagogues rang with cries of the crudest and most profane denunciations. The Christians, having no doubt as to the real meaning of the performances, were shocked and understandably indignant. Theodosius II put an end to these indecent scenes by the enactment of a law prohibiting the festival.

In a town named Inmester, between Chalcis and Antioch, two Jews publicly mocked and blasphemed the name of Christ. They erected a cross in the street, and having caught a Christian boy, fastened him to it, and scourged him so brutally that he died.

The Jews of Alexandria gathered in the dead of night and raised the cry that the great Church Alexander was on fire. Each Jew wore a ring of palm bark so that they might recognize each other in the dark. When the Christians rushed from all quarters to save their Church, the Jews fell on them and massacred them without mercy. The Archbishop Cyril, when daylight revealed the treachery, attacked the synagogues with a formidable force, killed many of the Jews, and drove the rest from the city.

The Jews had an almost complete monopoly of the slavetrade. While Europe was suffering under the crash and tumult of war, its Churches and Monasteries falling in ruins, and bankruptcy threatening the Christian world, the Jew grew rich and powerful as he drove his human chattels to the slave markets. He must have chuckled with deep satisfaction as he surveyed the young Christian men and women who made up the most valuable merchandise in his slave-gangs. The Church did everything within its power to put an end to this horrible traffic, but its voice went unheeded. Christian monarchs, however, had a rather honest excuse for their failure to enforce the edicts of the Church. To have prohibited the trade would have condemned the Christians to death. Invading and conquering armies had respect for human life only if it had value to them. Without the self-interest of gain from the sale of a captive, the vicious hordes attacking Christendom would have slain every Christian encountered. Hence, the
choice was between massacre or slavery, and the Christian rulers decided on the lesser of the two evils. So the Jew continued this odious calling without much hindrance.

* * * * * *

There is no single fact in history more clearly obvious than the peculiar animosity of the Jews for all peoples other than their own. It is only to be understood on the basis of the almost incredible obsession of race-superiority—the myth of the chosen people. The general antagonism against all Gentiles in general is surpassed only by Jewish hatred of Christianity in particular. If Christ was the Son of God and brought salvation to all the races of the world, then, of course, the Covenant with Abraham was misinterpreted by the Jews in the first place, or it was superseded by Christ's mission. The Jew—as long as he is hedged in the mental ghetto of his race—can never accept this doctrine. The Messiah he expected was to be an invincible warrior who would conquer the Gentiles, rebuild the Temple, and rule the nations of the world from the ancient seat of power in Jerusalem. The Jehovah of Judaism is a jealous God, and glory and power is only for the seed of Abraham who wear the scar of the Covenant. Organized Jewry will never abandon its inborn conviction that it is the chosen people. The passing of the centuries has neither dulled nor modified this ingrained faith of destiny. Only the interpretation of the means of accomplishment have been altered; new methods for old, and a concerted plan of action under modern and scientific planning. There is no need for blue-prints and maps of strategy. A tacit understanding is the in-built work of the synagogue, laminated with indestructible cement over a period of two thousand years.

Perhaps the Messiah expected so long is merely a symbol of their own genius; the tempered weapon of their own ingenuity. What might not be accomplished by the sword, may more easily be achieved by the mind. There is more power in the intrigues of the cloak-room than is to be purchased in the halls of oratory, and it is better to own the king than sit on the throne. There is more destructive power in the counting-room than may be found in a hundred atom bombs, and it is more profitable to finance your enemies to fight each other than it is to fight both of them yourself. It is easier to infiltrate a government than to take it by assault; and what can be done with a single government may be done with a government of all nations.
WHEREVER a Jewish community existed, there also was the Talmud. It has been well said that the Talmud not only awaited the Jewish infant at birth but anticipated each event and circumstance in its life thereafter from the earliest moment of probability. "In every relation of life, in every action, in every conceivable circumstance—for food, dress, habit, language, devotion, relaxation—it prescribes almost every word to be uttered, and almost every thought to be conceived. Its rule is minute, omnipresent, inflexible. Its severity is never relaxed."

Each Jewish community throughout the world turned its thoughts toward Jerusalem and, as the centuries rolled by, the ancient seat of Jewish power came to symbolize the central theme of Judaism—the ultimate fulfillment of the Covenant Jehovah had made with Abraham. Certainly, before the Gentile world lay at their feet, the Chosen People must have reestablished the seat of world-government in its ancient place—Jerusalem. When Jewish poets again would sing they would sing of Jerusalem—and more particularly of Zion, its holy hill where David built the Temple, and Zerubbabel rebuilt it.

Wherever a Jew wandered he found Jewish settlements and colonies. Wherever he wandered he found the Gentile rulers more or less under the influence and control of his brethren. Political pressure and "back stair diplomacy" were fine Jewish arts throughout the Gentile world long before Titus battered down the walls of Jerusalem.

"How numerous even in Rome the Jewish population was already before Caesar's time, and how closely at the same time the Jews even then kept together as fellow-countrymen, is shown by the remark of an author of this period, that it was dangerous for a governor to offend the Jews in his province, because he might then be certainly hissed after his return, by the populace of the capitol. Even at this time the predominant business of the Jews was trade... At this period too we encounter the peculiar antipathy of the Occidentals toward this so thoroughly Oriental race and their foreign opinions and customs. This Judaism, although not the most pleasing feature in the nowhere pleasing picture of the mixture of nations which then prevailed, was nevertheless an historical element developing itself in the natural course of things... which Caesar, just like his predecessor Alexander fostered as far as possible.... They did not of course contemplate placing the
Jewish nationality on an equal footing with the Hellenic or Italo-Hellenic.”—(History of Rome, Mommsen.)

Eastern Europe received its immigrants from Hellenized Asia. The immigration into Western Europe stemmed mainly from the Roman Empire. Among the ancient Jewish settlements in Eastern Europe were those colonies on the northern shores of the Black Sea. For some unexplained reason the Jews appear to have followed in the footsteps of the Greeks as they moved from Asia Minor into various parts of the then known world.

At the end of the Third Century the pagan population in concert with the Jews revolted against the Christian regime in Chersonesus, near Savastopol. “The struggle between the Christian missionaries during that period,” writes Dubnow, the Jewish historian, “had for its object the Khazar nation…”

* * * * *

“Forming originally a conglomerate of Finnish-Turkish tribes, the war-like Khazars appeared in the Caucasus during the ‘migration of nations’ and began to make inroads into the Persian Empire of the Sassanids, often acting as tools of Persia’s rival, Byzantium. The great Arabic conquests of the seventh century and the rise of the powerful Eastern Caliphate checked the movement of the Khazars towards the East, and turned it westward, to the shores of the Caspian Sea, the mouths of the Volga and the Don, the colonies on the Black and Azov Seas, and in particular, the flourishing region of Tauris. At the mouth of the Volga, where the mighty river joins the Caspian Sea, near the present city of Astrakhan, arose the Kingdom of Khazars with its capital Ityl, the name originally designating the river Volga. From there the bellicose Khazars made constant raids upon the Slavonian tribes far and near, to the very gates of Kiev, forcing them to become their tributaries.”—(Dubnow, History of the Jews in Russia and Poland, Vol. 1, page 19.)

Another Khazar center was established in the Crimea among the Byzantine Greeks and Jews. From this vantage point the savage and ruthless Khazars pressed forward toward Byzantium and the Balkan Peninsula, threatening the Roman Empire of the East. The Byzantine emperors did not hesitate in entering into alliances with the Khagans (Khazar kings), thus appeasing their rapacious greed and checking their unbridled energy by means of concessions and the payment of tribute. It was believed in Constantinople that if the bloodthirsty Khazars could be converted to Christianity that the threat to the peace of the world—and to Christianity itself—might be averted. Thus the feet of the Russian bear were revealed, as the Khazars menaced Christian civilization in the eighth century after Christ.
Missionaries were dispatched from Byzantium and Tauris. The Jews, who mingled with the Khazars in the Crimea, rushed to forestall the Christian missionaries, and, in the end, succeeded in converting the Khagan and his people to Talmudic Judaism.

The Jewish Encyclopedia, using the spelling "Chazars," traces the early history of this savage people, as follows:

“The people of Turkish origin whose life and history are interwoven with the very beginnings of the history of the Jews in Russia. The kingdom of the Chazars was firmly established in most of South Russia long before the foundation of the Russian monarchy by the Varangians (855). Jews have lived on the shores of the Black and Caspian seas since the first centuries of the common era. Historical evidence points to the region of the Ural as the home of the Chazars. Among the classical writers of the Middle Ages they were known as the ‘Chazars’, ‘Khazirs’, ‘Akatzirs’, and ‘Akatis’, and in the Russian chronicles as ‘Khwalisses’ and ‘Ugry Byelyye’.

“The Armenian writers of the fifth and following centuries furnish ample information concerning this people. Moses of Chorene refers to the invasion by the ‘Khazirs’ of Armenia and Iberia at the beginning of the third century: The chaghan was the king of the North, the ruler of the Khazirs, and the queen was the chatoun’ (‘History of Armenia’, ii: 357). The Chazars first came to Armenia with the Basileans in 198. Though at first repulsed, they subsequently became important factors in Armenian history for a period of 800 years. Driven onward by the nomadic tribes of the steppes and by their own desire for plunder and revenge, they made frequent invasions into Armenia. The latter country was made the battleground in the long struggle between the Romans and the Persians. This struggle, which finally resulted in the loss by Armenia of her independence, paved the way for the political importance of the Chazars. The conquest of eastern Armenia by the Persians in the fourth century rendered the latter dangerous to the Chazars, who, for their own protection, formed an alliance with the Byzantines. This alliance was renewed from time to time until the final conquest of the Chazars by the Russians. Their first aid was rendered to the Byzantine emperor Julian, in 363. About 434 they were for a time tributary to Attila—Sidonius Apollinaris relates that the Chazars followed the banners of Attila—and in 452 fought on the Catalanian fields in company with the Black Huns and Alans. The Persian king Kobad (488-531) undertook the construction of a line of forts through the pass between Derbent and the Caucasus, in order to guard against the invasion of the Cha-
zars, Turks, and other war-like tribes. His son Chosroes Anoshirvan (531-579) built the wall of Derbent, repeatedly mentioned by the Oriental geographers and historians as Bab al-Abwab (Justi, 'Gesch. des Alten Persiens', p. 208). "

In the second half of the sixth century the Khazars moved westward and established themselves in the territory bounded by the Sea of Azov, the Don and the lower Volga, the Caspian Sea, and the northern Caucasus. The Caucasian Goths (Tetraxites) were conquered by the Khazars in the seventh century. The Khazars were now powerful enough to send to the Byzantine emperor Heraclius an army of forty thousand men in his war against the Persians (626-627). The Khazars already occupied the northeastern part of the Black Sea region. Under Khagan Jebu they invaded Persia during the second campaign of Heraclius and devastated Albania. Heraclius thought so much of the Khagan that he is said to have promised him his daughter in marriage. In a battle between the Khazars and the Arabs near Kizlar, some four thousand Mohammedans and their leader were killed.

In 669 the Ugrians (or Zabirs) came under the rule of the Khazars. In 679 they conquered the Bulgars and extended their domain west between the Don and the Dnieper and as far as the head-waters of the Donetz.

The conversion of the Khazar hordes of Russia to Judaism took place about the year 740 A. D. Thus a vicious and rapacious nation akin to the blood-thirsty hordes that would later sweep out of Asia to overwhelm the Roman Empire came to be part of the Chosen People. Thus, this conquering Finnish-Turkish-Mongolian horde, whose ancestors never saw nor heard of Palestine, became Jews. The Khagan, his nobles and his people were circumcized. The Talmud went to Russia. Ultimately a strange many-languaged dialect became the tongue of the Khazar Jews, written in Hebrew characters, and called Yiddish. The descendants of the Khazars would one day become the most zealous Zionists of all Jewry. They would become the revolutionary leaders of the world, the socialists and communists of the 19th and 20th centuries. As the more ruthless of the Chosen People they would be the conquerors of Palestine and the destroyers of Christianity. They would work in the councils of nations; finance opposing armies and ultimately establish the parliament of the world. For is it not written: "The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth... and thou shall consume all the people which the Lord
thy God shall deliver thee; thine eyes shall have no pity upon them...”

According to A. Harkavy the conversion of the Khazars to Judaism took place in 620. Other authorities believe it was in 740. King Joseph in his letter to Hasdai ibn Shaprut (cerca 960), gives the following account of the conversion:

“Some centuries ago King Bulan reigned over the Khazars. To him God appeared in a dream and promised him might and glory. Encouraged by this dream, Bulan went by the road of Darian to the country of Ardebil, where he gained great victories (over the Arabs). The Byzantine emperor and the calif of the Ishmaelites sent to him envoys with presents, and sages to convert him to their respective religions. Bulan invited also wise men of Israel, and proceeded to examine them all. As each of the champions believed his religion to be the best, Bulan separately questioned the Mohammedans and the Christians as to which of the other two religions they considered the better. When both gave preference to that of the Jews, the king perceived that it must be the true religion. He therefore adopted it.”

The Jews of Europe were unquestionably in contact with the Khazar Jews and looked to this powerful war-like nation as the possible conqueror of Christendom. Messages that passed from the Khagans of the Khazars to princes of the Sanhedrin in Europe would necessarily have been carefully guarded. The many reports of Jewish dealings with the brutish hordes that constantly attacked the frontiers of Christian nations from the east have more substance in fact than historical writers have been prone to confess. Jewish merchants had established well defined routes from Europe to the Khazar Kingdom before the ninth century. The Arab geographer Ibn Khurdadhbeh (860-880) traces a route used by the Rahdanite Jewish merchants leading from Spain or France, through Germany, across the land of the Slavonians, to Atel (or Ityl), the capital of the Khazars. These Jewish merchants spoke Arabic, Persian, Greek, Spanish, French, and Slavonian, and “traveled continuously from west to east from east to west by sea and by land.” They dealt in eunuchs, servingmaids, boys, silks, furs, swords, musk, aloes, camphor, cinnamon, and other products of the Far East. In his letter to the Jewish Khagan, Hasdi ibn Shaprut expressed his thankfulness “that God in His mercy had not deprived the Jews of a deliverer,” but had preserved the remnant of the Jewish race.

In the ninth and tenth centuries the Khazars extended their
empire and brought more than twenty-five nations into their system of tributaries. Whenever the Khagans heard rumors of “Jewish persecutions in other countries,” their “tolerance” of Mohammedans, Christians, and Russian pagans within their kingdom would “reach its limits.” Writes the great Jewish historian Dubnow: “Thus on one occasion, about 921, on being informed that the Mohammedans had destroyed a synagogue somewhere in the land of Babun, the Khagan gave orders to destroy the tower (mineret) of a certain mosque and to kill the muezzins (the heralds who call to prayer) explaining his attitude in these words: ‘I should have destroyed the mosque itself, had I not feared that not a single synagogue would be left standing in the lands of the Mohammedans.’”

* * * * *

Between 867 and 886 A. D. many Jews fled from Byzantium to the kingdom of the Khazars and integrated with them. Masudi, an Arabic writer, refers to this Jewish immigration: “The population of the Khazar capital consists of Moslems, Jews and pagans. The king, his court, and all members of the Khazar tribe profess the Jewish religion, which has been the dominant faith of the country since the time of Caliph Harun ar-Rashid. Many Jews who settled among the Khazars came from all the cities of the Moslems and the land of Rum (Byzantium), the reason being that the king of Rum persecuted the Jews of his empire in order to force them to adopt Christianity... In this way a large number of Jews left the land of Rum in order to depart to the Khazars.” (954 A. D. —quoted by Dubnow. )

In his letter to Hasdai ibn Shaprut Khagan Joseph describes the Khazar kingdom. “The country up the river,” he wrote, “is within a four months’ journey to the Orient, settled by the following nations who pay tribute to the Khazars: Burtas, Bulgar, Suvar, Arissu, Tzarmis, Ventit, Syever, and Slaviyun. Thence the boundary-line runs to Buarasm as far as the Jordan. All the inhabitants of the sea coast that live within a months’ distance pay tribute to the Khazars. To the south Semender, Bak-Tadlu, and the gates of the Bab al-Abwab are situated on the seashore. Thence the boundary-line extends to the mountains of Azur, Bak-Bagda, Sridi, Kliton, Arku, Shaula, Sagasar, Albusser, Ukusser, Kiadusser, Tzidlag, Zunikh, which are very high peaks, and to the Alans as far as the boundary of the Kassa, Kalkial, Taket, Gebul, and the Constantinian Sea. To the west, Sarkel, Samkrutz, Kertz, Sugdai, Aluss, Lambat, Bartnit, Alubika, Kut, Mankup, Budik, Alma, and Grusin—all these western localities are situated on the banks of the Constantinian (Black) Sea. Thence the boundary-line extends
to the north, traversing the land of Basa, which is on the River Vaghez. Here on the plains live nomadic tribes, which extend to the frontiers of the Gagries, as innumerable as the sands of the sea; and they all pay tribute to the Khazars. The king of the Khazars himself has established his residence at the mouth of the river, in order to guard its entrance and to prevent the Russians from reaching the Caspian Sea, and thus penetrating to the land of the Ishmaelites. In the same way the Khazars bar enemies from the gates of Bab al-Abwah."

The Russian Slavonians of Kiev in the ninth century had to pay a yearly tax to the Khazars, consisting of a sword and the skin of a squirrel for each house.

* * * * *

In the tenth century about five hundred Russian ships, each ship carrying about a hundred men, sought permission from the Khagan of the Khazars to pass down the Volga and through the Khazar kingdom for the purpose of looting the nations along the sea coast. The Khagan gave his consent on the Russians' promise that they would give him half of the plunder on their way back. When the Russians, returning from their raids, loaded with captives and booty, approached the Khazar kingdom, they sent messengers ahead with money and gifts to notify the Khagan of their return and to inform him that they were ready to divide their plunder with him as they had agreed. In spite of his promise of safe conduct the Khagan permitted an army of about 15,000 Moslems to attack the unsuspecting Russians. The battle lasted three days. Many of the Russians were drowned. Five thousand who escaped the water were slaughtered by the Moslems and the Burtas.

* * * * *

So it was that Russia and the South East of Europe acquired its Jewish population. As the centuries passed accretions came, as the wondering Jews intermarried with the Khazars. In their exodus from Russia in the 19th and 20th centuries they would be known as Russian Jews and would pass as direct descendants of Abraham. The Turkish-Finnish-Mongolian origin, however, would still distinguish the Khazar Jew from the descendants of the Biblical Jew.

* * * * *

Khagan Bulan was the Khazar king who accepted Judaism and imposed it upon his people. Obadiah, one of Bulan's descendants, was a particularly zealous adherent of Judaism. Many rabbis came to his country at his invitation to instruct the converted Khazars in the Torah and the Talmud. Bulan founded many synagogues throughout his domain. The successors of Bulan adopted Jewish Names. Obadiah, Hezekiah, Manasseh, Hanukka, Isaac, Zebulun, Moses (or Manasseh II), Nissi, Aaron, Menahem, Benjamin, Aaron (II), and Joseph, are the Khazar kings (after the adoption of
In the order of their reign, according to Khagan Joseph, who, as related by Dubnow, was the last king of the Khazars.

Between 966 and 969 A.D. the Slavonian tribes under the leadership of Russian princes succeeded in throwing off the oppressive yoke of the Khazar Jews. The Slavonian armies invaded their territory and finally destroyed their stronghold at the mouth of the River Volga. Prince Svyatoslav of Kiev and his armies drove through the land to the Caspian region dispersing the Khazars in every direction. Many of them succeeded in reaching Khazar possessions on the Black Sea and established themselves on the Crimean Peninsula, which, for a long time thereafter, was known as Khazaria.

The Russian princes were not quite so successful in their onslaught on the Khazar kingdom in Tauris. It was able to stand for nearly fifty years before it fell to the Russians and Byzantines (1016 A.D.). Some of the relatives of the last Khagan, according to Jewish tradition, fled to Spain, but the greater part of the Khazar population scattered throughout eastern Europe to be ultimately lost among the Jewish colonies in Poland and elsewhere. Many, of course, swelled the settlements on the Crimean Peninsula. Kiev eventually became the center of Jewish immigration, the overwhelming portion of which were Khazar Jews from Khazaria and the Crimea.

The ancient hatred of the Jews for the Christians was nourished and intensified by the Khazar Jews and their rabbis from the beginning of their conversion to Judaism. This hatred, of course, was directed also against the Moslem. Until the Khazar empire was overthrown in the eleventh century the Khazar Jew came into but infrequent intercourse with the Christians. What contact they had had was in the crash and roar of invasion; the momentary flash of recognition before the thrust of sword or the crunch of battle-ax; a fleeting glimpse of the despised cross on a monastery or a church as it toppled in the flames of their kindling or tumbled into the rubble under the hammering of their war-engines. Some of the Khazar envoys had personal knowledge of the Christians. And they despised them the more for having met them in their own countries. The rabbis believed they were justified in their hatred of these people. Certainly they were cattle, fit only to serve the chosen people of Jehovah; smiling cowards who paid the Khagan the staggering tributes demanded so that they might save their miserable hides from the wrath of the children of Abraham.

Christianity came to Russia at about the same time the Russian princes crushed the Khazar empire. That the Russians bore a deep hatred toward their former oppressors is understandable.
Their conversion to Christianity did little to mitigate the ill-feeling. And the Khazar Jews, having hated Christians since their conver­sion to Judaism on general principles, now hated their conquerors with particular intensity. To have been conquered by the despised followers of Jesus, was a cup almost too bitter to swallow. The rabbis had heretofore taught hatred of Christians in general; now as a conquered and scattered people the rabbis taught hatred of Christian Russians in particular. Some day the Khazar Jew would rise again and reconquer Russia; some day the Russian dogs would grovel at their feet and serve their purpose. There would be no rest, no respite from toil and intrigue, until Russia paid in blood and wealth; yes, and in degradation and slavery, for having stood against the converted hordes of the Chosen People. And before the strongholds of Kiev, Moscow and the northern kingdoms were crushed and again in Khazar hands, the cross and the icons, the saints and the churches—yea, even Christ Himself—must be toppled from their places in the land and the hearts of men.

The destruction of the ruthless Khazar empire by the Russian princes and the scattering of its people was a severe blow to Jewish influence in the East. Many of the leaders and rabbis in European Jewish communities, not being aware of the eighth cen­tury conversion of their mongolian brethren, believed that this mighty scourge of Christian and Moslem was descendant of the lost Jewish kingdom. Hasdai Ibn Shaprut, the Cordova Caliphate in Spain, having learned of the Khazar Kingdom through the Persian and Byzantine ambassadors, entered into correspondence with Khagan Joseph (955 A.D.) and planned a mass migration of Spanish Jews to the Khazar Kingdom. But the Khazar dynasty was already tottering under the ever strengthening blows of Sla­vonian armies, and the Caliphate’s plans to swell the eastern empire died aborning.

The blow did not prove fatal. The Khazars, now fully endowed with the characteristics of the chosen people, drew closer together in the Jewish communities of Poland, the Crimea, Kiev and Tauris. Every male Khazar wore the token of Jehovah’s Covenant with Abraham; the ever-present reminder that Israel must eventually establish its rule over the entire world. The Covenant was not only indelibly seared into their minds, it was everlasting by a seal and a scar in their flesh. While the Christian mouthed idiotic doctrines of the kingdom to come, and the immortality of his mis­erable soul, the sons of Abraham were assured of the immortality of Israel and its ultimate conquest of the existing world. The Khazar Jew would know how to set Christian against Christian so that in the end they must destroy themselves. Slowly and surely, under the relentless dialectic blows of Talmudian scholars,
the vaunted citadels of Christianity would erode and crumble. The sons of the covenant would find the means to topple Christian kings from their thrones, the despised crosses from the churches, yes, even the Christian God, His Son, the Holy Ghost and the hierarchy of angels from the Christian heavens. For, had it not been said by Jehovah that the nation and kingdom that will not serve Israel shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted . . . . ? The deadly wound would be healed, and the entire world would wonder and bow in admiration.

* * * * * * *

When the Crusades were over there came a great migration of Jews from Germany to Poland and Kiev. The intermarriage of these German-speaking Jews gave impetus and direction to the development of the Yiddish jargon spoken by the Khazars. In addition the German-Jews supplied the Khazars with rabbinical instruction in the Talmud. The minute reasoning, hair-splitting dialectic logic of the Talmudian authors stimulated the Khazar mind and opened up visions of conquest far greater than the bloody triumphs won by his Turkish-Mongolian forebears.

The conquest of the Crimea in the 13th century scattered the Khazar Jews further throughout the territory that would some day be a part of the Russian Empire. The capture of Constantinople by the Turks had a similar and continuing effect. Khazar-Jewish influence was extended for a time to Moscow after Turkish sovereignty was established over Chimea (1475-1783 A. D.). Khoza Kokos, a Jew of Kaffa, became an agent of the Muscovite Prince (1484-1500 A. D.). A Jew by the name of Zechariah (Skharia) from Kiev succeeded in converting several representatives of the Christian Clergy to Judaism. One Carp Strigolnik founded a sect called the “Strigolniki”, the members of which abrogated church rites and denied the divinity of Christ. Two priests, Dionis and Alexius, leaders of the Novgorod apostates, went to Moscow in 1480 A. D. and converted a number of Greek Orthodox Christians there. Many of these converts submitted to the rite of circumcision. Converts were made among the nobility of Moscow and in court circles. The daughter-in-law of the Grand Duke, Helena, is said to have been among the sympathizers of the Jews and the “Strigolniki”.

Thus the Khazar Jews struck back at their conquerors. By decision of the Church council of 1504 A. D., backed by the support of Ivan III, the principal apostates were burned at the stake and the others imprisoned or exiled to monasteries.

It is believed that Zechariah (Skharia) and his followers were Cabalistic Jews. The fact that the Russians looked upon them with great fear and considered them “adepts of black art” and in
“black magicians” indicates their Cabalistic character. These first contacts with the Khazar Jews left a deep impression on the Moscovites and the Russian generations that followed. They would long bear the mental scars of their cruel oppression under the iron yoke of the Khazars, even though the events and incidents of its horror were forgotten in the mists of history. Instinctively the Russian would seek to shield himself from these sinister people. In the end he must fail and again fall under their yoke. So it had been written, and so it must be.

The western Jews continued to increase the Khazar population in Poland, and ultimately produced the Polish Jew. By the end of the fourteenth century Jewish colonies were established in Lithuania, particularly at Brest, Grodno, Troki, Lutzk and Vladimir. In 1495 they were expelled from Lithuania, and most of them settled in Poland, swelling the already teeming Jewish colonies there. In 1501 they were permitted to return to Lithuania. The Lithuanians had captured Kiev in 1320 and this teeming center of Khazars had remained part of the Polish Empire (through the union of Lithuania and Poland) until 1654, when, together with the province of Little Russia, it was ceded to Moscovy.

* * * * *

The Cossack uprising against Poland further scattered the Jews. The peace treaty of August, 1649, between King John Casimir and Khmelnitzki, the leader of the rebellious Cossacks, contained a clause forbidding the residence of Jews in that portion of the Ukraine inhabited by Cossacks, the regions of Chermigor, Poltava, Kiev, and part of Podolia. As a result of this clause, the Khazar Jew, now more thoroughly interbred with the Semite blood of the western Jews, became more densely settled in Poland proper. The Treaty of Byelaya Tzerkov in 1651 restored the rights of the Jews to live in the Greek Orthodox portion of the Ukraine. As a result of this treaty, the Cossacks and Greek Orthodox Ukrainians again rebelled. Bogdan Khmelnitzki, in alliance with the Russian Czar Alexis Michaelovich, incorporated the Greek Orthodox portion of the Ukraine into an autonomous province under the name of Little Russia, into the Muscovite Empire.

* * * * *

In 1654 the Russian armies waged war on Poland. The Swedish invasion (1654-1658) brought a large part of Great and Little Poland into the hands of the Swedes. The Jews betrayed Poland to the invaders (as, indeed, did some of the Poles) and, as the Swedes retreated, the Jews were attacked by indignant patriotic Poles.

* * * * *

Poland was first partitioned in 1772. Russia, Austria and Prussia
absorbed the border provinces. To Russia went the southwestern border province, the greater part of White Russia and the provinces of Vitebsk and Moghilev. As a result of this partition the center of Jewish settlement shifted to Russia.

The memory of the Khazar Jewish oppression lingered in the consciousness of the Russian people. The "judaizing heresy", the dark, sinister, clandestine people in their strange costumes; "black magicians", cabalistic mystery—all these things and more, at the beginning of the sixteenth century—made the Russians fearful and suspicious of these strange aliens who would neither become Russians nor assimilate into Russian life and custom. The Jews, on the other hand, finding themselves suddenly under the sovereignty of a people they had once conquered and oppressed, despised and exploited, smouldered with hatred and frustration against the Czar and particularly against the Greek Catholic Orthodox Church which had brought Christianity to the land. Although they equally despised the Christianity of Poland and had betrayed that adopted land when opportunity offered, they now added Polish patriotism to the Jewish-Khazar hatred of the Russians. Holy Russia was barred to them. The Russian government, ever fearful of them, confined them to the annexed territories.

In 1526 the Ambassador of the Muscovite Grand Duke, Basil III, at Rome observed to the Italian scholar Paolo Giovio: “The Muscovite people dread no one more than the Jews, and do not admit them into their borders.”

When Little Russia was annexed to the Empire by Czar Alex Michaelovich in 1654 the Muscovite people had their first contact with large masses of Jews. They were not favorably impressed by the experience.

* * * * *

In 1793 came the second partition of Poland. Russia received Volhynia with part of the province of Kiev, Podolia, and the region of Minsk, heavily populated with the descendants of the Khazar Jews. Minsk was to be the birthplace of Russia’s Communist Party—and the Khazar Jews would officiate as midwives.

* * * * *

The third partition of Poland came in 1795. Russia received the dense Jewish masses of Lithuania and the provinces of Vilna and Grodno. The quarantine which Russia had established for the Jews was broken through in 1772 by the first partition of Poland. The second and third partitions brought hundreds of thousands of Jews from Lithuania, Volhynia and Podolia under the Czar. Thus is was that Russia, which a generation before had not tolerated a single Jew within its borders, now found itself possessed of a territory more densely populated by Jews than any other country in the world. The old laws of exclusion of the Jews from
Holy Russia proper were extended to the annexed territories, and thus was created the so-called Pale of Settlement of the Russian Empire. Although the organized Jews of the world would make much of this alleged Ghetto, the effect of the Russian law—older than the partitions of Poland—was to confine the Jews to the same territories they had occupied under the Polish regimes.

The descendants of the conquering Khazars had come home to Russia.

* * * * *

The term Ashkenazim refers to the Jews of Germany. The term Sephardim refers to the Jews of Spain and Portugal. The Jews of Poland, Lithuania and Russia are generally referred to as Ashkenazic by Jewish and most Gentile historians and writers, because of the general reluctance to recognize the comparatively late origin of the Khazar Jew. As a claimant to the covenant with Abraham the Khazar Jew’s title is clouded. He can trace his ancestry to the Biblical Jews only through inter-marriage with the Ashkenazim. On the other side of his lineage are the Turks, the Mongols, and the Huns. It should be noted, however, that the Khazar is no less a Jew because of his origin. As a matter of fact the Khazar Jew, as he makes his appearance in the Western World, is more Jewish than his Sephardic and Ashkenazic brethren. Had his savage ancestors not been converted to Judaism, the nineteenth and twentieth centuries might have traced an entirely different, and more satisfactory, historical course.

The Jew is but one of an ethnic group known as the Semite—and a very small part at that. The Semite originally was one of a people believed to be descended from Shem, a son of Noah. The modern use of the term includes the Arabs, the Akkadians of ancient Babylonia, the Assyrians, the Canaanites (including Amorites, Edomites, Ammonites and Phoenicians), the various Aramaen tribes (including Hebrews), and a considerable portion of the population of Ethiopia. This classification is made on the basis of related languages deriving presumably from a common tongue, similarities in physical characteristics, aspects of culture, and other such evidence. It generally is believed that the original home of the Semites was Arabia. From there they spread in successive migrations to Mesopotamia, the eastern Mediterranean sea coasts, and the delta of the Nile. The tribes were gradually mixed throughout the centuries, at first with non-Semitic peoples, and later with new waves of Semites sweeping out of Arabia.

In Mesopotamia the Semites came into contact with the Sumerian civilization. The rise of Sargon of Agade and Hammurabi of Babylon saw these Semites in a dominant position. The Semitic population of Phoenicia developed a widespread maritime trade and may be said to have become the first sea-faring people. The Semites
who had filtered through Sinai into the Nile delta settled with other Semitic people in Palestine, and became the Hebrews.

There is no such thing as a “pure-blooded” Jew, any more than there is a “pure-blooded” Irishman or Spaniard. The emphasis on the “seed of Abraham” and the “chosen people” myth, however, has resulted in a greater discipline in marriage among the Jews than among the people of any other nation. The issue of the comparatively few Jewish-Gentile marriages ultimately disappears among the Gentiles, so that the remnant of the Jewish nation remains intact. Such marriages are vigorously condemned by the Jews and only occur where the Jew has broken the mental chains that bind him to the ghetto of the Jewish community. And these chains are not to be broken if the Jew in question was raised in the stifling straight-jacket of Judaism.

In spite of the strenuous efforts of Jewish historians and their Gentile apologists, there is no evidence that the Jews believed in a universal God. In the beginning Jehovah was the greatest God of all, because He was Israel’s God. It was not until the event of Christianity with its offer of salvation to all the nations of the world, that the Jews attempted a retroactive belief in one God. This belief superseded the idea of other tribal gods. Only Israel had a God. The belief was hedged about with the particularism of Israel and the “chosen people” myth. Jehovah remained Abraham’s tribal deity, and, to the Jew, Jehovah was greater than all the pagan gods combined. The Jew merely deprived the Gentiles of any god of any kind. That Jehovah would share His mercy and blessings with any people other than the Jews was, to the Jew, an unthinkable blasphemy. The “One God” with whom Abraham made the Covenant was the “One God” of Israel; and that Covenant—that Brit—was symbolically renewed by every Jewish male. “Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is One!” The central affirmation of the Oneness and uniqueness of the God of Israel—His Oneness with His particular and peculiar people—with its promise of world domination, this may be said to be the hard core of Jewishness. When a Jew ceases to practice this affirmation he has no further reason for existence as a Jew. To the Jews he may be alive biologically but his soul is dead. He has despaired not only of himself but also of his people. He is lost to himself and Judaism.

Jews are the Perushim, the separated ones. They look at Gentile society and its forces objectively, from without. While seeming to be a part of the Gentile world within which they live and have their being, they are in fact—and they are amazingly conscious of that fact—not at all concerned with it, except as it is of use to them. The fate of the Gentile world—its hopes, desires and its
dreams—are of no significance. True, its upheavals have caught his people in its turmoil in the past and they have been tossed from pillar to post, but they have always survived. Only the Jew possesses the Law of redemption. He dares not forget that Law and dares not merge with any pagan or Christian society; to become a part of such society is to die spiritually. Being a Jew consciously, absorbedly, affirmatively, and continually, is an existential problem. He is separate from other people. It is a conscious separateness; a steel-willed determination to remain separate. It is a separateness that is inherent in Jewish destiny. Without it there is no meaning in life. If the Jew is to dominate the world through the Covenant he must daily renew his dedication to his Jewishness. His part in history is determined. If he attempts to abandon it his conscience condemns him before his fellow Jews have the opportunity. To the Jew this is not a mere matter of a loyalty; it is the loyalty—the only loyalty. Moreover, it partakes of the law of self-preservation, which, to the Jew, is race or nation preservation. Isms, reforms, new social techniques—these, and politics in general—are for the Gentiles. The Jew must remember that Gentile society and Gentile governments are still Gentile. In their boastfulness they would say that they gave the world Christianity—that they gave the world Islam—and that both faiths have abandoned the Jewish elements that made them living religions! Halacha—the Way—the Jewish Way, is a way of separateness from the ways of the Pagans—the Christians. Halacha is a life within the historical community of eternal Israel.

Because the Jew is capable of holding himself separate from the Christian society in which he works and lives, and because of his objective view of that society, he believes that not only is he justified in using it for his own purposes, he believes that it is his duty. His objectivity is akin to that of a scientist who observes a germ world through his microscope. His concern for the strange wriggling specks of life beneath his glass—if, indeed, he has any concern at all—is strictly academic. The Jew looks upon Christianity and Islam as Pagan. Hebrew morality is exclusively a system of morals to be practiced between Jews. Even the Ten Commandments have no application to relations between Jew and non-Jew. It follows, therefore, that what a Jew might not in good conscience do in his relation with another Jew, he may do with a clear conscience in his relations with the Goyim. Moreover, the fulfillment of the Covenant is for the Gentiles best interest; in fact it is the Gentile’s only salvation! The world can be redeemed only through Israel!

Men, generally, are governed by a sense of self-interest. The weaknesses of human nature are well known, and the Jews, in
their commerce with Gentiles—in trade or government—know those weaknesses too well. It is their duty to use those weaknesses in furtherance of Israel’s mission.

The Jews have their own Law—and it is never the law of the Gentile lands in which they live. This law is always above and superior to the law of the countries of their sojourn. They have no scruples in breaking Gentile law so long as in doing so they do not violate Jewish Law. In Rome they lived by their own Law with Caesar’s permission. Consequently there is nothing immoral or wrong in the violation of Gentile law. Where Jewish aims come in conflict with the laws of the land in which they reside, Jewish objectives must be first served.

The so-called “freedoms” of the Gentiles are myths to the Jew. While he deals in these terms in his political maneuverings for Jewish purposes, he has no concern with them. “Freedom” is merely an idea to be used in a “selling” campaign. Like good slogans in merchandising, “freedom” is sure-fire bait when dealing with the goyim masses. In weakening existing power the use of such terms as “freedom”, “liberalism” and “democracy” are important catch-phrases. This Gentile world is infected with these ideas, and their use either causes the Gentiles to compromise or ultimately to be overthrown. The more the Pagans compromise the sooner the fulfillment of the Covenant.

Two methods for the control of nations are now firmly established by history. The first is the liberal use of wealth, and the second is the exercise of sheer terror. An ingenious use of both might bring the entire world to its knees. It makes little difference, as the pages of history are turned, whether nations go down under the blows of a foreign enemy, or collapse as the result of an internal explosion. War is not, in any modern sense, a gallant adventure. It is not confined to the movements of armies and the bombing of cities. Cunning, stealth, deceit and dishonesty are weapons of greater effectiveness than atom bombs, and their successful use is the stuff of which victories are made.

In pursuit of its glorious destiny Israel is at war with the Gentile world. It is not an undeclared war merely because there has not been a recent proclamation. The gauntlet was hurled down two thousand years ago, and the battles that have been fought through the centuries have been but mere skirmishes. New weapons, new skills, new methods—these are the products of the ages. The development of wealth on the one hand has corroded the integrity and power of Caesar, while the rise of terror on the other has sent thrones sprawling into the dust. Holy things have been corrupted and things sacred defiled. The vices of mankind have been exploited and made to pay fabulous dividends. From the Opium Wars of the Sassoons to the rape of South Africa for the Roth-
schilds, human blood has counted for little and gold has been the objective. The Jewish war continues and Christendom is again losing every battle.

There is no relationship between morals and politics, any more than there is between morals and war. Not that it is right that it should be this way; it just happens to be a fact in a coldly calculating world. Statesmanship, frankness and honesty, are terrific handicaps in the character of today's politician. Should such an ill-equipped candidate succeed in gaining public office and persist in clinging to these outmoded follies, he would only last until next election—if not recalled in the meantime. The people are not much interested in these virtues. They dislike and resent the truth if it interferes with their fancies, and they are repelled by the unpleasant facts of life. The masses of people are moved by passion, emotion, self-interest and sheer greed, and the propagandists know it. Logic and reason, practical consideration, and plain facts find no response in such a market.

Behind the rapidly moving scene of international politics stands the Jew in all his separateness; objective, unimpassioned. The crash and fall of nations, the tottering crosses of Christianity, the sullen advance of godless communism—all these tragedies are gigantic steps on the road to Israel's destiny. It has so long been prepared; so long, so well prepared. And every Jew knows his part, merely because he is a Jew. He is seen on every hand as he manipulates the strings that make his Gentile puppets dance, yet he remains invisible. This invisibility is the strangest phenomenon the world has ever known. Although he is always clearly in sight there are but few who dare acknowledge what their eyes perceive. Others who also see dare not speak lest they be ridiculed by the blind. When all acknowledge that they see what their eyes proclaim it may be too late to appraise the view.

* * * * *

Masses of people lack the capacity to understand great issues because they are moved collectively toward composite objectives by an emotional urge. What, under the stress of excitement and hysteria, appears to be the "general welfare", often turns out to be disaster when experienced individually. There is no reason in a mob. A bright uniform, a red flag, a slogan—these are the sparks that move masses of people toward revolution and acts of violence. The deep theories of the secluded study are worthless without the psychological catchphrases that launch the theories into action. The catchphrases—and the slogans—must bear no relation to calm or considered judgment. They must be couched in terms of need, greed, prejudice, and hate. Once the mob is in action it is difficult to stop, and its savagery is increased by its
own brutality. Thus, planned revolution contemplates traps for
the revolutionaries, lest they also destroy their mentors.
These are the known factors of human behavior; these are the
triggers of power.

Those who would rule the world in the twentieth century must
possess great wealth and be capable of colossal deceit. The pre-
tended welfare of people must be the announced objective, even
though the means to that goal end necessarily in disaster. If the
true objective is destruction—even with the best of intentions for
the building of a finer world—then the means by which the pre-
tended betterment is to be accomplished matters little. Nothing
so intrigues the "have-nots" as the confiscation of the property of
those who have for the benefit of the "have-nots". The politician
who can promise to "sock the rich" is always the hero of the
envious.

Liberty, Equality, Fraternity! What blood has stained the bar-
icades in response to this senseless cry! Few who thrilled to these
abstractions could explain their meanings, and then, only in vaguely
defined further abstractions, "Liberty" to most meant anarchy;
"Equality" meant a leveling process to the least common denomi-
inator, and "fraternity" signified some sort of brotherhood that
excluded a fatherhead and the better part of mankind.

The Sephardic and Ashkenasic Jews were destined to control the
money markets of the world, and hence the venal men of the
nations of the world. These Jews would provide the intellectual
doctrines that must weaken the citadels of Christianity and destroy
the foundations of governments. The hordes of Khazar Jews would
become the revolutionary leaders of the world. They would eventual-
ly sweep out of Russia by the millions for the conquest of
Western Christendom. Nation would be pitted against nation,
class against class, and race against race. World wars would be
fought and the red flag of communism would fly over the ruins in
the shadows of the vultures. Palestine would be conquered and
the ancient seat of Jewish power re-established. A bleeding and
frightened world would huddle together under the lash of the
atomic age, and tremble in the shadow of the hammer and sickle.
Gradually a world government must emerge with the masters of
the world planted securely in the driver's seat. And the Beast
will cause "all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond,
to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads."

Wilhelm Marr, who played an important role in the preparation
of the revolution of 1848 wrote of the coming Jewish conquest of
the world. "The epitome of the degradation of humanity," he
declared, "is the so-called religion called Christianity." In 1879 his *Conquest of Germanism By Judaism* made its appearance. "The advent of Jewish Imperialism, I am firmly convinced," he wrote, "is only a question of time... The Empire of the world belongs to the Jews... *Val Victis!* Woe to the conquered!... I do not pretend to be a prophet, but I am quite certain that before four generations have passed, there will not be a single function in the State, the highest included, which will not be in the hands of the Jews... To judge by the course of events, the capitulation of Russia is only a question of time... In that vast Empire... Judaism will find the fulcrum of Archimedes which will enable it to drag the whole of Western Europe off its hinges once for all. The wily Jewish spirit of intrigue will bring about a revolution in Russia such as the world has never seen... When the Jews shall get control of the Russian State... they will set about the destruction of the social organization of Western Europe. This last hour of Europe will arrive at least in a hundred or a hundred and fifty years... What Russia has to expect from the Jews is quite clear."

On July 1, 1922, a Czech deputy by the name of Mazanac, in a speech before the Czech Parliament, read a translation of a circular written in Hebrew which had been taken from the pocket of an individual named Zunder on the night of December 9, 1920, after a skirmish with Bolshevik troops on the Estonian frontier. Zunder was the officer in command of the 11th Regiment of Sharpshooters. (Mazanac's speech appeared in No. 375 of the Russian paper *Novol Vremia*, edited at Belgrade and dated July 28, 1922. The document read by Mazanac is similar to a handbill distributed among the Jews in Budapest in 1919. A translation of the text, as it is found in Dr. Hans Eisele's book, "*Bilder aus dem Kommunistischen Ungarn*," published in 1920 by the publishing firm "Tyrolia" of Innsbruck, is given in "*The rulers of Russia*", third edition, page 52.)

The document follows:

"Sons of Israel! The hour of victory is at hand. We are on the eve of becoming masters of the world. What seemed to be merely a dream is on the point of being realized. Formerly weak and feeble we can now proudly lift up our heads, thanks, to the disorder and confusion of the world. By clever propaganda we have held up to criticism and ridicule the authority and practice of a religion which is foreign to us. We have plundered the sanctuaries of that foreign cult, and we have shaken the hold of their traditional culture upon nations, finding among them more helpers than we needed in our task. We have succeeded in bringing the Russian Nation under Jewish
sway and we have compelled it, at last, to fall on its knees before us. Russia, mortally wounded, is now at our mercy.

“The fear of the danger in which we stand will not allow us either to exercise compassion or to feel mercy. At last, it has been given to us to behold the tears of the Russian people. By taking away from them wealth and their gold, we have turned the Russians into wretched slaves. But we must be prudent and circumspect. We have to eliminate all the best elements of Russian society, in order that the enslaved Russians may have no leaders. Thus we shall forestall every possibility of resisting our might. Wars and civil strife will destroy all the treasures of culture created by the Christian peoples.

“Be prudent, Sons of Israel. Do not confide in treacherous and mysterious forces. Bronstein, Rosenfeld, Steinberg, Apfelbaum, and many other faithful sons of Israel are in the ranks of the Commissars and play the leading roles, but do not lose your heads over the victory. Be prudent, for you can rely only on yourselves to safeguard you and defend you. Sons of Israel, close up your ranks and combat for your eternal ideal.”

* * * * *
THE Grand Duke of Moscow, Ivan III (1462-1505) abolished the feudal system and established the first centralized government in Russia. The political and religious controversies of his day produced a fertile soil for the Judaizing sect. In 1470 Michael Olelkovich, brother of the viceroy of Kiev, responding to the call of the people of Novgorod in their struggle with Moscow, utilized the services of the Jew Skhariyah in the venture. Meanwhile many of the influential men close to Duke Ivan became impressed with Judaism, and, the Duke himself, looked upon it with favor. It was Skhariyah who converted the priest Dionis to the Jewish faith. For this reason—and probably for political reasons as well—the Duke made no effort to stop the Jewish efforts to convert the Christians. He was engaged in strengthening his influence in Lithuania with the assistance of Michael Olelkovich and Skhariyah, and probably had pledges of Jewish support. It therefore was with considerable reluctance that he finally yielded to the appeal of the Bishop of Novgorod and the Metropolitan of Moscow to suppress the Judaizing movement and punish the offenders. It is believed by some that there was a connection between the expulsion of the Jews from Lithuania by Alexander in 1495 and Ivan's attitude toward the Judaizing heresy. The Jews were re-admitted in 1503, but effective measures against them were not taken until 1504. It appears established that Ivan corresponded with Khoza Kokos, and that he sought this Jew's influence with the Crimean Khan, Mengli-Girei, in his efforts to secure a formal treaty.

Jewish merchants of Poland and Lithuania traveled to the border city of Smolensk in Russia from time to time, but were forbidden to establish permanent residence there. Occasionally they carried their merchandise into Moscow. In 1545 they sent certain goods from Brest-Litovsk to Moscow, where it was promptly burned. King Sigismund Augustus of Poland, acting on Jewish persuasion, addressed a "charter" to Czar Ivan IV in 1550, demanding the admission of Jews into Russia for business purposes in conformance with former commercial treaties. Ivan IV rejected the demand. "It is not convenient," he stated, "to allow Jews to come with their goods to Russia, since many evils result from them. For they import poisonous herbs into our realm, and lead astray the Russians from Christianity. Therefore he, the (Polish) king, should no more write about these Jews." In spite of this determ-
ination of the Czar, the Jews of Poland and Lithuania managed to find their way to Moscow and carried on their trade illegally. By 1610 many Jews had managed to smuggle themselves into Russia. Captive Jews (prisoners of war) were permitted to remain in Moscovy by the terms of the Peace of Andrusovo (1667) between Russia and Poland. With the connivance and aid of “legal” Jews in Russia, “illegal” Jews from Lithuania and White Russia were enabled to escape the vigilance of the Russians and make their way into Moscow.

* * * * *

Peter the Great’s change of heart toward “foreigners” did not include the Jews. During his sojourn in Holland he was petitioned by the Jews of that country through the burgomaster Witsen to permit the Jews to enter Russia (1698). The Czar listened attentively and politely to the argument and, when the burgomaster had concluded, he replied: “My dear Witsen, you know the Jews, and you know their character and habits; you also know the Russians. I know both, and believe me, the time has not come to unite the two nationalities.”

Solovyov, the Russian historian, states that when Czar Peter invited skilled foreigners from all over the world to settle in Russia he made a permanent exception of the Jews. “I prefer,” he declared, “to see in our midst nations professing Mohammedanism and paganism rather than Jews. They are rogues and cheats. It is my endeavor to eradicate evil and not to multiply it. They shall not be allowed either to live or to trade in Russia, whatever efforts they may make, and however much they may try to bribe those near me.” In spite of his determination, however, Peter permitted certain Jewish financiers and their agents to enter his new capitol, St. Petersburg. Among these was the “court Jew”, Lipman Levy, a banker from Courland. He attained great prominence and influence under Peter’s successors.

Napoleon took the province of Great Poland in 1808 and converted it into the Duchy of Warsaw under the rule of the Saxon King, Frederick Augustus III. In 1809, after he had crushed Austria, Napoleon annexed a portion of the conquered territory to the Duchy of Warsaw. He had disbanded the Great Sanhedrin on March 17, 1808, and his attitude toward the Jews had altered considerably. His policy toward them was reflected in decisions made concerning them in the Duchy of Warsaw. The Jews had petitioned the government for “civil rights”, which were denied. The report submitted to Duke Frederick Augustus stated that the Jewish people “cherished a national spirit alien to the country.” It was held that “a somber future would be in store for the Duchy if the Israelitish nation, which is to be found here in vast numbers, were suddenly to be allowed to enjoy civil rights.” In January
of 1809 the Jews addressed another petition to the Minister of Justice Lubenski, which was also denied. The Minister stated that constitutional equality before the law did not make a man a citizen, for only those could claim citizenship who were loyal to the sovereign and who looked upon the country as their only fatherland. “Can those,” asked the Minister, “who profess the laws of Moses look upon this country as their fatherland? Do they not wish to return to the land of their fathers? . . . Do they not regard themselves as a separate nation?” Another report the Duke declared that the Jews had brought upon themselves the curtailment of their rights by their “dishonest pursuits” and by “their mode of life, subversive of the welfare of society.”

* * * * *

The Karaites, a Jewish sect, are distinguished from the rabbinate Jews by the fact that they follow the Bible and spurn rabbinical (Talmud) traditions and laws. To some extent they follow the Sadducees and the Essenes, and take some of their religious orientation from the Mohammedans. The orthodox Jews attacked and persecuted the Karaites viciously whenever they had the opportunity. At one time it appeared that Karaism would overwhelm the Talmudists, but the threat was averted by Saadia al-Fayyumi (892-942). The Karaites claim that they have never been Talmudists, and that their religion is older than the Jewish faith. Moreover, they contend that the Karaites had no part in persecuting and crucifying Jesus.

Because of the social virtues manifested by the Karaites, Count Zubov, the Governor-General of New Russia, interceded on their behalf and was successful in having them released by the government of Tavrida from the double tax paid by the other Jews. They were granted permission to own estates, and, in general, given equal rights with the Christian population. These privileges were granted on the understanding “that the community of Karaites should not be entered by the Jews known by the name of Rabins (Rabbinites), concerning whom the laws enacted by us are to be rigidly enforced.” (Ukase of June 8, 1795.) The Russians accepted them and they apparently lived together in peace and harmony. They were granted full civil rights in 1863, which was confirmed in 1881 by Nicholai Ignatieff with special emphasis.

* * * * *

At the turn of the nineteenth century the Russian Government was bombarded with complaints against Jews engaged in the traffic of alcoholic beverages in the Pale of Settlement. The clamor was so insistent that the Government ultimately launched a series of investigations. A statute to establish the rights and limitation of the Jews was enacted in 1804. It provided that beginning January 1, 1807 in the Governments of Astrakhan and Caucasia, Little
Russia and New Russia, and beginning January 1, 1808, in the other Governments, “no one among the Jews in any village or hamlet shall be permitted to hold any leases on land, to keep taverns, saloons, or inns, whether under his own name or under a strange name, or to sell wine in them, or even to live in them under any pretext whatever, except when passing through.”

The statute, of course, sought to put an end to the abuse of the Jewish liquor trade, and, by its other provisions, attempted to direct Jewish energies into agriculture. Unoccupied land was opened to them throughout the western Governments, and in two eastern Governments, in addition to the right to settle on crown lands. As a further inducement those who availed themselves of the opportunities thus offered, were given an exemption of all taxes for the first years. Schools, gymnasiums, and universities were thrown open to them throughout the Empire, in addition to the right to open their own schools. One of three languages—Russian, Polish, or German, was made compulsory. The mode of dress of either Poland, Germany or Russia was required.

The statute did not arouse any great enthusiasm among the Jews in the Pale of Settlement. Napoleon’s Paris Sanhedrin had, of course, created great agitation among the Jews everywhere, but the Russian Jews were particularly aroused. Most of the Governments of Europe suspected that Napoleon was using the Sanhedrin for the purpose of creating a rebellion of the Jews in their several countries, and this suspicion was especially strong in Russia. Because of this feeling the effective date of the Act of 1804 was postponed in the beginning of 1807, but in October of 1807 the Czar ordered it put into effect. The program had to be abandoned, however, when Napoleon invaded Russia in 1812.

The Vienna Congress of 1815 enlarged the borders of European Russia by the addition of the former Duchy of Warsaw, which was renamed the Kingdom of Poland. During the period from 1815 to 1848, about two million Jews occupied the western portion of the Russian Empire.

Every effort at converting the Khazar Jews to Christianity failed miserably. Czar Alexander I made a sincere effort in 1817. On March 17th of that year he established the “Society of Israelitish Christians”, and set aside crown lands in the northern and southern provinces for the possible converts. The land was to be free. Nicholas I was forced to dissolve the project in 1833. There had been no converts.

Meanwhile the Judaizing movement continued under the zealous efforts of the Sabbatarian sect. The rabbinical Jews fought the Sabbatarian Jews with greater vigor than they fought the Chris-
A number of Christians were impressed with the false Messiahship of Sabbatai, who, it was said, was still alive and about to appear, and embraced the Judaism of the sect. The Russian Government in its effort to check this “Judaising” movement, impressed the converts into military service, and, where they proved unfit for military duty by reason of their new faith or otherwise, they were sent to Siberia. The movement of the Sabbatarians brought about legislation forbidding Jews to employ Christian domestics. In 1824 Jewish emigrants from neighboring countries were forbidden to settle in Russia.

The Russian government, like the other governments throughout the world, was inclined to be tolerant and liberal toward the Jews. The Russian people, however, had been extremely hostile toward them from the beginning, and closer acquaintance had served to deepen that hostility. This popular antagonism weighed heavily in the government’s policy.

Pestel was a Russian revolutionary writer. He was of the opinion that some type of Sanhedrin should be convened for the purpose of working out plans for governmental cooperation in an honorable expulsion of the Jews from Russia. He believed that the government should assist the Jews in forming a separate commonwealth of their own in some portion of Asia Minor.

In his "Russian Truth" Pestel describes the Jewish problem as an indissoluble tangle. He contends that the peculiar characteristics of the Jews render them utterly unfit for membership in a social order. “The Jews,” he wrote, “foster among themselves incredibly close ties.” They have a “religion of their own, which instills into them the belief that they are predestined to conquer all nations,” and this belief “makes it impossible for them to mix with any other nation.” He found that the rabbis wield unlimited power over the Jewish masses and keep them in spiritual bondage, “forbidding the reading of all books except the Talmud” and other such writings. They are waiting, he declared, “for the coming of the Messiah, who is to establish them in their kingdom,” and they therefore “look upon themselves as temporary residents of the land in which they live.” These doctrines, concluded Pestel, gives the Jews their passion for commerce and accounts for their neglect of agriculture and handicrafts. Since commerce alone is unable to provide the huge masses of Russian Jews with a livelihood, cheating and trickery are considered permissible as long as they are practiced on Christians.

The 1917 Bolshevik Revolution may be said to be the culmination of the efforts of Russia’s unassimilable minorities to dominate the government. Of these alien elements the most important, and by
far the most numerous, were the Khazar Jews. The peculiar economic, social and political systems of the empire were ill-designed to sustain the impact of prolonged war abroad, and the corroding acid of disloyalty at home. The monarchy was inept and vacillating, and the government corrupt and inefficient. The mammoth structure rapidly deteriorated and collapsed under the lash of war and revolution.

For nearly a hundred years the government had swayed back and forth in a frenzy of indecision, seeking solutions for unsolvable problems and attempting to appease unappeasable people. The emancipation of the serfs in 1861 was followed by extreme measures against the seditious Jews. The Russian policy was a strange mixture of arbitrary firmness, and sudden outbursts of liberality and gentleness. At times the policy was cruel and ruthless, but seldom without exasperating provocation. On occasion the government made awkward attempts to appease its subversive subjects by the proposal of modified European reforms. In most cases these timid efforts were answered by an assassin's bullet. Liberalization of the laws, “democratic procedures,” “leniency” and “tolerance,” and all such governmental gestures, were seized upon by the Jewish revolutionaries and their conspirators as signs of weakness. Extended concessions and reform would be withdrawn and the forces of the internal security police corps strengthened.

If Russia's internal policy was weak and vacillating, her foreign relations techniques were utterly ineffective and, for all practical purposes, non-existent. More than anything else, in all probability, this lack of foreign relations effectiveness assured the success of the Russian Revolution. The abdication of the Czar and the subsequent overthrow of the comparatively mild socialistic government of Alexander Kerensky might have been averted had Russia established an effective foreign relations policy at the turn of the century. Perhaps the Czar could not know—although it was his business to have known—that his government was dealing with the same enemy abroad that fought him so viciously at home. While his agents did not meet the enemy face to face in foreign capitals of the world, they were either in the cloak-room or had just departed down the back stairs. Organized Jewry in Vienna, Paris, London, Washington, and the other capitals of the world made Russian policy their particular concern, and they saw to it that that policy boded no good for Russia. Agents of the Czar traveled from country to country futilely seeking audiences who would view motion pictures of the riots and demonstrations that were sweeping Russia; begged public officials and newspaper men to investigate the revolutionary excesses of the Jews. Everywhere these agents traveled they found that the Jews had been there ahead of them; that the pressures they exerted on officialdom
created a barrier they could not hurdle. Russia was unable to secure a hearing.

Former Russian Jews, armed with American passports, arrogantly clamored at Russian ports of entry for the purpose of carrying on the revolutionary activities in the country from which they had been expelled. When they were denied admission organized Jewry in the United States was able to precipitate international incidents by pressuring the newspapers and the Presidents for United States’ intervention. There were few newspapers in the United States, England or in continental Europe that dared publish a favorable item concerning the Russian government. When the Russo-Japanese war broke out, organized Jewry hailed Japan, and Jewish money became immediately available to the Mikado. Jacob Schiff in the United States worked vigorously for the destruction of the Russian Empire. There were no spokesmen for the Russian cause anywhere. Those who knew and perhaps cared, dared not speak. And the unthinking public was not interested. Russia was a vast, dark, mysterious land with a cruel Czar who sent most of his subjects to Siberia and spent the greater part of his time persecuting the Jews.

From 1855 to 1870 the revolutionary activities against Czarist Russia were directed, for the greater part, by Nihilists. While the philosophy of Nihilism might be summed up by the single word “Destruction”, its pernicious influence in motivating the Russian masses to horrible acts of terrorism is not so easily described. The essence of the doctrine of Nihilism is that nothing, or anything of a specified class exists; is knowable, or is valuable. Even if something did exist it could not be known, and if it were known this knowledge could not be communicated. Schopenhauer’s pessimism and denial of the will is said to express a nihilistic attitude toward the so-called values of the world. As a social doctrine Nihilism is the belief that progress is possible only through the destruction of all social and political organizations. As an ethical doctrine Nihilism is the denial of the validity of all distinctions of moral value.

Ivan Sergeevich Turgenev (1818-1883) is said to be the first to use the term Nihilism. In his novel, “Father and Sons” (1861) he applies the word to the theory that the existing economic and social institutions must be destroyed without concern as to the new order that would take its place. The Russian Nihilists, however, had various programs, but gave no real thought to the future order. Its immediate purpose and the pledge of its members was naked and unadorned destruction. Assassinations, arson, and dynamiting were the chief characteristics of their activities. There was no central planning committee or board of strategy, and the spe-
Specific criminal acts of the members were not necessarily directed by a leader. Small groups and even individuals were encouraged to act on their own initiative.

Czar Alexander II was one of Russia’s most benevolent monarchs. He was gentle, patriotic, and made a sincere and sustained effort to understand and solve the problems of his people. He did more to bring Russia in line with the enlightened policies of the West than any of his predecessors. Had he been permitted to live out of his life, the course of Russian history—perhaps the history of the world—might have been radically different in the twentieth century.

On February 19, 1861, he granted freedom to more than twenty million Russians. Under the provisions of the imperial manifesto the peasants were made the owners of a considerable area of land. In 1863 he established an elaborate system of provincial and municipal self-governments known as the “Zemstvos”. Jury courts were established throughout Russia on November 20, 1864, initiating a more liberal judicial system for the empire. The death penalty in ordinary cases had been abolished for nearly a hundred years. He had signed the draft law for a basic constitution the day of his assassination. Many of Alexander’s reforms had been worked out with the help of Loris-Melikov, his Minister of the Interior, who was very popular with the Russian people. The Czar’s policies were hailed with approval throughout the empire. The feeling of the Russians is indicated by a letter addressed to Loris-Melikov in 1880 from the Tver zemstvo. “In a short time,” the letter read, “you have been able to justify the confidence of the Czar, and many hopes of the public. You have introduced straightforwardness and good-will into the relations of the Government and the people. You have wisely recognized the lawful needs and desires of the public.” The letter ended with the opinion that “a happy future is opening for our dear country.”

There was nothing, however, that the Czar might do that would satisfy the revolutionaries. Loris-Melikov’s popularity with the Russian people was merely a source of irritation to the Nihilists. The reforms, long demanded, served only to fill their minds with alarms and their hearts with renewed hatred. The underground revolutionary periodicals scoffed at the new laws, and condemned the liberal policy of the Minister as “the fox’s tail.” They saw the “excuses” for their blood-letting activities slipping away, and, what was more important, a growing popular satisfaction with the Czar and his government.

Alexander opened the high schools and universities to the Jews. All classes, rich and poor alike, took immediate advantage of the opportunity thus presented. Education, however, increased rather
than lessened Jewish animosity against the Czar and his government. This antagonism, following the pattern established by the Jews in western nations, was concealed behind the shell of “race” and “discrimination”. The universities became hot-beds of revolutionary agitation, and the Jewish students threw themselves into the various movements with vigor and zeal.

Nihilist philosophy was entirely too obscure and ill-defined to create a lasting movement, but its basic principle of violent destructiveness was one of the elementary tenets of Marxism. The dialectic materialism of “scientific socialism” would add a convincing “anti-thesis” to the Nihilist thesis—the conflict and struggle for the birth of the new order. The Nihilist was not required to make a difficult mental journey from his basic philosophy to the doctrines of Marx, and, when the time came, he made the transition with vigor and sinister enthusiasm.

The Russian Nihilists called themselves the Narodnaya Volya (“Will of the People”). Lenin’s elder brother was a member of this movement. His execution by the Russian government in 1887 is said to have made a lasting impression on Lenin’s mental processes. Lenin himself was raised in the criminal conspiratorial atmosphere of the Narodnaya Volya.

Sergei Mihailovich Kravchinski (1851-1895) has been described as a “practical terrorist”. He was the son of an army doctor. He attended the Military Academy and Artillery School. He became a lieutenant in the Artillery in 1870, but resigned in 1871. He attended St. Petersburg Forrestry Institute in 1872. He was a member of the Chaikovski Circle. In 1875 he went to the Balkans to assist the revolt of the Southern Slaves against the Turks. He returned to Russia in 1878 and became a member of Zemlya i Volya.

Kravchinski was aroused by reports of the ill-treatment of the terrorists who had been convicted and sent to the Peter and Paul Fortress. He considered General Mezentsev, Chief of the Third Section of the Gendarmie, responsible. Kravchinski considered assassinating the General. When a certain Kovalski was arrested and sentenced to death (the first death sentence against a terrorist for an attempt on the life of anyone other than the Czar, Kravchinski decided to act.

Alexander Mihailov planned and organized the murder, and established the pattern for such subsequent ventures. Mezentsev’s habits and movements were carefully checked and noted before final plans were made. A good horse and carriage were secured, and two revolutionaries acted as Kravchinski’s body-guards. A third was in charge of the horse and carriage. The General and an adjutant, as was his custom, walked toward his office at nine
KRASAVTSEV, Lev Grigorievich, was born in South Russia. In 1873 he was a member of the revolutionary movement in Kiev. His activities brought him to the attention of the police and he was arrested in 1875. He succeeded in escaping the following year. Returning to his former activities he helped organize the peasants of the Chigirin and Cherkess districts into a secret league for revolution. The peasants were led to believe that the Czar had secretly ordered the revolt and that they were acting in their sovereign's behalf. Deutsch was again arrested in September of 1877, and again escaped, in May, 1878. He became a member of the revolutionary secret society, Zemlya i Volya (Land and Freedom). Later he joined the Cherni Peredel (Black Party), which had as its revolutionary basis the division of the "black earth" among the peasants. In 1880 Deutsch went abroad to escape arrest. In 1884 he was arrested in Germany, extradited to Russia, and imprisoned. He again escaped in 1901, was arrested in 1906 and escaped the same year. For a time he was associated with Plekhanov, Zasulich, and Lenin in the Russian Social Democratic Party. After the success of the Bolshevik Revolution he returned to live in the Soviet Union.

Georgi Valentinovich Plekhanov (1857-1918) was born near Tambov. He attended the Petersburg University. He joined the revolutionary Zemlya i Volya in 1876 and attended the Voronezh conference. He later became one of the leaders of the Cherni Peredel party. In 1880 he left Russia and lived abroad. As a member of the Social Democratic Party he became associated with Lenin, and was one of the outstanding figures in the revolutionary international left-wing movement. He returned to Russia in 1917, but split with Lenin. He died in Finland in 1918.

Grigori Davidovich Goldenberg (1856-1888) was the son of a Jewish merchant who lived near Kiev. His entire life was devoted to revolutionary-terrorist activities. He was first apprehended by the police in 1878 and exiled to Archangel province in April of that year. By June he had made his escape. In February,
1879, he assassinated Prince Kropotkin at Kharkov. He was elated with the ease with which he had murdered the Prince and boasted that the whole enterprise had cost only 520 rubles. When he returned to St. Petersburg he told his fellow assassins that he was now ready to kill the Emperor. Most of the conspirators believed that history would be better served if the Emperor was murdered by a "pure-blooded Russian". If Goldenberg, a Ukrainian Jew, struck the fatal blow, the Russian Jews would suffer grave reprisals. Although intensely vain and excitable, Goldenberg reluctantly bowed to the argument.

The attempt on the Czar's life at Alexandrovsk contemplated careful planning. Much of the equipment had to be fabricated by the assassins. Goldenberg assisted in storing the dynamite that had been secured for dynamiting the Czar's train, and helped make the brass containers for the mine. It was finally decided that he might participate in the Czar's murder, but word having come from Moscow that additional assassins were needed there, Goldenberg had to forego the pleasure. The plot to dynamite Alexander's train failed because of some defect in the wiring or the switch that was to set off the blasts, although the conspirators could find nothing wrong with the apparatus when it was later examined.

The Moscow project for the assassination of Alexander II was more elaborate. A small house was purchased on the outskirts of Moscow in the Preobrazhenskoe district near the main railway line from Kursk. A gallery was to be dug fifty yards from the cellar of the house to the railway embankment so that a charge of explosives might be laid under the road bed. Goldenberg was assigned to the job of clearing the earth from the gallery and other tasks connected with the venture. As the work progressed through many difficulties, Goldenberg again demanded the honor of setting off the charge. "I gave it as my view," he wrote, "that I should be the one to fire the charge, as I had carried out the execution of Kropotkin."

Learning that an alternative assassination attempt at Odessa had been abandoned because of a change in the Czar's plans, and that more explosives would be needed for the Moscow attempt, Goldenberg was dispatched to Odessa to secure the dynamite that had been stored there. He was arrested with the dynamite at the railroad station at Elizavetgrad.

Captain Dobrinski, one of Russia's most brilliant police officers, tricked Goldenberg into revealing a hundred or more names of the terrorists. When he became convinced that he had unwittingly betrayed his fellow-criminals he committed suicide by hanging himself in his cell.

The order of the Czar's train was changed at the last minute,
and, instead of being the fourth coach of the second train as the conspirators expected, he was in the fourth coach of the first train. His life again had been spared.

Lev Nikolaevich Hartmann (1850-1913) was a member of the Executive Committee of the Narodnaya Volya. He had been arrested in 1876 but was released a year later. He played an important role in the unsuccessful attempt on the Czar’s life at Moscow in 1879. He was successful in eluding the Russian police and, like so many others of the terrorists, escaped abroad. Russian agents tracked him to Paris where he was apprehended by the French police. Russia’s attempts to extradite him failed because of a publicity campaign and heavy pressures on the French government. On visits to England and the United States he was hailed as a hero by the international left-wing. Marx and Engels looked upon him as an outstanding example of the revolutionary proletariat, and, as the foreign representative of the Executive Committee of Narodnaya Volya, Hartmann made it his business to keep in touch with these founders of “scientific socialism.”

The Narodnaya Volya set up a press in a flat in the Troitski Pereulok in St. Petersburg. Gesya Mironova (Jesse) Helfmann (1855-1882) leased the flat under a false name. Here the terrorists published the Rabochaya Gazeta (Workers’ Paper) at irregular intervals.

Jesse Helfmann was the daughter of a Jewish tradesman near Kiev. She joined the terrorists in 1874 and was arrested in 1875. In 1877 she was one of the defendants in the Trial of the Fifty which commenced in Moscow in the autumn of that year. The revolutionaries used this trial for publicizing their movement, and the techniques developed became a pattern for all such subsequent trials. Many of the crimes charged against the defendants were revolting in their sheer brutality. One Gorinovich, a member of Russia’s secret police, had been a particular target of the assassins. He had aroused their hatred by rounding up some of the terrorists in Kiev in 1876. When his identity became known to the Narodnaya Volya party, he was marked for death. Elaborate plans were made and carefully executed. Gorinovich was lured to a railway siding in Odessa, where the hiding assassins attacked him with knives. Believing him dead they rubbed lime in his face to prevent identification. A paper was pinned on his coat reading: “This is what happens to spies.” His sudden appearance at the Trial of the Fifty in Moscow was a horrible indictment of the accused. The disfigured face, half burned away, was living testimony of the inhuman character of the men and women who would “save Russia” through destruction.
The Jewess Helfmann was convicted and imprisoned until 1879. The leniency of the government is indicated by the fact that she was released in 1879, although confined to a fixed residence by police orders. She escaped the same year.

During the preparations for the assassination of Alexander II Helfmann and Nikolai Sabin were in charge of the terrorists' headquarters in the Telezhnaya in St. Petersburg. After the brutal murder of the Czar on March 1, 1881, the police raided the flat in the Telezhnaya. Extra bombs had been stored in the flat. In the shooting that attended the raid before the police broke in the door. Helfmann, fearing a stray bullet might explode the bombs, attempted to carry them to a safe place. While she was so engaged Sablin killed himself with his last bullet.

Charged with czaricide, Helfmann went on trial for her life with Rysakov, Mihailov, Kibalchich, Perovskaya and Zhelyabov. All were convicted and sentenced to death. Helfmann, however, announced that she was pregnant, and a medical commission confirmed the statement. Her death sentence was commuted to life imprisonment. She died in prison in February of 1882. Her daughter (born in September of 1881) was sent to an orphanage and her record was marked “parents unknown”. The child's father was Nikolai Kolotkevich, a member of the Narodnaya Volya. He was tried and convicted in 1882 and died in prison in 1884.

Isak Aronchik and Chernavskaya, posing as husband and wife, maintained headquarters for the conspirators in the Moscow attempt on the life of Alexander II. Goldenberg said that Aronchik was lazy and that the men digging the gallery for mining the road-bed would not work with him. He was born in 1856 in Gomel in Central Russia and devoted himself to revolutionary acts of terrorism until he died in the Fortress of Peter and Paul in 1882. He was a member of Narodnaya Volya. In addition to his participation in the railway attempt at Moscow in 1879, he assisted the assassins in the successful murder of the Czar on March 1, 1881. He was arrested shortly afterward and tried and convicted in 1882.

It was Aaron Isakovitch Zundelevich and Alexander Kviatkovski, as a committee of two who decided that the Czar should be killed by some one of “pure Russian blood”. Zundelevich was the son of a Jewish merchant of Vilensk (1855-1923), a member of Zemlya i Volya, and a member of the Executive Committee of Narodnaya Volya. Alexander Soloviev was selected as the “Russian” to make a single-handed attempt on the Czar, which he did on April 2, 1879. He proved a poor shot, as the Emperor, dodging and zig-
zagging, escaped with only a bullet hole through his clothing. Soloviev was captured, tried by court martial and hanged.

Zundelevich was arrested in the St. Petersburg Public Library in October of 1879 and was tried and convicted with fifteen others. He was sentenced to hard labor for life. For a time he was imprisoned with Goldenberg, and it was he who convinced Goldenberg that Dobrinski had tricked him into betraying his co-conspirators. Zundelevich was released from prison in 1905. He settled in England where he died.

The Russian people considered *Nihilism* a Jewish movement. The *Pale of Settlement* had always been a hotbed of sedition and many of the most active terrorists were Jews. *Nihilism* was characterized from the beginning as anti-religious, and antagonistic to every conventionality of society. Its venom was directed against Christianity in general, and the Greek Catholic Church in particular.

“*Nihilism*” was not a name selected or used by the terrorists to describe their movement, activities, or political philosophy. The term was used generally by those who condemned the conspirators and their criminal activities. There never was a political doctrine or movement by that name. Turgenev apparently coined the term from “annihilation”. It has been said that the term “nihilist” might be considered a slang term for an attitude of mind, in the same category of what is known as “debunking”. All radical thinking is, in essence, a *reaction* against timehonored ideals and tradition. Such maxims as “man is an animal”, and “the belly is the center of the world” are described as the work of “the thinking realist”.

Anarchy should be distinguished from *Nihilism*. Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865) is the father of anarchy. He was first attracted to the socialism of the Utopians (which was not socialism in any modern sense), and later, under the influence of Karl Marx, became an anarchist. “Government of man,” he held, “is oppression. The highest perfection of society is found in order and anarchy.” The violent application of this philosophy characterized the revolution of 1848. Michael Bakunin may be said to be one of the founders of the movement referred to as *Nihilism* as it developed in Russia.

Socialism and anarchism developed together in the beginning. The Hague conference of the *First International* in 1872 marked a point of difference, but there is not much distinction as to ultimate aim. One socialist element conceives a “withering away of the dictatorship of the proletariat” and the beginning of the “stateless state,” while the anarchist wing proposes to abolish the state at the outset.

The *First International*, organized by Marx, was definitely anar-
chistic in spirit. Bakunin’s Social Democratic Alliance, organized in Geneva in 1868, went considerably beyond the anarchism of the First International, although this fact did not prevent its affiliation with the International in 1869. The modern anarchist movement may be said to have been launched at the conference held at Saint Imler, Switzerland, in 1872. After Bakunin’s death, Count Malatesta took over the leadership of the movement at the Congress of Berne in 1876, and gave impetus to the extreme anarchistic spirit of the Italian revolutionists.

At the convention held at Fribourg, Switzerland, in 1878, the delegates declared unanimously for the “collective appropriation of social riches; the abolition of the state under all its forms; insurrectional and revolutionary action, and against the use of the ballot, a mischievous instrument incapable of realizing the sovereignty of the people.”

Thereafter the movement spread, allying itself with Nihilism in Russia, and finding vigorous response in Italy, France and Spain. An important result of the movement was that the United States eventually was made the haven of refuge for the criminal leaders and assassins who were hunted by the European police. Violent demonstrations in the industrial centers of the United States soon disclosed that the transplanted anarchists and Nihilists had not abandoned their murderous philosophies at Ellis Island.

Johann Most, expelled from Germany in 1879, found refuge in London where he immediately organized a secret international club for the purpose of carrying on agitation in preparation for a general revolution. A Central Committee in London was planned for the purpose of directing revolutionary activities in every country. Lev Hartmann, who also had found refuge in London from the Russian police, joined Most in calling an International Revolutionary Congress in London in July, 1881. About forty delegates attended the Congress. The “principles” adopted by the delegates follow:

“The revolutionaries of all countries are uniting into an ‘International Revolutionary Working Men’s Association’, for the purpose of a social revolution. The headquarters of the association is at London, and sub-committees are formed in Paris, Geneva and New York. In every place where like-minded supporters exist, sections and an Executive Committee of three persons are to be formed. The committees of a country are to keep up with one another and with the General Committee regular communications by means of continual reports and information and to collect money for the purchase of poison and weapons, as well as to find places suitable for laying mines, and so on. To attain the proposed end, the annihilation of all rulers, ministers of state, nobility, the clergy, the most prom-
inent capitalists, and other exploiters, any means are permissible, and, therefore, great attention should be given specially to the study of chemistry, and the preparation of explosives, as being the most important weapons. Together with the chief committee in London there will also be established an Executive Committee of international composition, and an information bureau whose duty is to carry out the decisions of the Chief Committee, and to conduct correspondence."

When London became too uncomfortable for Johann Most in 1883 he came to the United States. New York and Chicago became the important centers of anarchist activities.

Home-made bombs exploded in churches and public places throughout the world, and assassin’s bullets cut short the lives of public figures.

George Darboy the Archbishop of Paris, was murdered May 24, 1871.

Three attempts were made on the life of William I of Prussia and Germany.

On September 28, 1883, an attempt was made to explode a bomb at the unveiling of the Niederwald monument in Germany, at which Emperor William, the Crown Prince, and other eminent personages were present. The fuse failed to burn. Remsdorf, Rupsch and Kuchler were tried for the crime in Leipsic in 1884, convicted and sentenced to death.

Jules Ferry, ex-Premier of France, escaped death through the poor marksmanship of his would-be assassin December 19, 1887.

Seven persons were wounded by the explosion of a bomb in the Rue Clinchy in Paris, March 27, 1892.

Six persons were injured April 25, 1892, by the explosion of a bomb thrown by Menuier into the Cafe Verze in Paris.

A bomb thrown into a crowded Church in Warsaw, September 7, 1892, killed the bomb thrower—the only person killed by the explosion.

As Joseph Pauwels threw a bomb into the Church of the Madeleine in Paris, during services in March of 1893, a swinging door caught his arm, causing him to drop the bomb which killed him when it exploded. No one else was injured.

Twenty persons were injured at Grenoble, France, March 21, 1893, when a bomb was exploded at the entrance of a church.

General Campos in Spain narrowly escaped death by a bomb thrown September 24, 1893.

Thirty people were killed and eighty injured in the Lyceum Theatre in Barcelona, Spain, November 8, 1893, as a result of the explosion of a bomb.

Auguste Vaillant threw a bomb into the Chamber of Deputies
at Paris, December 9, 1893, wounding seven deputies by its explo­sion. Vaillant was guillotined February 5, 1894.

Emile Henry, on February 12, 1894, threw a bomb into the cafe of the Hotel Terminus, at Paris. Twenty persons were injured. Henry was guillotined May 20, 1894.

A bomb thrown in front of the Chamber of Deputies in Rome March 8, 1894, injured eight people.

Several persons were wounded by a dynamite explosion in Liege, Belgium, May 3, 1894.

Marie Francois Carnot, President of France, was mortally stabbed at Lyons by Cesare Santo, Sunday, June 24, 1894.

On June 7, 1896, a bomb thrown into a religious procession in Barcelona, Spain, exploded and killed eleven persons and severely wounded forty others. More than three thousand anarchists were arrested. Thirty-one were given life sentences, and many of the others were deported.

President Faure of the French Republic was shot at on June 13, 1897.

Antonio Conovas del Castillo, Prime Minister of Spain, was shot to death by Miguel Angolillo, alias Golli, at Santa Aguenda, Spain, August 8, 1897.

King George I and Princess Marie of Greece missed death on February 26, 1898, when the assassin’s bullets missed their targets.

Empress Elizabeth of Austria, while going from her hotel to a boat at Geneva, Switzerland, was stabbed to death by Luccheni, a Franco-Italian anarchist, September 10, 1898.

King Humbert was shot to death at Monza, July 29, 1900. The crime was planned at Patterson, New Jersey, and Angelo Bresci traveled from there to Italy where he committed the murder.

William II, Emperor of Germany, was struck and wounded in the face by a missile thrown at him March 6, 1901.

Privy Councillor Podiedonosteff, Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod, narrowly missed death on March 22, 1901. He was writing in his study at St. Petersburg when the assassin, who was outside, fired four shots. Two of the bullets narrowly missed the Privy-Councillor. The other bullets did not enter the room.

An Italian boy by the name of Spido shot at the Prince of Wales, as the Prince was about to enter a train at Brussels. He missed.

President William McKinley was shot while attending a public reception at the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo, New York, September 6, 1901, by Leon Czolgosz. The President died of the wound September 14, 1901.

Stark terror haunted the capitals of the world. A mad beast stalked in the shadows, ready to strike with knife, bullet or bomb, and no official or clergyman walked the streets in safety.
The afternoon of March 1, 1881 in St. Petersburg was sullen and dreary. The snow, defiled by mud and debris, lay piled in the streets and on the sidewalks. The mine under the street of the Malaya Sadovaya was ready to be exploded by Michael Frolenko from the cheese shop. Helfmann and Sabin were at the conspiratorial headquarters in the flat on the Telezhnaya. Sophia Perovskaya was at her post within sight of the riding academy, and saw the Emperor depart. She left immediately to signal the bomb throwers. Mounted Cossacks rode in the front and at the sides of the Emperor’s carriage. Colonel Dvorzhitski and his staff followed in a sleigh, behind which, in a second sleigh, rode Captain of Police Koch. The convoy moved at a rapid pace down the Inzhenernaya, and turned toward the Ekaterinski Canal. Rysakov threw his cotton-wrapped bomb. Its explosion shattered the rear axle of the Emperor’s carriage. Several of the Cossacks were caught in the blast and thrown from their saddles. A small boy screamed as his body was torn by the explosion. The horses bolted. The cries of the injured boy caused the Emperor to order the coachman to stop. When he alighted from the carriage he was seen to limp and it was believed that he had been hit by a splinter. Rysakov had been seized. A crowd of people were gathering. The boy was on the pavement writhing and screaming in agony. The Emperor walked along the pavement inquiring of the wounded. Grinevitski, leaning against the railing of the canal, waited until the Emperor was but a few paces from him before he hurled the bomb at his feet. The explosion was heard throughout the city. A second explosion followed. Twenty people had been hit, including the assassin Grinevitski. The Emperor was still breathing. He lay in his blood in the dirty snow and debris. One leg was shattered to the thigh, and the other severed to the knee; his abdomen was torn open, and his face horribly shattered. His right hand was badly torn. Pieces of his wedding ring had been driven into the flesh. Grand Duke Michael had heard the first explosion and had arrived at the scene just before Grinevitski had thrown the second bomb. The Czar was able to urge the Grand Duke to get him to the palace to “there die”. At the palace his legs were amputated. He died about an hour and a half later without regaining consciousness.

Ignati Grinevitski died of his wounds a few hours after the explosion. Andri Ivanovich Zhelyabov, Sophia Perovskaya, Nikolai Kibalchich, Timothy Mihailov, Nikolai Rysakov, and Gesya (Jesse) Helfmann were sentenced and convicted of the crime. They were all sentenced to be hanged.

* * * * * * *

The condemned did not take an official appeal. Mihailov and
Rysakov, however, petitioned the Czar for reprieve. Rysakov was a student and only nineteen years old at the time of the crime. His petition to the Emperor reads in part:

“Your Imperial Majesty and All Merciful Ruler:

“Fully aware of the horror of the crime which, under the influence of others, I committed, I have decided most humbly to beg Your Imperial Majesty to spare my life so that I may unceasingly attempt to atone for my appalling deed . . . I was turned to crime accidentally, through the evil influence of others, whom my immaturity and ignorance of life and men were unable to oppose . . .”

Karl Marx in London, wrote to his daughter, Jenny:

“Have you been following the trial of the assassins in St. Petersburg? They are sterling people through and through, sans pose melo-dramatique, simple, business-like, heroic. Shouting and doing are irreconcilable opposites . . . they try to teach Europe that their modus operandi is a specifically Russian and historically inevitable method against about which there is no more reason to moralize—for or against—than there is about the earthquake in Chinas.”

On the morning of April 16, 1881, the five assassins were hanged (Helfmann having been reprieved because of pregnancy). If the five men expected sympathy from the people of Russia they were direly disappointed. Mihailov attempted to address the crowds as he jostled along in the cart that drove the condemned men to Semenovski Square, but his voice was drowned out by the roll of the drums that accompanied the cortege. Several spectators waved to the assassins as the cart rolled by, but they were immediately attacked by those who stood near them. Over eighty thousand people jammed Semenovski Square where the scaffold had been erected.

The drunken Frolov was the executioner.
MONEY has been said to be the root of all evil. It may be said also that the source of power—particularly evil power—is money. It may corruptly achieve what flattery, logic, and pleading may never touch. It is the magic wand for special privilege, influence in high places; it buys governments as well as railroads. It is the fuel that moves armies and navies, and revolutions perish on the barricades without it. In modern times money may buy public opinion. The world tomorrow belongs to those who own the press, radio and television.

Money is the dragon which gives power to the beast.

"And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money changers, and the seats of them that sold doves. And said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves."

Jewish law from the beginning, in all dealings among Israelites, forbids all "increase" of the debt by reason of lapse of time or forebearance, be the rate of interest high or low, while it does not impose any limit in dealings between Israelites and Gentiles. Hence, while a Jew is forbidden to charge interest on a loan made to another Jew, the sky is the limit when money is loaned to a Gentile. The Hebrew word for usury is "neshek" which means literally "a bite", because of its painfulness to the Gentile. The Talmud writers are minute in their analysis of possible evasions of the law of usury in transactions between Jews. All evasions and tricks are permissible when the Jew deals with the Gentile. Maimonides expressed the opinion that it is positive command of Jewish law for Jews to charge Gentiles interest. The modern Jew is not allowed by his religion to charge a Gentile a higher rate of interest than that fixed by the law of the land where the loan is made or to be paid. There is great wisdom in this concession because most usury laws make the debt unenforceable by the lender if the interest rate exceeds the legal maximum, and many such laws provide for penalties as high as three times the amount collected by the lender. Maimonides did place some limitations on money-lending by Jews to Gentiles: he believed the practice should be within restricted limits, "lest the lender should acquire a passion for taking usury, and practice it on his fellow Israelites."

—84—
The Christians were forbidden to charge interest on money loaned, even to the Jews. This prohibition was decreed by canon law, but, of course, had no application to the Jews. Ecclesiastical punishments were imposed on Christian usurers by the popes, and Pope Alexander III excommunicated all usurers in 1179. The field of usury became a monopoly to the Jews and, of course, Christians were the only available victims. The Jews, therefore, had no competitors, and usury being illegal by canon law to Christians, no laws existed in the beginning in any Christian country setting legal rates. The Jews therefore might charge any rate they had a mind to, or all the traffic would bear. The aristocracy and the rulers of the Christians were the obvious borrowers of money, though the poorer classes of borrowers were not overlooked. Everything of value, except the sacred vessels of the Church, might be pledged to the Jewish money-lenders, and this, of course, was done. Thus the pawn-shop and high Jewish finance developed together.

Banking in the sense of taking money on deposit and loaning it out on interest, generally speaking, is a modern development. There were but few institutions of this character in the Middle Ages, although the financial activities of the Jews as far back as the pre-Christian era in the Roman Empire are referred to as “banking”. The Jewish money-lenders did not accept or receive money on deposit, which is an essential element of “banking”. The Jewish money-lenders used their own money, or pooled the money of their relatives or the more affluent members of the Jewish communities.

Many Jews were the tax-collectors for the Gentile rulers and amassed fortunes in this calling. The Egyptians, when they controlled Palestine, annually leased the taxes of each city to the highest bidder. The lessee paid into the royal treasury a fixed annual sum; and whatever the revenue yielded in excess was the lessee’s profit. Conversely, if the taxes collected were less than the fixed annual sum the lessee had to bear the loss. Jews usually were the highest bidders, and hence became the “tax gatherers,” Joseph ben Tobiah, a nephew of the high priest Onias II, under Ptolemy IV, held the office of tax-collector for twenty-two years, and was succeeded by his son, Hyrcanus. Joseph and Hyrcanus accumulated vast fortunes. During his twenty-two years of tax-gathering, Joseph employed every known means of governmental persuasion for prompt annual payment, and many of his arguments were unanswerable. For instance, he beheaded twenty distinguished citizens of Ascalon and Scythopolis for refusing to pay their taxes, and then confiscated their possessions. It hardly need be said that the twenty-two recalcitrant tax-payers were Gentiles. When it came to collecting taxes from their fellow Jews, both Joseph and Hyrcanus were much more restrained in their persua-
sions. As a matter of fact it is recorded that they showed great leniency toward their co-religionists, and that their accumulated wealth raised the material condition of Judea.

The general outcry against the rapacious Jewish tax-collector caused the Council of Macon in 587 A.D. to prohibit the leasing of taxes to Jews. The injunction was so poorly observed that it became necessary for the Council of Meaux to renew it (849 A.D.). But these decrees appear to have been futile. During the reign of Charles V (1364-1380) Menassier of Vesoul was receiver-general of the Jewish taxes for the north of France, and Denis Quinan for Languedoc. Polish nobility used Jewish tax-collectors. Until the middle of the seventeenth century the customs duties were generally leased by the Turkish government to Jews. Although the office was sometimes fraught with peril and some of the Jewish tax-collectors paid for their fabulous fortunes with their lives, it was nevertheless, a source of great wealth and power.

Aaron of Lincoln and Aaron of York in England, Jahudan Cavalleria and Benveniste da Porta in Aragon, Esmel de Ablitas in Navarre, and Nathan Official in France, are some of the great Jewish financiers of the Middle Ages. They were associated with the royal treasuries of their respective lands of domicile.

A Marrano is the name given by the Spaniards to those Jews who falsely professed Christianity in order to secure the privileges of the Christians in Spain. As the Marranos spread throughout the world empire of Spain and Portugal (1580-1640) Jewish commerce was extended. Don Joseph Nasi became the center of Spanish finance. The Marranos reaped fabulous fortunes from the profits of importation into Europe of the raw products of the East and West Indies. Gradis at Bordeaux, a branch of the Mendes family, established relations with Amsterdam and the New World, so that it ultimately became the chief exporters from France to Canada, besides maintaining relations with the Marranos in Spain itself. The importations included bullion, so that these Jewish merchants gradually became bankers.

During the latter part of the seventeenth and the early part of the eighteenth centuries, certain Marrano merchants became loan agents for European monarchs. Isaac Suasso, and Baron Auvernes de Gras are said to have loaned two million florins to William of Orange for the invasion of England. As the armies of Europe mobilized for the wars of Louis XIV the Jews amassed great fortunes as commissaries, which were then loaned out to the warring Christians in banking operations. The Jews financed both sides. On one side, Marlborough's troops were supplied by Sir Solomon Medina and Joseph Cortisos; while Jacob Woms supplied the armies of Louis XIV.

In Hamburg, Germany, the "Hamburger Bank" came into being,
Diego Teixera de Mattos, a Marrano, being one of its chief founders. Later the two Abensurs, financial representatives of the King of Poland, formed connections with the Hamburg institution. “Court Jews” gradually insinuated themselves into the smaller German courts and took over their finances. Michael of Berlin was court Jew to Joachim II of Brandenburg; Samson Wertheimer at Vienna, and Bassevi von Treuenberg were connected with the imperial finances of the Hapsburgs.

Pintos, Delmontes, Bueno de Mesquita, and Francis Mels of Amsterdam became the leading financiers of northern Europe in the middle of the eighteenth century.

The financial control of the Anti-Napoleonic League was in the hands of Mayer Amschel Rothschild, court Jew of William I, elector of Hesse-Cassel. It is interesting to note in passing that the origin of the Rothschild fortune came from eight million and more pounds sterling accumulated by Frederick II (William’s father) for the hire of his Hessians to the British government in its efforts to crush the American revolution.

The rise of the house of Rothschild may be said to be the beginning of intensive Jewish international finance. Mayer Amschel Rothschild so cleverly manipulated the inheritance of William I, that he was able to establish branches of his operations in the most important capitols of Europe, and he had enough sons to manage them.

The vast international connections of great Jewish families, such as the Rothschilds, Sterns, Pereires, Hirschs, and Bischoffsheims, permitted them to amass greater and greater wealth as the nineteenth century progressed. State loans, financed by these Jewish families between 1820 and 1860, became important sources of wealth and power. The Rothschilds, it is true, had a virtual monopoly of the loan market until the fifties. Credit banks began to appear after 1850. The Credit Mobilier was founded in 1852 by Pereire, Solomon Heine, and D’Eichthal.

When railroads came to Europe the Jewish bankers were immediately involved in their financing. The Pereires obtained the concession for the South Russian railways, and the railroads of northern France. The Bischoffsheims became connected with the railroads of Belgium, and Baron de Hirsch with those of Turkey. Jewish credit houses, especially the house of Bleichroeder, took over the railways of Germany and Austria.

Catholic financiers in France, in an attempt to wrest the control of money from the Jews, organized the Union Generale in 1885. The venture proved a disastrous failure.

many commercial banks and, through their international connections, placed Russian government loans in the German and French money markets. The Kronenbergs and Ivan Blioch, of Warsaw, and Efrussi and Rafalovich, of Odessa, are other Jews who carried Jewish finance to the Russian Empire.

Seligman Brothers and Speyer & Co., financed the North, and Eranger financed the South, in the American Civil War.

David Sassoon was born at Bagdad in October of 1792 and died at Bombay November 7, 1864. His father, a wealthy Mesopotamian Jewish merchant, was for many years state treasurer to the Turkish governor of Bagdad. He was a Nasi (Prince of the Captivity).

David Sassoon was employed in a banking-house at Bagdad until 1822. He left Bagdad and spent some time at Basora, and, later went to Bushire. Having been in Bombay in 1832 and being impressed with its opportunities in the traffic of opium, he subsequently settled himself and family in that city. Here he soon established the house of David Sassoon & Co., with branches at Calcutta, Shanghai, Canton, and Hongkong. Within a short time he had monopolized the opium trade. It has been said that Sassoon “attributed his great success to the employment of his sons as his agents and to his strict observance of the law of tithes.” The obnoxious traffic in narcotics undoubtedly contributed to most of it.

Elias David Sassoon was the first of David Sassoon’s sons to go to China (1844) to open a branch of the house of David Sassoon & Co. there. The Opium War had given the British merchants the right to dump into China all the opium India and the Near East could grow. Elias had four hundred million customers and a monopoly of the poison. He was spectacularly successful.

When he returned to Bombay he took over his father’s business, where he remained until 1867, when he opened branches in Hongkong and Shanghai.

Solomon David Sassoon was born at Bombay in 1841 and died there in 1894. He served in his father’s business in China as an assistant, and afterwards became the head of the firm of David Sassoon & Co., retaining that position until his death. He was the director of the Bank of Bombay and one of the port trustees. He was chairman of the Sassoon Spinning and Weaving Co., of the Sassoon and Alliance Silk Co., of the Port Canning and Land Improvement Co., of the Oriental Life Assurance Co., and of several other joint stock associations. He was also president of the Bombay branch of the Anglo-Jewish Association.
Sir Albert Abdallah David Sassoon became the head of the house of *David Sassoon and Co.*, in 1864. He was born at Bagdad in 1817, and died at Brighton, England, October 24, 1896. He was the eldest son of David Sassoon. He was vice-president of the *Anglo-Jewish Association*. In Bagdad he erected the school of the *Alliance Israélite Universelle*, which he presented to the Jewish community free of all encumbrances. He was knighted in 1872, after financing a colossal statue of Edward, then Prince of Wales, in Bombay. In 1890 Queen Victoria made him baronet.

* * * * *

There have been users of opium and the coca leaf for many centuries. Its organized use for the purpose of commerce and revenue, however, developed during the last two hundred years. The *House of Sassoon* inflicted this misery on China (and other parts of the world) and reaped a fabulous fortune and unlimited power and influence in the course of the operation. A few voices were heard in protest but they were weak and went unheeded. Warren Hastings, in 1783, declared that "opium was a pernicious article of luxury which ought not to be permitted but for the purpose of foreign commerce only!" Hastings' sense of morals and decency appears to have been confined to the British Isles. Some time later the directors of the East India Company were willing to concede that the traffic in the drug was deplorable. "If it were possible to prevent the use of the drug altogether," they declared, "except strictly for the purpose of medicine we would gladly do it in compassion to mankind." Lord Ashley, in 1843, proposed a resolution in the British parliament in which it was said that the continuance of the opium monopoly and opium trade "was utterly inconsistent with the honor and duty of a Christian kingdom."

The importation of opium into China by the Sassoons gave rise to the war of 1840 between Great Britain and China. Every pressure was brought to bear on the Chinese government in an effort to force it to legalize the pernicious trade. When bribery and diplomatic pressure failed, and, in desperation China seized large quantities of opium stored in Canton warehouses, the British government went to war to assure the Sassoons their four hundred million customers. The first Opium War was on.

The war was undeclared. England attacked with vigorous brutality. Peaceful cities were sacked, public buildings were burned, the people were plundered and murdered. Sacred temples were ransacked, exquisite wood carvings were used for firewood, and the Chinese populace treated with a ruthlessness seldom associated with the British character. The British soldiers are said to have watched old men, women and even children cutting each other's throats in despair, or even drowning themselves. "The lament of the fatherless, the anarchy, the starvation, and the mis-
ery of the homeless wanderers,” reported the East India Committee of the Colonial Society (1843), “are the theme of a frightful triumph.”

No explanation was given to the public concerning the cause of the war. Great Britain merely announced that the Chinese had flaunted British prestige, property and flag. The Treaty of Nanking, 1842, compelled the Chinese to pay an indemnity of twenty-one million dollars, of which six million was reimbursement for the destroyed opium.

China still refused to legalize the opium trade, but the bayonets of Great Britain stilled its voice of protest. The Sassoons continued to saturate the Chinese masses with the product of the Indian poppy.

Gladstone, one of Britain’s great statesmen, in speaking of the Opium War, declared: “A war more unjust in its origin, a war more calculated to cover this country with permanent disgrace, I do not know and have not read of. The British flag is hoisted to protect an infamous traffic; and if it was never hoisted except as it is now hoisted on the coast of China, we should recoil from its sight with horror.”

Fifteen years later Great Britain, with France as her ally, again threw its gigantic weight against the resisting Chinese. When this war was over, the Chinese were not only forced to legalize the importation of opium by the Sassoons, but also were forced to permit its cultivation in China itself. The British government thus insured the Sassoons’ monopoly of the narcotic market in China.

Contrary to the general understanding of most people, China consistently fought against the vicious traffic in opium. In spite of being forced to legalize its importation, the Chinese government continued to regard the use of the drug as an important moral and economic question. In 1906 the government entered into a “Ten Year Agreement with India,” by which China should cease the cultivation of the poppy and forbid the consumption of opium on the understanding that the export of Indian opium to China should gradually decrease, and cease altogether in ten years. By 1917 China was well on the road to solving the problem, but political upheavals and intrigue thereafter rendered the government ineffective, so that the production of opium flourished with increasing vigor.

The Sassoon family, next to the Rothschilds, became the most influential Jewish family in England. It has retained intimate relations with the last several generations of the Royal Family.
It apparently has not been tainted by the fact that its fabulous fortune and power is the result of the cruel Opium Wars.

Sir Edward Sassoon, the second baronet (son of Albert Abdullah's son, born in Bombay in 1856) married Baron Gustave de Rothschild's daughter. The daughter of this marriage, Sybil, married the fifth Marquis of Cholmondely. Sir Edward Sassoon was very close to King Edward VII. He became a member of the House of Commons.

Sir Victor Sassoon invested heavily in Shanghai beginning in 1931. He bought everything that had any potential value. He took over the Nanking Road holdings of Silas Aaron Hardoon. He became chairman of E. D. Sassoon & Co., Ltd., and soon controlled the Yangtze-Finance Company and the International Investment Trust.

“The Sassoon pedigree goes back to King David,” says the American Mercury of January, 1940, “and Sir Victor was the white boss of Shanghai.”

As the Sassoons had acquired great wealth and power through the English war against the unoffending Chinese to compel them to buy opium, so the Joels, Barnatos, Oppenheimers, Rothschilds and other English Jews induced Christian England to wage war on the unoffending Boer farmers in South Africa. President Krueger, speaking in the Johannesburg market-place in February, 1899, said, in effect, that it was the Jews, and not the British, who were the real enemies of the Boers. “If it were conceivable,” he said, “to eject the Jew monopolist from this country neck and crop without incurring war with Great Britain, then the problem of everlasting peace would be solved.”

Along about 1898 Cecil Rhodes requested the London Rothschilds to buy out the French interests in the Kimberley mines. This move gave the Rothschilds control of the diamond industry in South Africa. Rhodes was financed by the Rothschilds to the extent of one million, four hundred thousand pounds. Soon after, with Barnato (to whom five million, three hundred and thirty-eight thousand pounds was paid), the De Beers Consolidated Mines was formed. The Jew Sir Carl Meyer was put in charge by the Rothschilds as director. The Rothschilds are said to have made one hundred thousand pounds during the first three months of operation by the rise in value of the company’s shares. They received an additional one hundred thousand pounds commission for the purchase of the De Beers mine. The Jew Sir Ernest Oppenheimer became the chairman of the company, and the Jew Sir Alfred
Beit was made Life Governor. The diamond industry thus became a Jewish monopoly.

The Rothschilds had long been interested in South African ventures. They had a financial interest in the Jewish firm of Werner, Beit and Co., which owned huge tracts of land and gold mines. In order to eliminate the Boers and obtain their gold mines, the Rothschilds offered Portugal seven hundred thousand pounds for the purchase of Delagoa Bay so that the Transvaal of the Boers might be encircled. Rhodes organized the Jameson raid than launched the Boer War. Four leaders of the raid were sentenced to death by a British court, among them being the Jew Lionel Phillips. Rothschild influence intervened and the condemned got off with a twenty-five thousand pound fine. A virtual flood of baronetcies for those who participated in the Raid followed. Cecil Rhodes was made Director of De Beers in 1900.

Thereafter the Rothschilds, Mocatta & Goldsmid, and Samuel Montague & Co., not only controlled the mining of South African gold, but also controlled its price.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries great accumulations of capital came into the hands of the Jews. The court Jews of Germany had acquired fortunes through their purchases of loot during the Thirty Years’ War, and they also had done well on the Amsterdam bourse. The financial center of the Anti-Napoleonic League was ultimately transferred to Frankfurt-on-the-Main and the House of Rothschild came into ascendency.

After Waterloo international finance moved into high gear. The international Jews, because of their peculiar position, were quick to combine into syndicates, and negotiated national loans in addition to financing larger industries. Even where there were Gentile firms (as in England and the United States) ready and able to advance money, the actual operations were generally conducted by the Jewish financiers. The Bischofsheims, Pereires, Siligmans, Lazard’s and others, followed the example set by Rothschild and placed brothers and sons in charge of their institutions in the capitals of the principal continental countries. Rothschild unquestionably headed the combine. Thus the destiny of the Gentile nations fell into the hands of the Jews. State and municipal loans were financed largely by this Jewish combine, although the Jewish financier of a given country apparently negotiated them. The Sterns and Goldsmids financed Portugal. In other countries—particularly in railroads—other Jewish names became associated with finance: Baron de Hirsch in Turkey, the Rothschilds in France, Strousberg in Rumania, Politakoff and Speyer & Co., in Russia, and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., in the United States.

The Jewish financiers have been active in the field of precious
metals and stones. The Rothschilds long have controlled mercury. Barnato Brothers and Werner, Beit & Co. control diamonds, and Lewisohn Brothers and Guggenheim Sons monopolize copper and, to some extent, silver.

The Jewish financiers appear to weather most economic panics. Jewish apologists attribute this uncontroversial fact to the international character of Jewish financial operations, plus their cautious approach to speculation.

On the stock exchange the Jewish financier is found predominantly in the foreign market where he again is at home in international finance. Many of them, if not all, are foreign exchange brokers. The movement of precious metals throughout the world is directed by them, and the rate of exchange between one country and another is determined by them.

Before 1917 the international Jewish financiers were strategically stationed throughout the world. Camondo, Fould, Pereire, and Bischoffsheim in France; Montague, Sassoon, and Stern in England; Bleichroder, Warschauer, and Mendelssohn in Germany; Gunzburg in Russia; and Kuhn, Loeb and Co., Seligman, and Lazard in the United States. There are others. Over all stands the House of Rothschild.

Mayer Anselm Bauer founded the House of Rothschild. He was the son of Anselm Moses Bauer, a Jewish merchant of Frankfort-on-the-Main. Under the sign of the “Red Shield” (Rothschild) in the Frankfort Judengasse, Mayer ultimately established himself as a money-lender. The sign under which he did business was eventually adopted as the family name.

In due course Mayer became the agent of William, ninth Landgrave. He negotiated his first government loan in 1802—ten million thalers for the Danish government. He died at Frankfort December 12, 1812, leaving ten children—five sons and five daughters.

Branches of the House of Rothschild were established at Vienna, London, Paris and Naples, each under the supervision and management of one of Mayer’s sons. Within a short time, through the amazing coordination of Jewish financial interests, the employment of agents throughout the world, ingenious methods of communications, and the clever manipulation of public officials, the brothers Rothschild brought all of Europe within their financial web. Intermarriage solidified and preserved the family interests throughout the capitals of Europe, so that within a generation the House of Rothschild exercised greater influence on world affairs than all of the European monarchies combined. The interests of the Rothschilds were international, as are all Jewish interests, and the conflict of Christian nations was the meat on which they grew fat. European monarchs vied with each other for the Rothschild favor. In 1815 Austria granted the brothers the privilege of hereditary
landowners. They had been made barons in 1812. The Rothschild
dughters thereafter married into English and Continental Chris­
tian families of the nobility, so that the Rothschild influence was
extended into the British House of Lords and into the ruling circles
of European aristocracy. Anselm Mayer, in charge of the Frank­
fort House, was able to become a member of the royal Prussian
privy council of commerce. In 1820 he became Bavarian consul and
court banker. Solomon, in charge of the Vienna branch, established
intimate relations with Prince Metternich, and thus extended the
Rothschild influence into the councils of the Allied Powers.

In Paris, Jacob (James), the youngest of the brothers, after the
restoration of the Bourbons, established the French branch. He
negotiated large loans for the Bourbons but lost heavily in the
1848 Revolution. He reaped enormous profits, however, in financing
the early French railroads.

Karl established the Naples branch of the Rothschild empire,
which was the least important of the five. It was abandoned in
1860 when Naples was annexed to Italy.

Nathan, the third brother, is considered to have been the financial
genius of the family. He went to Manchester in 1800, and in 1805
moved to London. It is said that he inaugurated a system of rapid
communication, using carrier pigeons and fast sailing boats to
transmit intelligence throughout the capitals of Europe. In pos­
session of information withheld from the public, Nathan was in a
position to manipulate the stock market; to anticipate the rise and
fall of a given commodity long before the event. He purchased
government drafts that the government could not meet, buying
them at great discounts, and was thereby enabled to make a for­
tune when the government was forced to redeem them at par.

The war with Napoleon presented a golden opportunity for
Nathan. He negotiated loans for the Allied Powers, thus enabling
the war to continue. Ultimately his entire fortune was involved
in the outcome, and he followed the ebb and tide of the struggle
with the same feverish eagerness that he watched stock market
quotations. Waterloo was the turning point. The defeat of Blue­
cher two days before the final victory of Wellington, caused a
panic in London and stocks went crashing. Informed of Napoleon's
defeat hours before it became public knowledge, Nathan moved into
the market and made a fortune.

Nathan soon became the financial agent of nearly every gov­
ernment in Europe. He was able to maneuver a fixed rate in ster­
ling, making dividends payable in London, and thus popularized
foreign loans in Great Britain.

Lionel took over the management of the London office in 1836.
The fall of Louis Philippe (1848) of France added to the impor­
Lionel was elected to Parliament as a representative of the city of London in 1847, and held that seat until 1874. He devoted himself to politics and the “Jewish question”. During his management of the London office he financed no less than eighteen government loans, including the Irish famine loan and the Turkish loan of 1858.

Mayer Amschel, founder of the House of Rothschild apparently impressed two commandments on the minds of his sons: The Rothschild fortune must be kept within the male line of the House, and the source and the extent of the Rothschild fortune must be kept a family secret. The first commandment was reinforced by the ancient Jewish law prohibiting intermarriage with Gentiles, while the second found compliance in the inherent exclusiveness of their Jewishness.

The first three generations following Mayer Amschel looked upon marriage as a business affair. Perhaps it was a little more than this, as the Jewish nation was also involved. The male issue of the Rothschilds were princes of the captivity—the uncrowned Kings of Israel in the Diaspora. Hence, the meticulousness with which the marriage partner was selected. The common practice of the male Rothschild marrying a Rothschild was early established. Betty Rothschild, daughter of Solomon, married her uncle. Baron Jacob (James) of Paris, married his niece, the daughter of Nathaniel. Of the fifty-eight marriages contracted by the descendants of Mayer Amschel up to the year 1905, twenty-nine, or one-half, were between first cousins. The surplus Rothschild females generally married Gentiles, if such unions strengthened the power and influence of the House of Rothschild.

Mayer Amschel sold to his five sons all his shares in the business, his securities, his large stocks of wines, and all other possessions for 190,000 gulden. It was agreed that any inequality in the son’s respective shares were to be adjusted after the father’s death. The five daughters were excluded from any share in the business, and even from all knowledge of it. In disposing of the 190,000 gulden by will, Mayer Amschel left his wife, Gudula, a life interest in 70,000 gulden, and the remainder was divided among the daughters. This clever arrangement made it unnecessary to disclose to the officials or the public the tremendous extent and value of the Rothschild fortune, and secured the five sons from any interference from their sisters or other relatives.

Anselm Solomon, son of Solomon Meyer Rothschild, was born January 29, 1803. He died July 27, 1874. He left his houses and estates equally to his three sons, with instructions never to sell
or mortgage them, and to maintain them in the male line. His will read, in part, as follows:

“In accordance with the exhortations of my father, the grand-father who so sincerely loved them, as contained in Clause 15 of his will, may they and their descendants remain constantly true to their ancestral Jewish faith.

“I forbid them most explicitly, in any circumstances whatever, to have any public inventory made by the courts, or otherwise, of my estate . . . Also I forbid any legal action, and any publication of the value of the inheritance . . . Anyone who disregards these provisions and takes any kind of action which conflicts with them shall immediately be regarded as having disputed the will, and shall suffer the penalties for so doing.”

********

Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield (1804-1881), the first Jew to hold the premiership of England, undoubtedly owed his political success to Lionel Rothschild. Disraeli was perpetually in financial straits. He worked incessantly to please Lionel’s every order. In his novel, “Coningsby”, Disraeli appears to have Lionel in mind as the original of his Jewish “Sidonia”. This character is a Sephardic Jew, heir to a loan-lending world empire with family representatives in every capital of the world. “Sidonia” is convinced that the Jews are a superior people to all others.

Disraeli worked with Lionel against Russia. A dispute in Palestine gave Disraeli a pretext upon which he was able to persuade Napoleon III to join with Britain in the Crimean War. He raised sixteen million pounds for financing the conflict. Because of Russia’s resistance to Jewish pressures, both at home and abroad, Jewish policy in England and elsewhere was to impress and influence the several governments against any move on the part of Russia that would tend to strengthen her position either at home or in the company of nations. Britain therefore was constantly pressured by its influential Jews that any effort on the part of Russia to secure an outlet into the Mediterranean would endanger England’s prestige and particularly create a threat to India. The Crimean War was a very definite step in the Jewish program to isolate Russia from the rest of Europe. Rothschild told Duke Ernst II of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha that he would put any amount of money at his disposal for war with Russia.

********

The Rothschild influence in the United States probably dates from the arrival in New York in 1837 of the firm’s agent. His real name was Schoenberg. He had served in the Frankfort and Naples offices. Although Jewish, Schoenberg professed Christianity. He changed his name to August Belmont and, in 1860, became the chairman of the Democratic National Committee.
Rothschild influence he was made the Austrian Consul-General at
New York. In 1853 he was appointed the United States representa­
tive to the Netherlands, and lived at the Hague for several years.
He amassed a fortune. He married the daughter of Commodore
Matthew Perry who "opened up" Japan to the western nations.

Rothschild agencies were established in the Southern States for
the purchase of wool, tobacco, and other commodities. Rothschild
ships carried enormous cargoes between the United States and
France. In the war between the States the Rothschilds played
both sides, in lieu of an opportunity to make a deal with Napoleon
III of France, who distrusted them. Napoleon III had plans of his
own, and employed other Jewish bankers to finance France. Backed
by loans through the Credit Mobilier, Napoleon was able to land
Maximilian of Austria in Mexico in 1864, and to make him Emperor.
In a secret deal with Judah Benjamin, the Jewish Secretary of State
of the Confederacy, Napoleon III hoped to exchange Louisiana and
Texas for French intervention and the smashing of the Union
blockade of the South. Britain and the Rothschilds would have
come in on the plot, but the action of Czar Alexander II of Russia
apparently made British participation too risky. While historians
side-step the story, Russia's fleet—such as it was—crossed the ocean
at the invitation of Seward and put its services at the disposal of
President Lincoln. France and England did not care to find them­selves embroiled in a war with Russia, and England backed out.

August Belmont supported the North by a constant correspondence
with the Rothschilds and others in Europe. Lionel Rothschild was
of the opinion that the North would win, but other Rothschilds in­
vested heavily in Confederate bonds.

The Montefiore family intermarried with the Rothschilds and the
Goldsmids. A sister of Moses Mocatta was the mother of Sir
Moses Montefiore.

Abraham Montefiore, brother of Sir Moses, married Jeanette,
daughter of Mayer Amschel, in 1815. Nathan Mayer Rothschild
Meyer Amschel's son, married the sister-in-law of Sir Moses Monte­
fiore in 1806. Abraham Montefiore's daughter, Louisa, married
Sir Anthony Rothschild in 1840. Another of Abraham's sons,
Nathaniel, married a daughter of Sir I. L. Goldsmid. Sir E. A.
Sassoon married Baron Gustave de Rothschild's daughter in 1887.
Leopold Rothschild married a Perugia, sister of Mrs. Arthur Sas­
soon. Thus the Jewish financiers established a royal dynasty in the
world that exercised more power and influence than all of the
monarchs who did their bidding.

The raw materials of the world are largely in the hands of the
Jews. The Rothschilds obtained the lease of the Almaden mercury
mines in Spain in 1832 in consideration of a loan of fifteen million francs to the Spanish government. Lionel also received the Order of Isabella the Catholic from the Queen Regent when he made the deal in Madrid! The Rothschilds had previously purchased the Austrian mines of Idria, and thereby monopolized the world’s quicksilver. This monopoly lasted until 1863, when mercury was discovered in the United States. Their Spanish mine lease was seriously threatened in the years between 1835 and 1837 by Don Carlos’ efforts to take the throne of Spain from the Queen Regent. The Rothschild agent in Madrid, a Jew by the name of Mendizabal, was also the Finance Minister to the Queen Regent. In their determination to protect the mercury mines the Rothschilds did everything possible to bring about armed intervention by England and France. As a result of these efforts France loaned the Queen Regent the Foreign Legion, and England raised a volunteer force which was financed by Nathan Rothschild. Don Carlos was defeated, and the Rothschilds’ mercury mines were saved.

Canadian nickel is controlled by the Jew, Lord Melchett, and the New Caledonian mines are controlled by the Paris Rothschilds. The new nickel mines in Finland are owned by Melchett’s International Nickel Company of Canada.

Abraham Lincoln did everything possible to keep out of the hands of the Jewish money-lenders in his efforts to finance the War. He tried to introduce State Loans, and met formidable opposition from the New York bankers. Belmont opposed him. In spite of the heavy Jewish opposition the War was financed on State credit, and there are those who believe that Lincoln’s assassination by the Jewish actor Booth was because of this policy.

Jacob Henry Schiff was born January 10, 1847 at Frankfort on-the-Main. He became a broker for the Rothschilds of that city, and probably migrated to the United States at their request. He arrived in New York in 1865 and made an immediate connection with the Jewish firm of Frank & Gans. In 1867 he formed the brokerage company of Budge, Schiff & Co. This latter firm was dissolved in 1873 when Schiff returned to Europe. He spent about two years in contacting Jewish banking houses in Germany. He returned to the United States in 1875, and became a member of the banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. of New York. Within a short time he was virtually the head of the concern.

Kuhn, Loeb & Co. thereafter dominated the railroad scene in the United States. It became the financial reconstructors of the Union Pacific Railroad in 1897. In 1901 Schiff led the company into a gigantic struggle with the Great Northern Railway Company for
the possession of the *Northern Pacific Railway*, which gave rise to the panic on the stock exchange May 9, 1901. The firm of *Kuhn, Loeb & Co.* dominated the situation. As a result of these maneuvers Schiff's firm became one of the world’s leading influences in railway financing, controlling more than twenty-two thousand miles of railway and a billion, three hundred and twenty-one million dollars in stock. *Kuhn, Loeb & Co.* floated the stock issues of the *Union Pacific*, the *Pennsylvania Railroad*, the *Missouri Pacific*, the *Western Union Telegraph Company*, and many others.

Schiff, like Jews generally, hated Russia, and hailed the Russo-Japanese War as a possible beginning of the end for the Czars. Under his direction, *Kuhn, Loeb & Co.* subscribed for and floated the three large Japanese war loans in 1904 and 1905. In appreciation the Mikado conferred upon Schiff the Second Order of the Sacred Treasure of Japan. In 1904 he was received in a private audience by King Edward VII of England.

Schiff became a director of the *Union Pacific*, the *Baltimore and Ohio*, and the *Chicago, Burlington and Quincy* railroads; director of the *Western Union Telegraph Company*, the *Equitable Life Assurance Society*, the *National City Bank*, the *Morton Trust Company*, the *Columbia Bank*, the *Fifth Avenue Trust Company of New York*, and various other trust companies in New York and Philadelphia.

He was one of the founders and the president of the *Montefiore Home* in New York, and was prominently connected with all of the major Jewish charities. He provided the first building for the *Young Men’s Hebrew Association*. He was a trustee of the *Baron de Hirsch Fund*. He founded a chair in social economics at *Columbia University* and established scholarships for that subject. He presented *Harvard* a fund and a building for Semitic studies.

In the months that preceded the United States' entry into World War I, most Jews were pro-German, primarily because of their hatred of Russia. Sir William Speyer was so loyal to Germany that he was deprived of his British citizenship and title. He became an American citizen. Jacob Schiff of *Kuhn, Loeb & Co.* was vigorous in backing Germany in the beginning of the War, as were the brothers Paul and Felix Warburg. Max Warburg was a banker in Hamburg, and was the financial expert for the German delegation at the peace conference in Paris in 1919. Paul Moritz Warburg, brother of Max, was also a banker, a partner in the *M. M. Warburg & Co.* firm in Hamburg in 1885. He came to the United States in 1902 and joined the banking firm of *Kuhn, Loeb & Co.* at a yearly salary of five hundred thousand dollars. He did not become a citizen of the United States until 1911. While still an alien he set about reorganizing the banking system of the United
States. He is reported to have been one of the bankers who met secretly with Senator Nelson Aldrich at Jekyll Island, Georgia, in 1910 to work out the details for the Federal Reserve Act of 1913. He became the first chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, resigning his half million dollar a year job with Kuhn, Loeb & Co. to accept the twelve thousand dollar per year post.

During World War I Paul Warburg, through Kuhn, Loeb & Co. helped finance the War against Germany, while his brother, Max Warburg, of M. M. Warburg & Co. in Hamburg, helped finance Germany in the War against the Allies. Paul was compelled to resign from the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board in May 1918, after someone had announced that “his brother was the head of the German Secret Service.”

Felix Moritz Warburg had become a citizen of the United States in 1900, and also was a member of Kuhn, Loeb & Co.

Paul Warburg was either a partner or director of the Western Union, Westinghouse, Wells Fargo, Union Pacific, Baltimore and Ohio, Kuhn, Loeb & Co., American I. G. Chemical Co. (I. G. Farben), Agfa Ansco Corp., National Railways of Mexico, International Acceptance Bank, Westinghouse Acceptance Co., Warburg Company of Amsterdam, and many other banks, railways and industrial corporations.

Senator Robert L. Owen, in opposing Senate confirmation of Warburg’s appointment by President Wilson to the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, charged that Warburg was the American representative of the European Rothschilds. The Senate, nevertheless, confirmed the appointment.

* * * * *
BEASTS OF THE APOCALYPSE

V

R. ABBHAHU may be said to be the first Jew to attempt to refute the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. The growth of Karaitism in the ninth and tenth centuries gave rise to a group of rabbinical scholars who embarked on a campaign directed against Christian and Karaita doctrines. David ibn Merwan al-Mukammam was one of the first of these scholars and he devoted much of his work to the attempted refutation of Christian theology. Saadia Gaon augmented the work of David. He maintained that the Jewish religious system could not be replaced by another, least of all by the Christian, which “transmuted mere abstractions into divine personalities.” Hadassi asserted that certain Christian doctrines were blasphemous, while others were absurd. Jacob ben Reuben, in his “Sefer Milhamot Adonai”, attempted to discredit Christian arguments drawn from the Old Testament.

Hasdai Crescas, in his Spanish work “Tratado”, attempted to refute the Christian doctrines of original sin, redemption, the Trinity, the incarnation, the Immaculate Conception, transubstantiation, baptism, and the Messianic Mission of Jesus, on philosophic grounds. A satire upon Christian doctrine appeared at the beginning of the fifteenth century, written by Profiat Duran, “so skilfully written” that it was quoted by Christian writers, until the hoax was revealed by a commentary authored by Joseph ibn Shem-Tob.

* * * * *

Perhaps the most important of the Jewish attacks upon Christianity is “Hizzuk Emunah” written in Poland by Isaac Troki. The work was translated into Latin, German, Spanish, and many other languages. An English translation by Moses Mocatta, appeared in London in 1851 under the title “Faith Strengthened”. Wagenseil published “Hizzuk Emunah” in his collection of anti-Christian writings, “Tela Ignea Satanae” (“The Fiery Arrows of Satan”) in 1861. It was this publication that was used by Voltaire and the French encyclopedists of the eighteenth century as a weapon of attack on the doctrines of the Christian Church. Wrote Voltaire: “Not even the most decided opponents of religion have brought forward any arguments which could not be found in the Fortification of the Faith” by Rabbi Isaac.”

The Jews now had Gentile allies in their war against Christianity. The first target of their literary arrows was the divinity of Christ; the second all religions except Judaism, and finally, the dethrone-
ment of God Himself from the Heavens. Only the Jewish Jehovah must be preserved; a jealous and wrathful god who made a covenant with Abraham . . .

* * * * *

The Talmud is the product of about five hundred years of labor. It is the work of many generations of rabbis, and its traditions may be traced back to the restoration of the Jewish commonwealth under Ezra, the historic originator of the oral law. Thereafter the prophet gradually passed into the scribe, and prophesy subsequently finds it necessary to take the form of law. It becomes a legislative code. Ezra is said to have called the Great Synagogue (Great Sanhedrin) together after the return of the Jews from captivity in Babylon, for the purpose of establishing the Law. “As soon as the men of the Great Synagogue met together, they restored the law to its pristine glory,” and there arose a new order of men in Israel—the teaching clergy. They became known as Soferim (Scribes). “Piety dwindled into legalism,” writes Farrar. “Salvation,” he continues, “was identified with outward conformity. A torturing scrupulosity was substituted for a glad obedience. God’s righteous faithfulness was treated as a forensic covenant. For prophesy there was only the miserable substitute of the ‘Daughter of a Voice’; for faith, the sense of merit acquired by legal exactitude. The ‘pious’ were hopelessly identified with the party of the Scribes. The Synagogues became schools. Ethics were subordinated to Liturgiology. Messianism was debased into an unmeaning phase or a materialized fable. The pride of pedantry, despising moral nobleness, and revelling in an hypocrisy so profound as hardly to recognize that it was hypocritical, wrapped itself in an esoteric theology, and looked down on the children of a common Father as an accursed multitude in whose very touch there was ceremonial defilement. This was the ultimate result of that recrudescence of ceremonial which was the special work of the scholars of Ezra. And of this work the basis was a perverted Bibliolatry, and the instrument an elaborate exegesis.”

From this degeneration of morality came the unprecedented authority of the rabbi, who eventually superceded even God. “To be against the word of the scribes,” says the Talmud (Sanhedrin, xi, 3), “is more punishable than to be against the word of the Bible;” and (Erubin).—“The voice of the rabbi is as the voice of God.” In Berachoth: “He who transgresses the word of the scribes throws away his life.” The final iron-clamp of Rabbinism is the admonition to “make a hedge about the law” (Aboth). “This hedge,” says Farrar, “was made; its construction was regarded as the main function of Rabbinism; it excluded all light from without and all egress from within; but it was so carefully cultivated that the shrine itself was totally disregarded. The oral law was first exalted as a necessary supplement to the written law; then
substituted in the place of it, and finally identified with the inferences of the Rabbis."

The Soferim were followed by the Tanaim. The laws constituting the labors of the Tanaites—expounding and expanding the work of the Soferim—are called Halachoth, and constitutes the Mishna. Rabbi Juda the Holy committed the oral tradition to writing, arranging the material under the six orders of Hillel's classification. This work summed up the labors of four centuries. Thenceforth the Mishna moulded the entire theology of Judaism, and became the bond of Jewish nationality. "The publication of tradition," says Bernhard Pick, "put an end to the independent energy of the Halakha, and closed the long succession of the Tanaim." It completed the "hedge about the law." Henceforth, wrote Bernhard Pick "neither persecution nor dispersion could destroy" the iron mold, "and through which neither Hellenism, nor Sadduceeism, nor Alexandrianism, nor Gnosticism, nor Christianity, nor the Renaissance, nor the Reformation, nor modern skepticism, down to the days of Moses Mendelssohn, could break their way. This strange collection of completed and dead 'decisions,' being treated as of divine authority, superceded, all but entirely, the Scriptures on which they professed to have been based. The bold initiative of 'Rabbi' stamped on Judaism a character singularly dry and juristic, and laid upon the necks of all Talmudic Jews a yoke unspeakably more empty and definitely more galling than that of which St. Peter had complained even in the days when the observance of Mosaism had not yet been rendered impossible by the fiat of history, which is the manifest will of God."

Hillel added little to the Mishna. He changed nothing, leaving things pretty much as he found them. He introduced a few innovations in the civil laws, especially concerning the lending of money and buying and selling, which appear to be merely cunning contrivances for evading the laws of Moses. There is nothing reformatory or creative in his work. His major contribution to the Talmudic maze is the seven rules he laid down for the interpretation of the Scripture—probably the basic dialectic system that so strongly influenced Karl Marx. The system, briefly, is as follows:

1. Inference from the minor proposition to the major proposition;
2. the analogy of ideas or analogous inferences; (3) analogy of two objects in one verse (Scripture) or proposition; (4) analogy of two objects in two verses or propositions; (5) general and special; (6) analogy of another passage or proposition, and (7) the connection.

Akiha ben Joseph declared that every sentence, word and particle in the Bible must have its use and meaning. He therefore enlarged Hillel's seven rules into forty-nine, thus creating a mental
labyrinth in which the seeker of truth became hopelessly lost. Akiba’s method, however, was hailed by his colleagues with extravagant transports of delight. They went so far as to assert that Akiba had discovered many things of which even Moses was ignorant. His method, however, was unable to pierce the pseudo-Messiahship of Bar Kokba, confusing a Bar Koziba with a Bar Kokba—the “son of a lie” with the “son of a star.”

Rabbi Ismael opposed Akiba’s principles, and laid down, in opposition his own thirteen rules, as follows: (1) Inference from minor to major; (2) the comparison of words or ideas; (3) building of the father, or the chief law, from one verse, and the chief law from two verses; (4) general and special; (5) special and general; (6) general, special, and general; (7) a general subject which requires a special one, and a special one which requires a general subject for mutual explanation; (8) when a special law is enacted for something which has already been comprised in a general law, it shows that it is also to be applied to the whole class; (9) when a subject included in a general description is excepted from it or another enactment, whilst it remains in all other respects like it, it is expected to be alleviated, but not aggravated; (10) when a subject included in a general description is excepted from it for another enactment, whilst it is also not like it in other respects, it is excepted both to be alleviated and aggravated, i.e., its connection with the general law entirely ceases; (11) if a subject included in a general description has been excepted from it for the enactment of a new and opposite law, it cannot be restored again to the general class unless the Bible itself expressly restores it; (12) the sense of an indefinite statement must either be determined from its connection, or from the form and tendency of the statement itself; and (13) when two statements seem to contradict each other, a third statement will reconcile them.

Rabbinic Judaism regarded these rules of such importance that it was made obligatory for every Jew to recite them in the morning prayer, and they are found in every Jewish prayer-book.

* * * * *

The moral character of the Talmud has a distinct bearing on the moral nature of “scientific socialism” of Karl Marx, who was the product of a long line of Talmudic rabbis. The advice of Rabbi Ilai, the elder (Moed Katon), that “when men wish to sin let them go to a place where they are unknown, and clothe themselves in black so as not to dishonor God openly,” is not the exception to the general trend of the Talmud. It was said of the chastity of Rabbi ben Dordai (Aboda Zarah) “that there was not a bad woman in the world whom he did not go to see.” These are merely samples of Talmudic morality.
The moral essence of the work is aptly summed up by the following:

“On no subject are the doctors of the Talmud so prone to dilate as on that of the relation between the sexes. The third of the six orders of the Talmud, consisting of seven tracts, is entirely occupied with the subject of the rights and duties of women, and of men in relation to women. But in addition to this, questions of the same nature are continually springing forth from the ambush in the Gemara. It is very difficult, however, to convey to the English reader in appropriate language the mode in which that subject is approached by the Jewish doctors of the law. Delicacy, according to our ideas, is to them a thing utterly unknown. For modesty they have neither name nor place. Chastity, as exalted into a virtue by the Roman Church, is esteemed by the Halacha to be violation of a distinct command of the written Law. Virginity after mature years is a stigma if not a sin. With the exception of the prohibition of marriage within certain close limits of consanguinity, which do not forbid a man to take to wife the daughter of his brother or sister, almost the sole duty as to marital relations enforced by the Talmud is the fidelity of a wife to her husband during the existence of the technical marriage tie. The number of wives legal seems to have been limited only by the wealth of the husband; the rights of contemporary wives up to the number of four being severally discussed in the tract Kiddurin.”

Hillel held that a wife might be divorced if she over-salted or over-roasted her husband’s dinner. Akiba would allow a divorce whenever the husband found another woman who was fairer in his eyes than his wife.

The rabbis of the Talmud had a very low opinion of the female sex. Women were in the same category with slaves and children. They were not allowed to be instructed in the law, for “you shall teach the law to your sons” and not to your daughters. “He who teaches his daughter the law is like as if he teaches her to sin.” “The mind of woman is weak.” “The world cannot exist without males and females, but blessed is he whose children are sons: woe to him whose children are daughters.” In the morning prayer the husband and son thank God “that he hath not made him a woman.”

The Talmud holds that a service cannot take place in a Synagogue unless ten persons are present because God withholds His presence if there is any lesser number. Women are not “persons” and count for nothing, so that if there should be nine men and a hundred women Jehovah would not lend Himself to the occasion. But if a boy thirteen years and a day should come along, there is immediately a holy assembly and Jehovah will be present. (Meghilla, Berachoth, Sanhedrin.)

* * * * *
“The name of Jesus,” says Farrar, “occurs some twenty times only in unexpurgated editions of the Talmud, the last of which appeared at Amsterdam in 1645. The allusions to Him are characterized by intense hatred, disguised by intense fear. They are also marked by all the gross and reckless carelessness of these utterly uncritical and unhistorical writers.” (Life of Christ, II, 452.)

The influence of Christianity on the Talmud is recognized by most students of the subject. The saying of Hillel, to which modern Jewish writers point with such self-complacency, cannot be possibly considered original with the rabbi. Hillel is said to be the author of the following: “What is hateful to thyself, thou shalt not do to thy neighbor. This is the whole law, and the rest is commentary.” (Shabbath.) Observes Bernard Pick:

“This is the much praised answer attributed to Hillel, and which induced writers like Renan, Geiger, Deutsch, and the like to make Jesus an imitator of Hillel. But aside from the consideration that Hillel cannot be claimed as the original author of this saying, we must bear in mind the wide interval between the merely negative rule of the Jewish president, and the positive precept of the divine master. As to the saying itself, it existed long before Hillel’s time, and the fact that he in particular used it, accordingly loses much of its significance, and any superstructure based upon the assumption that he invented it falls to the ground.’ Thus Diogenes Laertius relates that Aristotle (died after 322 B.C.) being asked how we ought to conduct ourselves towards our friends answered: ‘As we would wish they would carry themselves toward us.’ And Isocrates who lived 400 years before the publication of the gospel, said: ‘We must not do to others that which would cause anger if it were done to ourselves.’ In his Ad. Deiatic c. 4, he says, ‘Be such towards your parents as thou shalt pray thy children shall be towards thyself,’ and the same In Aeginet. c. 23: ‘That you would be such judges to me as you would desire to obtain for yourselves.’ Even among the sayings of Confucius, the golden rule of the Savior, which Locke designates as the foundation of all social virtue, this maxim is found in the negative form: ‘What you do not wish done to yourselves, do not to others . . .’

And what is more important when Jesus said “Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets,” He was speaking to all mankind. Hillel only had reference to the Jews.

D. Moore sums up the influence of the New Testament on the Talmud as follows:

“Though the oral traditions of the Mishna and portions of the Gemara were some of them doubtless antecedent to the time of Christ by many generations, yet it cannot be proved
in a single instance where there is identity of sentiment between the Talmud and the New Testament, that the Talmud did not borrow from the New Testament rather than the New Testament from the Talmud. It is not likely that an utterance as clear, condensed, and cutting as the Sermon on the Mount, as given us by the Evangelists, was passed over with inattention by the learned senate of Jewish Rabbins. Those teachings passed into the community, and became an animating and forming force in society; and they must, in the very nature of the case, have acted powerfully on all existing schools of ethical and intellectual science. We find in Christ’s discourses frequent allusions to the teachings of these men, searching reviews and criticisms of their doctrines. Much of the Sermon on the Mount is a statement of the errors in their teaching and the establishment of a higher code of morals. “Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, etc.: but I say unto you,” is, as we all know, a frequent form of summary in that discourse.”

* * * * *

“But when we sound the sombre, exclusive, pitiless depths of the inner doctrine of the Talmud, we see that a reason exists for that marked and secular demarcation between the Jew and the Gentile, for which we were about to blame our own intolerance. Purposely and rigidly, in exile no less than in the splendor of the theocratic polity, has the hand of the Jew been directed by the depositaries of his tradition against every man. It is the law of self-defense that has raised the hand of every man against him. Our ancestors were not, after all, so blindly cruel as some writers are too ready to admit. Offers of friendship and of brotherhood are as powerless as are the fires of the Inquisition to break down that moral wall, substantial as the very fortress wall of the Temple, that resisted the voice of Christ, and that has been strengthened by the constant efforts of the doctors of the Talmud for five centuries after the fall of Jerusalem. The power of resistance is the same at this moment that it was two thousand years ago. The point of attack is still the same as in the days of Herod. To the question, ‘Who is my neighbor?’ the Talmud returns one reply, and the parable of the Good Samaritan another. The mercy to be shown, as Moses taught, to the stranger, is qualified by the Halaca by the assumption that he must also be a proselyte. All questions as to which accord would be otherwise, whether in the historic past, or the dimly predicted future, are insoluble, while the justice, mercy or truth—the weightier matters of the Law—are, by the guardians of the Law of Moses confined to those of their own faith and blood. The vitality of Judaism was contained in the doctrine that the Jews had one father, even God. The hope of the future of humanity lies in the good tidings that God is the common Father of mankind.” (Edinburgh Review, July, 1873.)

* * * * *
Cabala means “to receive.” Literally, “the received or traditional lore.” It purports to have come down as revelation, and was preserved only by a privileged few. It was written in a peculiar Aramaic dialect, and appears to be commentaries on the Torah and the Zohar, its holy book. Each doctrine of the Cabala is traced back to the Prophets or Moses on Sinai. It is asserted that the Cabala, unlike the Scriptures, was entrusted to the few elect of the Jews. “These words shalt thou declare, and these shalt thou hide,” the Lord is said to have commanded Moses.

Mysticism is the central theme of the Cabala. Magic and incantation, angelology and demonology, and the “power” of the Hebrew alphabet, may be said to be its essence. Sex is an important element, and, as adopted by the Talmud, syzygies (joining together; pairs) is an important system in the Cabala. God is characterized as “anthropomorphic”: of gigantic proportions, with limbs, arms, hands, feet, etc. Knowing the names and the functions of angels gave the possessor of that knowledge control over all nature and its powers. He who has a list of the mystical names has the means of guarding against sickness and enemies. Three primal elements constitute the substance of things, but the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet constitute their form.

Azriel (1160-1238) undertook to explain the Cabala. He stated that philosophical dialectics is for him the only means for explaining the doctrines of Jewish mysticism.

It is said that the modern cabalistic school begins with Isaac Luria (1533-72) in the sixteenth century. The doctrines of Luria’s Cabala were later taken up by the Hasidim and organized into a system of mystical religious exercises; writing of amulets, conjuration of devils, mystic formulas of letters and numbers, and control of the terrestrial world.

Oriental Jews in particular were (and the majority still are) cabalistic Jews. In the seventeenth century the Cabala spread throughout the Polish Jewish communities and hence into Russia and Germany, and all rabbis in those centers were required to have cabalistic training.

Pico di Mirandola (1463-1494) introduced the Cabala to the Christian world. He contended that the Cabala contains all the doctrines of Christianity. Through Reuchlin (1455-1522) the Cabala became an important weapon in the Christian dissensions at the time of the Reformation. Reuchlin accepted the cabalistic doctrine of divine illumination by means of which it is contended man is enabled to get insight into cabalistic mysteries through the symbolic interpretation of the letters, words, and the contents of Scripture. In short, it was believed that the Cabala is symbolical theology. Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa (1487-1535) held with
Reuchlin, except that he placed more importance on magic. Thus, there developed a "Christian" Cabala!

Cabalistic ideas continued to exert their influence on Christianity. Joseph de Voisin (1610-1685), Knorr Baron von Rosenroth, and Athanasius Kircher (1602-1684) endeavored to spread its doctrines among Christians by translating and distributing cabalistic works. They probably succeeded better than they knew.

The Cabala developed what might be called "Jewish magic." It was declared that there were malicious imps and helpful imps ready to do the bidding of the initiated. Demonology became an important element in cabalistic teachings. The imps were said to be endowed with assorted supernatural powers and possessed insight into the future. It was held to be permissible for the cabalist to practice magic with the help of these shadow-world creatures.

Only the practice of witchcraft is prohibited by the Babylonian Talmud. A knowledge of magic was considered indispensable to a member of the chief council or the judiciary. It was permissible to acquire such knowledge even from the heathen. Jewish scholars were adept in the black art, and the Law did not deny its power. They were able to create a calf when food was needed, and often consumed men with a glance, or reduced them to a heap of bones.

The Cabala made steady progress in Poland. Mattathiah Delacruta, a native of Italy who lived in Cracow, was the founder of the Polish Cabala, and the teacher of Rabbi Mordecai Jaffe. He is credited with imparting the "hidden science" of the Cabala to the Rabbi. It was Nathan Spira who applied the Rabbinical method of "pilpul" to the Cabala, thereby originating an innovation in "dialectic mysticism."

Czar Nicholas II, his wife and family were moved by the Kerensky government from Tsarskoe-Selo to Tobolsk in Siberia. The Bolsheviks brought them back to Ekaterinburg in the Urals (now Sverdlovsk), where they were imprisoned in the home of a merchant named Ipatiev. Neither the Czar nor his family were afforded a trial. Yurovsky, Commissar of Ekaterinburg, aroused the Czar and his family in the night of 16-17 1918 and took them to the cellar where a firing squad was waiting. Yurovsky read the death sentence. The Czar started to speak, but Yurovsky cut him short with a pistol shot to the head. The firing squad blasted the life of the Czarina and the children. All seven bodies were soaked in oil and burned in the forest.

General Denikin and his White armies recaptured Ekaterinburg
a few weeks after the cruel murder of the royal family. The General ordered an official inquest. On the wall of the room where the Czar and his family perished were found three cabalistic symbols inscribed upside down from right to left. The symbols are the letter “L” repeated three times in Hebrew, Samaritan script, and Greek. The ancient Hebrew letter “L” is the twelfth letter of that alphabet. Cabalistically it has a numerical value of 30 which is 3 plus 0 equals 3, and, according to the formula, is repeated three times. Beneath, or near, the cabalistic characters is a horizontal line, the symbol of passiveness, indicating that the murders were not of the executioner’s own will, and that he acted in obedience to a superior command.

Yakov Sverdlov (Yankel) was the first president of the Soviet Union. Long a Jewish revolutionary, he was Lenin’s chief assistant in reorganizing Russia’s industry. As the first president of the Central Committee it was Sverdlov who gave the order for the execution of the imperial family. It is probably for this reason that the town of Ekaterinburg was renamed “Sverdlovsk”.

The Central Committee, incidentally, was composed of sixty-one members, of which forty-one were Jews.

“Pilpul” is the name the Jews gave to a method of Talmudic study. The word is derived from the verb “pilpel”, which literally means “to spice,” or “to season,” and in a metaphorical sense, “to dispute violently” or “cleverly”. By argument and disputation, a subject under analysis might be said to be “spiced” or “seasoned”. Thus, the word came to mean intense investigation, argument and dispute, with the ultimate conclusion resulting from the mental conflict. The method strongly influenced Karl Marx and his doctrine of “dialectics”.

The rabbis and Talmudic scholars believe that the “pilpul” methods leads to a clear understanding of a given subject. They contend that the essence of a proposition may be revealed by minute and systematic dissection of the whole, separating the parts for the most infinitesimal distinctions so that a clear differentiation of each from the other may be made. A sentence, a maxim, or a proposition, when subjected to this method, is squeezed dry of all its possible ideas. The concepts thus determined are in turn dissected. All of the conceivable consequences deduced by these mental exercises are in turn subjected to the most minute investigation. The subject matter under examination is then compared with a similar and apparently harmonizing subject matter, and the subsequent analysis is directed toward a determination of the possible contradictions that may exist between them. If, after applying the method to two propositions that appear to be the same thing, contradictory deductions are
drawn from each of them, then it is concluded that the apparent agreement is not so in fact. The method is also applied to contradictory statements for the purpose of determining their scope of agreement and eliminating disagreement by more accurate definitions and exacting limitation of the concepts contained in the statements. The most negligible shade of meaning in a proposition may thus be revealed.

The rabbinical logician did not rest his case on the results of this tedious investigation. The *pilpulistic* method demands an inquiry into the possibilities of attaining the same conclusions by other means, so that if the first method should be upset, another proof of the result may be offered.

The *Jewish Encyclopedia* presents the following example of the *pilpulistic* method:

"The *Mishnah* says (B. M. i, 1): 'If two persons together hold a garment in their hands, and one of them asserts "I have found it," and the first one says "It belongs entirely to me," and the second likewise says "It belongs entirely to me," then each one shall swear that not less than one-half of the garment is rightfully his, and they shall divide the garment between them.' The *Gemara* explains this *Mishnah* as follows: 'The reason for the two expressions, "the one says I have found it," and "the one says 'It belongs entirely to me,' is sought because it is obvious that, if the persons insists that he found it, he lays claim to its possession.' After some futile attempts to prove by means of quibbling interpretations that one of these sentences alone would have been insufficient, the *Gemara* comes to the conclusion that two different cases are discussed in the *Mishnah*. In the first case a garment has been found, and each of two persons insists that he has found it; in the second case a garment has been acquired by purchase, each person insisting that it belongs to him, since he has purchased it. Then the *Gemara* inquires why decisions had to be rendered in both cases, and if it would not have been sufficient to give a decision in the one case only, either that of acquisition by purchase or that of finding. The *Gemara* then proves that the two ways of acquisition, by purchase and by finding, differ in certain respects, and that if a decision had been given for the one case, it could not have been concluded therefrom that it applied to the other case also.

"After this *Mishnah* sentence itself has been explained, its relation to other sentences is inquired into. Does the *Mishnah* sentence, according to which both parties swear, agree with the principle of Ben Nanos, who says, in a case in which two parties contradict each other (Shebu. vii, 5), that both parties should not be allowed to swear? It is then shown that, according to Ben Nanos, too, both parties might be allowed to take the oath, since both might swear truthfully: for it might be possible that the garment in dispute belonged to both of them together, since both together might have found or pur-
chased it, each one swearing merely that not less than one-half belongs to him. Then it is sought to ascertain whether the Mishnah contradicts the decision of Symmachus (B. K. 35b; B. M. 102), according to whom the two parties should divide the object in dispute between them without swearing. After a few other attempts at a solution, which are, however, futile, the Gemara comes to the conclusion that the mishnah in question agrees in principle with Symmachus, and that the oath which the Mishnah prescribes for both parties is merely an institution of the sages; otherwise any one might take hold of another person’s garment and insist that it belongs to him, in order to obtain possession of at least one-half of it. (B. M. 2a - 3a).”

The pilpulistic method was extended from study of the Talmud to a system of mechanical reasoning in diverse fields. From this Jewish method of dialectics came several variations, developing into minute and tedious processes that at times became more confusing than revealing. Rules and regulations for the application of the method added to the general complexity of the procedure. As a method of thinking, pilpul became an important process in the Jewish educational program. Riddles were used for exercises, and the most brilliant student was the one who came up with a solution for the greatest absurdity. The finer the hairs might be split and re-split the greater the fame of the rabbi or scholar.

* * * * * *

Hasidism had spread rapidly in the second half of the eighteenth century and, because it challenged the authority of the rabbis and Talmudic tradition, orthodox Jews vigorously opposed it. The teaching of Besht that a Jew might find salvation through faith rather than through mere religious knowledge was a heretical doctrine that Orthodoxy might not tolerate. Secret circles of Hasidim appereed in Lithuania in 1772. The Kahal (Jewish council or ruling body), with the approval of Elijah Ben Solomon, arrested the local Hasidic leaders, and excommunicated the members of the sect. Letters were dispatched to the various communities urging them to make war upon the “godless sect.” The rabbis responded, and, in many places, cruel and merciless persecutions were launched against them. Orders were issued calling for the expulsion of the Hasidim from every Jewish community; to regard them as members of another faith; to hold no intercourse with them; not to inter-marry with them, and not to bury their dead.

The antagonists of Hasidim became known as the “Mitnaggedim” (Opponents). Rabbi Tzaddik Zalman Borukhovich, who headed the hated sect, unsuccessfully attempted to appease the rage of the opponents. In 1797 the Mitnaggedim, in frenzied frus-
The Mitnaggedim were enraged at the escape of their intended victims, and continued their vicious activities against them. Abigdor Haimovich, a rabbi of Pinsk, was particularly vigorous in his activities of persecution. He was undaunted by the failure of the first denunciation to the Russian government, and, in the early part of 1800, he again petitioned the Czar, demanding repressive measures against the sect. He described the Hasidim as "a pernicious and dangerous organization" that "feared only God and had no fear of man — not even the Czar." In November Rabbi Zalmon was arrested in Liozna and returned to St. Petersburg, where he was confronted by Abigdor. The Russian authorities apparently failed to be impressed by such "proof" of the charges as Abigdor was able to produce. The palace revolution of 1801 caused Czar Paul's reign to come to an abrupt end, and his successor, Alexander I, released Zalman. The Russian government found that the sect was harmless, and Zalman was permitted the fullest liberty in preaching his doctrines.

Abigdor's example of denunciation of the Hasidim to the government was followed by the Jews in Austria and with about the same success. The sect continued to spread, reached its apex, and began to decline in the second half of the nineteenth century. It became as stiff-necked as the Orthodox Jews in resisting criticism and gradually was absorbed in the communities of the Talmudists. In its decline the Russian government turned its attention to the movement, and the police supervised its activities in the Pale of Settlement in order to counteract its propaganda.

Although Hasidism has ceased to be a threat to Orthodox Judaism, it continues to influence Jewish thinking,—particularly the religious thinking of the uneducated. Its resistance to Christian and western culture was far more stubborn than Mitnaggedim resistance was to Hasidism. The emotional appeal of its physical communion with God, with its violent body motions, its shouting
and singing, had a particularly strong influence on the Khazar Jew, and contributed an element of mechanical ecstasy and fervor to his brooding sullenness.

Haskalah means “wisdom” or “understanding.” Toward the end of the eighteenth century the word was used to denote a movement of Jewish infiltration into the Christian life of Eastern Europe. By abandoning their extreme exclusiveness and acquiring the knowledge and manners of the Gentiles it was believed that the Jews might exert more influence on Christian business and governments. In a more restricted sense Haskalah denotes the study of Biblical Hebrew and of the political, scientific, and critical parts of Hebrew literature, particularly in substitution of the study of the Talmud. Its advocates were known as Maskilim.

The rabbi, of course, was always the most influential as well as the most wealthy Jew in the community. Ordinarily he jealously guarded the ghetto (segregated quarters), and strenuously resisted every effort that would bring the Jews into daily contacts with Gentiles. For the greater part of his history in every land of his sojourn, it has been the Jew, and not the Gentile, who has insisted on the ghetto. All social intercourse with Gentiles was prohibited by the rabbinate. The rabbi, in addition to being the spiritual head of the Jewish community, was also the judge and court in all cases in which other parties were Jews. He was also the chief executive exercising important administrative powers. The rabbi acted as a sort of envoy between his Jewish community and the Gentile rulers, and the individual Jew had little or nothing to do with such matters. The haskalah movement, however, was to send the Jew beyond the walls of the ghetto to fraternize with the Gentiles.

Moses ben Menahem-Mendel, known as Moses Mendelssohn (1729-1786), may be said to be the father of haskalah. A Polish Jew by the name of Israel Zamosz, who had been run out of Poland because of his revolutionary activities, was one of Moses’ instructors. He learned French and English from one Aaron Solomon Gumperz, and, through Gumperz, he became interested in the Leibnitz-Walffian philosophy. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing exerted a great influence on Mendelssohn’s subsequent development. Lessing had employed a Jew to play a role in his play “Die Juden,” and in other ways indicated a great sympathetic interest in Jewry. He represented the so-called “liberal view” in Germany. From a mutual interest in chess there developed a strong bond of interest. Mendelssohn wrote a number of books, which appealed to Lessing and their first publication were with his assistance.

In 1766 Mendelssohn translated Jean Jacques Rousseau’s essay
“Discourse on the Origin of Inequality Among Men” into German. This work, as is well known, attacks the idea of private property. Mendelssohn greatly admired Rousseau and this admiration must, of course, be traced to Rosseau’s work. Later he edited the “Briefe die Neueste Literatur Betreffend,” an important revolutionary German publication.

Johann Kasper Lavater attempted unsuccessfully to convert Mendelssohn to Christianity. Mendelssohn replied that his beliefs in the truths of Judaism were unshakable. Following the controversies on Christianity raised by Lavater, Mendelssohn turned more and more to the Jews and Judaism.

His first activity was an intense effort to teach the Jews of Germany the German language. He translated the Pentateuch into German at the request of Solomon Dubno, who, in turn, prepared a Hebrew commentary for the translation. This translation had an important effect on German Jewry. It aroused interest in Hebrew grammar, and a desire for the study of the German language. The Judische Freischule was founded in Berlin in 1781 at Mendelssohn’s suggestion—the first organized Jewish school in Germany. For the first time instruction in technical branches and German and French language were included in the course of study, in addition to instruction in the Bible and the Talmud.

Mendelssohn now called for the “emancipation” of the Jews. In his “Jerusalem,” he deals with the relation of State and Church and concludes that as both have different functions they should be separate entities. He contended that the Church had no right to own property and that Church law is essentially contradictory to the nature of religion. (He was, of course, speaking of Christian Churches.) He laid down the proposition that the Church and State should be separated, and that every person should be guaranteed freedom of belief and conscience. He opposed the right of ban and excommunication by the Church.

It is extremely interesting to analyze these Mendelssohnian proposals in light of the times in which they were made. First, the states that Mendelssohn was criticizing were Christian states. There were no Jewish states. If his proposal was to be accepted, the states accepting would cease to be Christian states. Judaism, as such, owned no property. Only the Christian Churches owned property. If Mendelssohn’s proposition on this point was accepted, only the Christian Churches would be deprived of property. In contending that Church law was contradictory to the nature of religion, he was speaking of Christian law. The Law of Moses as interpreted by the Talmud is the whole of Judaism, and Mendelssohn had, by his own confession, “an unshakable belief” in the truth of his religion. He was not proposing to abolish it. The Jewish nation is necessarily a theocratic state, and Mendelssohn
knew it. His proposal therefore had no reference to the Jewish theocracy, as there was no Jewish state. His plea for “freedom of belief and conscience,” therefore, was particularly a Jewish plea.

In the second part of “Jerusalem,” Mendelsshon deals with Judaism. The faith of the Jews, he says in substance, is distinguished from Christianity in that it is not necessary for the Jew to accept dogma. Judaism, he declares, is not revealed religion; it is revealed legislation, further contradicting his proposal that Church law is contrary to the nature of religion. Kant, in evaluating “Jerusalem”, wrote Mendelssohn that the book “will effect not only your nation, but others as well.”

Mendelssohn had disclosed to German Jewry hitherto unsuspected possibilities of influence. Knowledge of the German language was, of course, necessary to secure entrance into cultured German circles. Mendelssohn’s translation of the Pentateuch into German together with the grammatical commentary, became “the primer of haskalah.” The movement spread throughout Germany. Wealthy Jews, such as the Friedlanders and Daniel Itzig were its sponsors. Mendelsohn was its prototype, and Hartwig Wessely was its prophet. Wessely wrote an epistle to the Austrian Jews advising them as to the best means to take advantage of Emperor Joseph II’s “Edict of Tolerance,” and his epistle became the program of haskalah.

Jews soon attained prominence in the social and intellectual life of Germany, and many turned from haskalah to assimilation and, in some instances, to Christianity. The Verein fur Cultur und Wissenschaft des Judenthums (Union of Jews for Culture and Science) was organized in 1821, which organization is believed to have had as its objectives the further weakening of Christianity and the Judaizing of Western Christendom—particularly Germany.

Israel Samoscz, Herz Homberg, Isaac Satanow and Solomon Dubno, Polish and Bohemian Jews, spread the haskalah movement in Poland, Bohemia and Galacia. From these countries the movement filtered into Russia.

The Jewish “nationalistic” trend in Russia transformed haskalah into what has since been known as “Zionism.” The Maskilim joined the “national” movement, but many of the essential features of haskalah, such as infiltration into Christian circles for Jewish political purposes, were retained. Asher Ginzberg became the “foremost Maskil”, as the leader of the Culture-Zionists. Except for the nationalistic tendency, the Zionist movement is in essence the old program of Wessely and the Berlin school of haskalah.

Yom-Tob Lippman, known as Leopold Zunz (1794-1886) is considered the founder of the modern “science of Judaism.” He
established, together with Eduard Ganz and Moses Moser, the Verein für Cultur und Wissenschaft der Juden on November 17, 1819. The organization had as its announced purpose ‘through culture and education to bring the Jews into harmonious relations with the age and nations in which they live’, which was the inoffensive way of saying that the Society intended to Judaize “the age and nations in which they live”. Zunz’s work and writings prove the true intent of the organization. The burden of his theme is the imposition of Jewishness on Christendom. The Verein—in which Zunz was the leading figure—attracted some of the foremost Jews of the day, Heinrich Heine, Ludwig Markus, David Friedlander, Israel Jacobson, Lazarus ben David... In 1822 the “Zeitschrift fur die Wissenschaft des Judenthums” made its appearance under the auspices of the Verein, edited by Zunz. The program, written by Wohlwill, revealed the sinister purposes of the association. The “new science,” it was said, comprised a study of the historical development and the philosophical essence of Judaism; two methods which must be based on a critical understanding of Jewish literature. There was not the slightest indication of either an effort or a method tending to “bring the Jews into harmonious relations” with their “age” and “the nations in which they lived.”

Heinrich Heine further revealed the true purpose of the Verein by referring to its members as “Young Palestine.” All of the revolutionary committees of Heine’s day were referred to in a similar manner, such as “Young Germany,” “Young Italy,” “Young Portugal” and “Young Turks.”

Zunz and his Verein proposed a doctrine which may be called “Neo-Messianism” for want of a better term. This doctrine differed from the Jewish Orthodox conception of a “personal” Messiah, in that it conceives a Messianic age when the Jewish nation dominates the world politically and socially. In order to achieve this Messianic Age, Christianity of course, must be utterly destroyed, or so weakened as to be a negligible force in world affairs. Without the Christian influence governments are increasingly weakened and become more susceptible to Jewish control. Zunz’s doctrine did more than deny the belief in the coming of a personal Messiah; he infused into the Jewish mind the fulfillment of the Covenant through domination over all Gentile people, and suggested the means for its early attainment. The haskalah movement received great impetus from the Verein. Christian society had heretofore repelled the unassimilable Jew. Suddenly he was in the drawing-room speaking German, talking guardedly of doctrines of revolutionary import. The Revolution of 1848 was not far distant.

Moses Hess, whom Karl Marx affectionately called the “Communist rabbi”, declared “at all times there has been a central union among Jews, even among those who have been scattered all over
the globe. It doesn't matter where found, Jews maintained rela-
tions with this spiritual center. Never has a nation felt in such
an acute a manner as Jews, the force emanating from such a
center. With them, every suggestion is broadcast with the greatest
speed to the extreme ends of the national organization.” (“Rome
and Palestine”.) Hess was the organizer of the first communist
groups in the Rhineland. He became a member of the First
International and represented the communists of Germany at the
1868 Bruxelles Conference, and again in 1869 at Basel. Dr. Wax-
man, who made the translation of Hess’s “Rome and Palestine”,
called the work “the herald and trumpet of Zionism.”

Bernard Lazare, Jewish writer, in his book “Anti-Semitism, Its
History and Causes”, devotes considerable space to the revolu-
tionary character of the Jew.

“In that time (tenth to fifteenth centuries),” he writes, “when
Catholicism and the Christian faith were the basic structure of the
States, to combat them or to supply arms to those who attacked
them, was to do the work of a revolutionist. The Jews did not con-
fine themselves to this. They supported Arab materialism that so
strongly shook the Christian faith and spread disbelief to the point
that we can affirm the existence of a secret society sworn to the
destruction of Christianity ... I understand by revolutionary pro-
cess the ideological march of Revolution that can be represented
on the one hand by the gradual destruction of the Christian state
and of religious authority and on the other by an economic revo-

There is no reliable evidence tending to prove that the Jews, as
such, initiated or controlled the “Illuminati” of Bavaria. This
organization, under the direction and control of a sinister character
known to history as Adam Weishaupt, was founded on May 1, 1776,
under the name Gesellschaft der Perfectibilisten (Perfectibilists).
The name ultimately employed to designate Weishaupt’s secret
society was the “Illuminati” (Enlightened). There was nothing
original in the name, as it had been given to, or assumed by
various sects or orders of mystics for several hundred years. The
“Alombrados” or “Alumbrados,” which arose about the year
1520 in Spain, is an early example. Under the name of “Illumines”
a similar sect appeared in Picardy in 1623, but succumbed in 1635.
Very little is known of another sect of Illumines that appeared in
the south of France about 1722, except that it is believed to have
disappeared after 1794. The title of “Illuminati” has often been
bestowed also on Rosicrusians, Martinists, and Swedenborgians.

Adam Weishaupt was a professor of canon law at Ingolstadt.
He was an ex-Jesuit and hated the order with great intensity-
“our worst enemies the Jesuits,” he wrote. He became deeply engrossed in secret societies, and apparently devoted much of his time in researching ancient mystic and occult orders and sects. It is said that a certain Jutland merchant by the name of Kolmer, initiated Weishaupt, in 1771, into the mysteries of a “secret” doctrine founded on Manichaeanism, that Kolmer had picked up in Egypt. Manichaeanism was a dualistic religious philosophy which originated with the Persian Manicheus or Mani. It was taught from the third to the seventh centuries. Its essence is that light and goodness, personified as God, is in eternal conflict with darkness and evil. While there is no direct evidence of the fact, Kolmer might have been a Jew, the name Kolmer being a corruption of the Jewish name Calmer. While it has also been said that Weishaupt himself was a Jew, there does not appear to be any real evidence in support of the assertion.

Most students of the Illuminati are agreed that the Cabala is no part of Weishaupt’s system. Mrs. Webster, in her book “Secret Societies” declares that “the only trace of Cabalism to be found amongst the papers of the Order is a list of recipes for procuring abortion, for making aphrodisiacs, Aqua Toffana, pestilential vapours, etc., headed ‘Cabala Major.’”

Bernard Lazare states that “there were Jews, Cabalistic Jews, around Weishaupt.” A French writer on the subject has declared that these Jews were Moses Mendelssohn, Wessely, and the bankers Itzig, Friedlander, and Meyer. But, again, there is no documentary evidence in support of these statements. Mrs. Webster—who must be considered an expert on the subject—states that Weishaupt “and his first coadjutors, Zwack and Massenhausen, were pure Germans.” Nevertheless, the anti-Christian propaganda of the Jews contributed to Weishaupt’s Illuminati. Mrs. Webster, in “Secret Societies,” writes: “But Lessing was also the friend and admirer of Moses Mendelssohn, who has been suggested as one of Weishaupt’s inspirers. Now, at first sight nothing seems more improbable than that an orthodox Jew such as Mendelssohn should have accorded any sympathy to the anarchic scheme of Weishaupt. Nevertheless, certain of Weishaupt’s doctrines are not incompatible with the principles of orthodox Judaism. Thus, for example, Weishaupt’s theory—so strangely at variance with his denunciations of the family system—that as a result of Illuminism ‘the head of every family will be what Abraham was, the patriarch, the priest, and the unfettered lord of his family, and Reason will be the only code of Man,’ is essentially a Jewish conception . . . To sum up, I do not see so far in Illuminism a Jewish conspiracy to destroy Christianity, but rather a movement finding its principle dynamic force in the ancient spirit of revolt against the existing social and moral order, aided and abetted perhaps by Jews who saw in it a system that might be turned to their own advantage.”
The part played by the Jews in the French Revolution is obscure. Mrs. Webster states: "On this point Jewish writers appear to be better informed than the rest of the world, for Monsieur Leon Kahn in his panegyric on the part played by his co-religionists in the Revolution finds Jews where even Drumont failed to detect them. Thus we read that it was a Jew, Rosenthal, who headed the legion known by his name, which was sent against La Vendee but took to flight, and which was the subject of complaint when employed to guard the Royal Family at the Temple; that amongst those who worked most energetically to deprive the clergy of their goods was a Jewish ex-old-clothes seller, Zalkind Hourwitz; that it was a Jew named Lang who murdered three out of the five Swiss guards at the foot of the staircase in the Tuileries on August 10; that Jews were implicated in the theft of the crown jewels on September 16, 1792, and one named Lyre was executed in consequence; that it was Clootz and the Jew Pereyra . . . who went to the Archbishop Gobel in November, 1793 and induced him by means of threats to abjure the Christian faith."

There is no evidence linking Meyer Amschel (founder of the House of Rothschild) with the French Revolution of 1789. As a matter of fact history strongly indicates that he could not possibly have had a hand in it. Although the headquarters of the Illuminati is said to have been established in Frankfort in 1782 there is no evidence that Meyer Amschel became a member, or is it at all likely that he did.

A Special Commissioner of Police at Meyence reported that an organization in Berlin called the "League of Virtue" or Tugendbund was "so identified with the Illuminati that no line of demarcation was seen between them." It was reported that the headquarters of the Tugendbund was the house of a Jewish member of the Illuminati named Herz, a friend and pupil of Moses Mendelssohn. Among the members or adherents of the Tugendbund were two of Mendelssohn's daughters. Two of Mendelssohn's sons had married into the family of Daniel Itzig. It is alleged that Mirabeau was well acquainted with Herz's wife, and that it was Mirabeau who introduced Illuminism into France and initiated the Duke of Orleans and Talleyrand into the order. Fanny von Arnstein, Daniel Itzig's daughter, was interested in the Tugendbund and is said to have conducted a similar association in Vienna. William von Humboldt, Alexander von Humbolt and Frederick von Gentz were other members or sympathizers. Mrs. Herz apparently made no secret of the fact that the Tugendbund supported the French Revolution of 1789.

The Jew von Gentz was responsible for the Rothschilds' success with Prince Metternich of Austria. William von Humboldt, who later became Prussian Ambassador to England, was close to the
Among the Jewish bankers who are said to have helped finance the French Revolution are Daniel Itzig (1722-1799), Court Jew to Frederick William II; David Friedlander (1750-1834), Itzig's son-in-law; Herz Corfbmeer (1730-1793); Benjamin Goldsmid of London (1755-1808); Abraham Goldsmid, Benjamin's brother (1756-1810); and Moses Mocatta (1768-1857), partner of the brothers Goldsmid, and uncle of Sir Moses Montefiore.

* * * * *

The idea of the return of the Jews to Palestine is an integral part of the Messianic doctrine. "For out of Zion shall go forth the law." This dream of a restoration, of a renewed national existence, and a return to Palestine with Israel dominant over all the Gentile nations of the world, has been the most persistent obsession of the Jews through the centuries. While some of the modern Jews, particularly in the United States, have attempted to blot out this sinister doctrine (Philadelphia Conference, November 3-6, 1869), the rise of Theodor Herzl's political Zionism through the zealous and energetic support of the Khazar Jews, completely smothered the good sense of the Reformed Jews.

The Jews of Babylon looked forward continually to the re-establishment of their kingdom. As has been seen, the Jews were despised throughout the civilized world long before the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. Nevertheless these voluntary exiles looked forward to the day when Israel would rule the world from Jerusalem. We have seen how they attempted, on several occasions, to bring this about by force of arms. The destruction of the Temple by Titus and Vespasian only served to rekindle the burning fever for the great day of retribution and revenge. The Talmud as a whole is based upon the promise of the reestablishment of the power of Israel and its ultimate control of the affairs of all mankind. The doctrine is expressed in numerous Jewish prayers. The Cabala gives particular emphasis to the Judaic dream of world-domination. The Zohar treats the event as having taken place. Toldoth Noah explains that "the Feast of the Tabernacles is the period when Israel triumphs over the other people of the world; that is why during this feast we seize the Loulab (branches of trees tied together) and carry it as a trophy to show that we have conquered all the other peoples known as 'populace' and that we dominate them."

J. P. Stehelin, in "The Traditions of the Jews", quoting Talmud treatises Baba Bathra, observes: "But let us see a little after what manner the Jews are to live in their ancient Country under the Administration of the Messiah. In the First Place, the strange Nations, which they shall suffer to live, shall build them Houses
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and Cities, till their Ground, and plant their Vineyards; and all
this, without so much as looking for any Reward of their Labour.
These surviving Nations will likewise voluntarily offer them all
their Wealth and Furniture: And Princes and Nobles shall attend
them; and be ready at their Nod to pay them all Manner of
Obedience; while they themselves shall be surrounded with
Grandeur and Pleasure, appearing abroad in Apparel glittering
with Jewels like Priests of the Unction, consecrated to God . . .”

The Cabala is not so generous with the goyim (Zohar, Schemoth;
Beschalah). When Israel takes over the dominion of the world,
all the goyim will be swept off the face of the earth. The Zohar
says the Messiah will declare war on all the nations and all the
nations will eventually declare war on the Messiah. The Messiah
will then display His force and exterminate them.

Mordecai M. Noah, in 1818, advocated the restoration of the Jews
to Palestine. He later conceived a plan for a preliminary settle­
ment which he called “Ararat” on Grand Island in the Niagara
River, near Buffalo. On January 19, 1820 Noah presented the
New York legislature with a petition, praying for the sale to him
of Grand Island. Nothing was done about it, but the incident
aroused interest in Europe. In 1873 the London Jewish Chronicle
editorially suggested a Jewish colony in the United States along
the lines suggested by Noah.

Joseph Salvador, in 1830, suggested that a coalition of European
powers might restore Palestine to the Jews, and the founders
of the Alliance Israelite Universelle had a similar idea. It was
this Jewish organization, under the leadership of Albert Cohn and
Charles Netter, that initiated the plan of colonizing Jews in Pales­
tine. Mikweh Yisrael, an agricultural school, was founded near
Jaffa.

In 1864 there appeared a pamphlet, generally ascribed to one
Abraham Petavel (a Christian clergyman and a member of the
Alliance Israelite Universelle), advocating Jewish nationalism.
One Lazar Levy-Bing, a banker of Nancy, favored the idea and
expressed the hope that Jerusalem might become the ideal center
of the world. Another Jew, J. Frankel, in 1868, published a
pamphlet that boldly urged the purchase of Palestine from
Turkey. Various schemes were presented. The Rothschilds were
urged to use their great wealth to “restore the kingdom of Judah
to its former glory.” Judah ben Solomon Alkalai, rabbi at Semlin,
Croatia, advocated the formation of a joint-stock company for the
purpose of inducing the sultan to cede Palestine to the Jews as
a tributary state. The Arabs, of course, occupied Palestine, as
had their ancestors, for nearly two thousand years. No one
seemed particularly interested in these occupants of the land or
seemed to care what would happen to them once they were driven
from their homes. And, incredible as it seems, no one seemed
to care when, in 1948, the Jews did finally drive them into the desert. The agitation continued without a thought of the people who must be dispossessed.

Luzzatti, in Padua, wrote to Albert Cohn in 1854: “Palestine must be colonized and worked by the Jews in order that it may live again commercially and agriculturally.” Sir Moses Montefiore and Alolphe Cremieux journeyed to Palestine and added their influence to the proposals. Henry Dumont attempted to interest the Alliance Israelite Universelle in France, the Anglo-Jewish Association in London, and the Jewish community in Berlin in taking immediate action for the acquisition of the Holy Land. The International Palestine Society and the Syrian and Palestine Colonization Society were organized for the promotion of interest in the subject. Sir Moses Montefiore, in 1840, unsuccessfully attempted to induce Mohammed Ali to permit the Jews to colonize in Palestine, and Lord Shaftesbury in a similar attempt did not fare any better.

David ben Dob Baer Gordon (1826-1886), Zebi Hirsh Kalischer (1795-1874), Elijah Guttmacher, Moses Hess, and the Jewish historian Heinrich Graetz were all advocates of the return of the Jews to Palestine. The movement in the course of time became known as Chovevei Zion. Gordon and Hess may be said to have been the intellectual leaders. Hess’ “Bom und Jerusalem” (1862), has remained one of the foundation works in Zionist literature, in spite of the fact that Hess was a self-avowed communist. Kalischer is considered the first practical Zionist. He advocated the colonization of Palestine, the cultivation of the land there, the founding of an agricultural school and a Jewish military guard. He believed that the Covenant could not be fulfilled unless the Jews worked for its attainment in the land of Abraham.

The result of all this agitation laid the ground-work for the political Zionism of Theodor Herzl in 1897. Two first congresses would be held that year, out of which would emerge two Jewish movements that were destined to change the course of history. Theodor Herzl would preside over the first Zionist Congress at Basel, and the Jewish Socialist Bund would meet in the first Communist Congress in Minsk.

* * * * * * *

Henri Barbusse (1873-1935), Jewish French communist who organized the communist front World Congress Against War (later to be known as American League for Peace and Democracy—Dies Reports, Vol. 1, page 438), wrote a book he called “Jesus.” The following quotes are from the English translation:

“The days are near. The old world will die its death . . . For the Eternal will glow from Zion . . . The heavenly Messiah will have a counterfeit, and the earth will be destroyed . . . The kingdoms shall fall, those who shall rule nations
will pass . . . And the hero of the Revolution will install a new era where Israel shall be elevated above the eagles . . . We, whose hopes have been crushed one after the other, we are the people of hope, the man-people . . . In the street where I pass on my return home, the setting sun is casting lengthened rays. People are thinking of the Revolution. And one of them says: You think it will come, this Revolution? And the other says: It seems as though it is for tomorrow . . . The multitude is lazy, and all memories flee from it. But we, the Saints, we make the courage of Israel come out of the earth . . . And it is faith . . . For Israel is the Chosen People. The universe was given to the Jews by God who told them this, by messenger, on Sinai . . . We shall carry, for the last thousand years of the world, that are just now to commence, the success of the Jews over the usurper of Rome . . . And we will scourge the nations with a rod of iron . . . I tell you we are the true and the sole ones to bring forth the law, the final battle for the Kingdom of God and for life eternal, that is the immortal glory of the conquering Jew . . ."

Abul Walid Muhammed ibn Ahmad ibn Roshd, better known as Averroes (1126-1198), an Arabian and Mohammedan found admirers among the Jewish scholars of the twelfth century, although his writings were rejected by Islam. Whether Averroes was a disciple of the Jewish rabbi Maimondes, or Maimondes was a disciple of Averroes has been a nice point of dispute. Nevertheless there is much of Averroes in Maimondes. Both were strong Aristotelians. Both deny the Diety the possession of "attributes," and both hold the same theories of intellect and the relation of faith and knowledge.

Averroes endorsed Aristotle's theories in their entirety, and never lost an opportunity to emphasize them. "God," he says, "has declared a truth for all men that requires for understanding no intellectual superiority; in a language that can be interpreted by every human soul according to its capability and temper. The expositors of religious meta-physics are therefore the enemies of true religion, because they made it a matter of syllogism." It made no difference to Averroes that his interpretation of Aristotle's doctrines may not have been in harmony with the doctrines of the Koran. While Maimondes admitted man's free will, Averroes restricted it. "Our soul," says Averroes, "can have preferences indeed, but its acts are limited by the fatality of exterior circumstances."

Certain Averroistic propositions aroused the criticism of Christian ecclesiastic authorities, and Averroes' theories were vigorously opposed by St. Thomas Aquinas. Among these Averroistic propositions were the co-eternity of the created word; the numerical identity of the intellect in all men, and the so-called two-fold-truth theory stating that a proposition may be philosophically true
though theologically false. St. Thomas Aquinas argued that there is no philosophical proof, either for the co-eternity of the created word or against it, and he established the principle that creation is an article of faith. St. Thomas rejected the proposition of the unity of intellect as being incompatible with the true concept of person and with personal immortality. It is doubtful whether Averroes himself believed the two-truths theory, and, of course, it was rejected by St. Thomas. Nevertheless the Averroes theories gained great influence and dominated many universities, particularly in Italy.

St. Thomas held that reason and faith constitute two harmonious realms in which the truths of faith complement those of reason. Both are gifts of God, but reason has an autonomy of her own. The first principle of philosophy according to St. Thomas is the affirmation of being. For man, all knowledge begins by way of the senses, which are the medium by which he grasps the intelligible world, the universal. The form of the universal may be said to exist in three ways, in God, in things, and in the mind. It is by the knowledge of things that we come to know of God’s existence. In the natural order what God is can be known only by analogy and negation. St. Thomas’ conviction that the existence of God can be discovered by reason is shown by his proofs of the existence of God.

Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860), the German philosopher — friendless, never married, and estranged from his mother — may be said to be the father of organized pessimism. The essence of his philosophy, growing out of Kantian idealism, is that true reality, expressing itself through all things, is a blind impelling force which is manifest in individuals as a will to live. The world is a place of unsatisfied wants, of pain. Pleasure is simply the absence of pain; unable to endure, it brings only ennui. The constant mutual resistance of various wills cause continual strife as each individual attempts to fulfill the never fully satisfied wants of his restless will. His stress on this strength of the “impelling will” has been strongly influential in both philosophy and psychology.

Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche (1844-1900) left a strong impression on various aspects of German thought. He preached the superiority of the aristocrat, the morality of masters, in which a life by the might of its own superiority will survive. The will of man must create the superman, who would be above good and evil and would eradicate decadent democracy.

Naturalism is the philosophic view that maintains that all explanation should keep within the realm of what is natural, and
avoid all recourse to the supernatural. This philosophy holds that the universe requires no supernatural cause and government, but is self-existent, self-explanatory, self-operating, and self-directing. The world-process, from this viewpoint, is purposeless, and man is merely an incidental product of the senseless universe-existence. Human life, with all its variety of attributes, may be justified on natural grounds without recourse to God or to supernatural sanctions. Further, Naturalism conceives that man’s highest good may be pursued and attained under natural conditions without expectation of a supernatural destiny.

Dr. Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), Jewish Austrian psychiatrist, gave the world psycho-analysis. The great emphasis on sex, so prevalent in the Talmud, unquestionably influenced Freud’s theories. As a Jew he hardly could have escaped the over-balanced impact of naked, unadorned sexuality that permeates the ancient book of the Law. He advanced the proposition that all human conduct—and mental ills, and many of their physical manifestations—have their origin in the sex instinct. His method consists in the use of such procedures as free association, automatic writing and dream-analysis for the purpose of recovering forgotten memories, suppressed desires and other subconscious debris which, according to Freud, exerts a disturbing influence on the conscious life of an individual. When the psychiatrist has succeeded in dragging the suppressed desires and hidden incidents from the patient’s subconscious mind so that they may be viewed consciously, the patient is miraculously cured. Freud found it necessary to presuppose a subconscious mind. His second invention is the libido—a broad term that places all motivating impulse in the sex-drive. A Freudian complex is an emotional mechanism that sets up a mental-block or check-mate, thus holding back either a natural or perverted sex-drive. This check-mate is caused by a sense of guilt, a religious or ethical prohibition, or, perhaps by just a sense of decency. His theories include infantile incest desires. Dreams are disguised (in the degree of the individual sense of morality) wish-fulfillments. No matter what form the dream takes psychoanalysis interprets it in terms of sexuality. Sublimation is the Freudian term for the transference of a suppressed desire into something that may be talked about in polite company. There is always danger, asserts Freud, that the patient will transfer his or her suppressed desires to the psychiatrist.

Came the materialists. Only matter is real; the only primordial or fundamental constituent of the universe. Mental entities, processes, or events are caused solely by material entities, processes or events and themselves have no causal effect. The universe is not governed by intelligence, purpose, or final causes.
Nothing supernatural exists; nothing mental exists. Everything is explainable in terms of matter in motion. All qualitative differences are reducible to quantitative differences. Wealth, bodily satisfactions and sensuous pleasures are either the only or the greatest values man can seek or achieve. Human actions and cultural change are determined solely or largely by economic factors. The end of free will and the dethronement of God!

* * * * *

A new force was suddenly unloosed in the world—hostility to God and religion. David Friedrich Straus wrote "The Life of Jesus" and believed that he had proved that the Gospels were without historical authenticity. Ludwig Feuerbach declared ("Nature of Christianity") that men are without future until they cease being "the valets of His Heavenly Majesty." He went further (1839): "Christianity has in fact long vanished," he wrote, "not only from the reason but from the life of mankind." Feuerbach's attack upon religion made him a hero with the revolutionaries of 1848-1849.

The decline of Christianity had begun.

* * * * *
BEASTS OF THE APOCALYPSE

VI

BEFORE the Christian era a certain religious harmony reigned throughout the known world, and where the various nations did not in fact embrace the prevailing superstition, each nation accorded the others a modicum of religious toleration. Only the Jews withheld respect and withdrew in hostile bigotry. True, the Jews had borrowed many of their notions from surrounding tribes and nations, particularly the rite of circumcision (from the Egyptians), but they had lost remembrance of these things in the passage of time. Unsocial, obstinate, the Jews ill-concealed (if at all they tried) their implacable hatred of the goy. The Covenant with Abraham extended only to a single family, and Abraham’s seed alone might share in its promises. Marriages with non-Jews were forbidden, and the non-Jew was forbidden in the community of Jews. There was no obligation to proselyte, and the sons of the Covenant rarely offered a Gentile an opportunity to share Israel’s exalted destiny.

The destruction of the empty temple at Jerusalem and the wide dispersion of the Jews throughout the world (which, as has been said before, began several hundreds of years before the fall of Jerusalem) failed to change their unsocial and sullen attitude. They shunned and despised the strangers whose hospitality they sought, and scoffed at the laws of their adopted countries with the same intensity. Moreover they demanded of the adopted countries that they be permitted to live by their own law, and succeeded in securing many concessions to the amazement and wonder of the native populations.

Christianity, pure and humble, obscure, and despised by pagan and Jew alike, emerged gradually. Its teachers spoke of the unity of God, and preached the gentle doctrines of Jesus. It carried with it the strength of the law of Moses, revitalized and cleansed of Jewish exclusiveness. The Christian teachers proclaimed the divine authority of Moses and the prophets and, by the Holy Scripture, established the divinity of Jesus. The Jews in their vanity, had interpreted the prophesies as proclaiming the coming of a Messiah, who, with sword and armies, would conquer the world. This “Messiah”, who was yet to appear, would establish the sovereignty of the sons of Israel over the goim.

The Crucifixion, however, had forever repudiated the sacrifices of the temple and the Jewish ambition of world conquest. The Jewish dream of divine special favor over all mankind had no part...
in the doctrines of Christianity. The Cross dispelled that narrow, selfish myth. Salvation was for all; God’s mercy and love encompassed everyone, everywhere; poor, rich, the slave and the prince. No one was excluded. All one had to do was to believe; to accept.

And the Jews loathed the doctrines that disenfranchised them as the “chosen” of Jehovah.

No where in the laws of Moses is there a doctrine that admits of the soul of man. The prophets of the Old Testament inferentially leave the impression of life after death. The Biblical history of the Jews indicates concern only with present existence. By traditional authority the Pharisees added a future state of rewards and punishment, which doctrines were embraced by the Jews. Immortality of the soul, however, became divine truth only through the example and authority of Christ.

The Jews generally exerted great influence at the court of Rome. From the capital they spread into other parts of Italy. Frequently expelled from the cities and provinces where they settled, they were as frequently readmitted. The emperors alternated between harsh measures and extraordinary special privileges. The oppressive measures were seldom executed or were lightly applied, and succeeding governments were busy either repealing the harsh laws of their successors or framing new ones to be repealed in turn. Generally the Jews fared well under the Roman Empire.

Under the Lombards Jewish power and influence increased. When the Lombards embraced Christianity the Jews passed under the protection of the Popes. As the Jewish merchants grew and prospered in the principal cities, their influence and special protection expanded. A nephew of Rabbi Nathan ben Jehiel became administrator of the property of Alexander III. Under Norman rule the power and influence of the Jews became so great in southern Italy and Sicily that they were given complete jurisdiction of their own affairs—a special concession afforded no other alien group. Isaac ben Mordecai became physician to the Pope.

When Pope John XXII contemplated a ban against the Jews, King Robert of Sicily was induced to intercede in their behalf, which he did, dissuading the Pope in his purpose. The synod convoked by the Jews at Bologna sent a deputation to Pope Martin V with costly gifts, requesting the repeal of the laws decreed by Benedict XIII. Pope Martin not only acceded to their prayer, but restored their special status. While Pope Eugenius reenacted the laws issued by Benedict, his bull (official order from the Pope) was neglected and unenforced in Italy. Many of the Jews in Venice, Genoa, Florence and elsewhere were bankers, and held
the commercial interests of those centers in their hands. In spite of the papal bull, their position became stronger than before. It became easy for them to obtain permission to establish banks and to engage in financial transactions. The Bishop of Mantua was prevailed upon to grant permission to the Jewish bankers to lend money at interest. All banking and financial transactions in Tuscany were in the hands of a Jew named Jehiel of Pisa. William of Portaleone became physician to the King of Naples and to the ducal houses of Sforza and Gonzaga.

Jewish exiles from Spain found refuge and protection under King Ferdinand I of Naples. Don Isaac Abravanel was given a position at the Neapolitan court, which he retained under Alfonso II. Jehiel and his sons, of Pisa, were sufficiently influential with Duke Hercules I of Ferrara and Tuscany to assure welcome for other Spanish Jews in his domain.

Isaac Abravanel and his sons became great favorites at the Naples court, and consequently exerted a great influence in behalf of the native Jews. At Ferrara, Abraham ben Mordecai Farissol enjoyed the protection of Hercules I.

Cabalistic doctrines were introduced into Italy in the sixteenth century by Abraham Levita, Baruch of Benevento, and Judah Hayyat. Prominent Christians, such as Algidius da Viterbo and Reuchlin, became devoted cabalists. A German Jew by the name of Asher Lammlein, pretending to be a prophet, appeared in Istria, and announced the coming of the “real” Messiah in 1502. Many Christians believed him.

David Reubeni, a swarthy dwarf wearing an Oriental costume, suddenly appeared in Rome in the early part of 1524 riding a white horse. Jewish supporters greeted him with enthusiasm. He sought an audience with Pope Clement VII and was received with the pomp and circumstance accorded an ambassador. He proposed a crusade against the Turks which proposal apparently met with some approval.

Reubeni was an unusual product of the Jewish nation, even in an age that was producing unusual Jews in every part of the known world. In Egypt Reubeni posed as a descendant of Mohammed, while he represented himself to the Jews as the envoy of a large Jewish kingdom in the East. A Jewish painter named Moses, and Felice, a Jewish merchant, financed his journey to Rome. He told Pope Clement VII that his brother Joseph ruled over a great Jewish kingdom in Arabia “where the sons of Abraham dwelt near the fabled Sambation River.” He carried credentials from Portugese captains confirming his pretensions. The Portugese minister, Miguel da Silva, suggested to his court
the feasibility of utilizing Reuben’s mission to secure allies in the efforts of the Portuguese against Salim I, who had seized Egypt in 1521 and diverted the spice trade.

Benvenida Abravanel, wife of Samuel, and the heirs of Jehiel of Pisa, provided Reuben with funds to go to Almeira, where he secured an audience with King John III of Portugal. The king was evidently deeply impressed with the strange ambassador. He promised him eight ships and 4,000 cannon, but apparently thought better of it, as there is no record of the promise being fulfilled.

Donna Gracia Mendesia Nasi, daughter of a Jewish banker in Portugal, patronized on occasion by Charles V, migrated to Turkey. Here her influence was so great that Sulaiman was persuaded to force the Pope to free all of the Turkish Jews imprisoned at Ancona.

* * * * *

The Jews had little success in influencing Pope Paul IV, and as a result they united with the Jews of the Levant to boycott the port of Ancona and stop all commercial relations with the papal state. The plan nearly succeeded, and probably would have, had not the Pope, by virtue of his supreme authority, called on Christendom to help put a stop to it. The city, nevertheless, was almost ruined. As a result of the boycott Jewish influence waned for a time in Italy. The Duke of Urbino withdrew his protection, and the Duke of Ferrara thereafter was less favorably disposed toward the peculiar people.

* * * * *

Converted and baptized Jews throughout history have been the most implacable enemies of the Talmud. Having had a more thorough training and understanding of this strange work, the Jewish convert to Christianity has been notable in his condemnation of it. For a time, however, cabalistic works—particularly the Holy Book of the Cabala, the Zohar—was looked upon favorably by Christians, and was not included in the edicts of destruction. The dual morality of the Talmud—justice and fair dealing with the Jew and the contrary in Jewish-Gentile relations—did violence to the Christian concept of justice to all. Hence, after such manifestations of its application to Christians, the Talmud was blamed. Therefore the burning of twelve thousand Hebrew volumes in Cremona in May of 1559 by order of the governor of Milan, while not to be condoned, is understandable. The destruction of the Hebrew books did little to appease the smoldering hatred the Jews entertained for the Christians, but it did bring about a degree of caution. The Soncinos, with printing-presses in various cities, in Lombardy, Constantinople and Prague, by a large gift of money, secured permission from Pope Pius IV to reprint the Talmud. The permission was granted on the condition that the
work be published under another name and that all libel against Jesus and Christianity be omitted. The *Talmud* was immediately reprinted at Basel.

Jewish historians, it should be noted, always omit the reasons for Christian objection to the *Talmud*. They would leave the impression that some instinctive meanness in the Christian heart caused him to make bonfires of the books throughout the centuries.

The modern Jewish "defense agencies" do not attempt to burn Christian books. They resort to more subtle means in destroying "Christological" manifestations, and look upon any public Christian ceremony as "anti-Semitic." It is quite obvious that the Christians looked upon the *Talmud* as anti-Christian, and, after the custom of the times, sought its destruction.

It is important to examine the manner in which Pope Pius' permission to reprint the *Talmud* was handled by the Jews. In 1631 a council of Jewish elders convened in Poland. As a result of their deliberations they addressed a circular letter to the Jewish communities, which reads as follows:

> "Great peace to our beloved brethren of the house of Israel. Having received information that many Christians have applied themselves with great care to acquire the knowledge of the language in which our books are written, we therefore enjoin you, under penalty of the great ban (to be inflicted upon such of you as shall transgress this our statute), that you do not in any new edition either of the *Mishna* or *Gemara*, publish anything relative to Jesus of Nazareth; and you are to take special care not to write anything concerning him, either good or bad, so that neither ourselves nor our religion may be exposed to any injury. For we know what these men of Belial, the *Mumrim*, have done to us, when they become Christians, and how their representations against us have obtained credit. If you should not pay strict attention to this letter, but act contrary thereto, and continue to publish our books in the same manner as before, you may occasion, both to us and yourselves, greater afflictions than we have heretofore experienced, and be the means of our being compelled to embrace the Christian religion, as we were formerly: and thus our latter troubles might be worse than the former. For these reasons we command you that if you publish any new edition of those books, let the places relating to Jesus of Nazareth be left blank, and fill up the space with a circle like this 0. But the rabbis and teachers of children will know how to instruct the youth by word of mouth . . . ."

* * * * *

Solomon of Udine was the Turkish ambassador sent to Venice to negotiate the peace treaty with the republic, which was accomplished in July of 1574. The Senate doubted that it might properly negotiate with an international Jew who owed allegiance only to the Jewish nation and could not possibly be said to truly represent the Turkish government. Through the influence of the Venetian diplomats and particularly of the consul, Marc Antonio
Barbaro, Udine was ultimately received with great honors at the palace of the doges. Because of his position Udine was able to influence the authorities in favor of the Jews of Venice and to avert a threatened edict of their expulsion. He was able to bring Jacob Soranzo, agent of the republic at Constantinople, to Venice. It appears that Udine spent more time and energy in behalf of the Jews than he did on behalf of Turkey. In addition to averting the threatened edict of expulsion he was able to exact a promise that such a decree should never be reissued and, furthermore, that the Jews who had already left Venice should be allowed to return and take up their former pursuits without molestation. Loaded down with gifts and honors, Udine returned to Constantinople, where he was greeted by the Turkish Jews as a conquering hero.

The victorious armies of the Turks rolled over Christian nations to the very walls of Vienna (1683). The Jewish communities of Italy, of course, cheered and supported the Moslem onslaught against Christianity and, as the consequence thereof, further aroused the Italian Christians against them. Support of Turkish arms and objectives were little disguised by the Jewish communities. The Christian populace of Italy were quite understandably aroused against the Jews because of their sympathies and support of the Turkish onslaught on the Christian world. In Padua the cloth-weavers attacked the ghetto, as the Turks pounded against the walls of Vienna. The Jews were saved by the governor, who, acting on strict orders from Venice, drove back the infuriated Christians with the greatest difficulty. The ghetto was placed under special guard until the indignation of the Christian populace died down.

Napoleon convened the ancient Sanhedrin (which actually had never ceased to exist in one form or another and under various names and for disguised purposes) in Paris in 1807. The Jewish communities of Italy sent four deputies, Abraham Vita da Cologna, Isaac Benzon Segre, Graziado Neppi and Jacob Israel Karnic. Cologna and Segre were elected first and second vice-presidents, respectively, of the Sanhedrin. The down-fall of Napoleon destroyed to some extent the open recognition of the Jews as a special nation within nations. In 1829, however, on authority of Emperor Francis I, the Jews established a rabbinical college in Padua, from which institution there issued many rabbis who distinguished themselves in a modernized and restrained school of Judaism.

In 1859 the papal states of Italy became a united kingdom under King Victor Emanuel II. The work of Moses Mendelssohn for Jewish "emancipation" through an apparent adoption of the countries of birth, exerted a strong influence on the Jews of Italy, as indeed it did throughout Europe. Wherever the tyranny of
self-imposed segregation freed Jews from the mental chains of the Talmud and the obsession of world dominion. Jews became integrated with their Christian neighbors. Many, of course, merely adopted the costumes and customs of the Gentiles and used their new positions of power for a more subtle and more effective strategy of conquest. Others were sincere, and free of the impelling persuasion of the rabbis, succumbed to the more gentle influences of Christian doctrines, if not to actual conversion. The inevitable result of the Mendelssohn doctrines, although not so intended, was complete and final integration through marriage. If the ancestors of the sullen, sleeping hordes of Khazars fermenting in Russia and Poland had not accepted Judaism in the eighth century, the peace of mankind in the twentieth century might have been assured.

Jewish influence continued in Italy under the United Kingdom. Isaac Pesaro Maurogonato had become minister of finance to the Venetian republic during the war of 1848 against Austria. A rabbinical college was established in Rome in 1887, but was later transferred to Florence. Jewish periodicals flourished and rabbinical attempts at continuance of the Jewish myth of world domination persisted, although with less intensity. Imposing temples arose in Milan, Modena, Florence, Turin, and even in Rome, replacing the old synagogues. Choirs were added, rituals were shortened, and the sermons became more general in scope. More and more Jews found important positions in the Italian government. Leone Wollemberg became minister of finance in 1901. Luigi Luzzatti was minister of finance in 1903. Ottolenghi was minister of war in 1902-3. Peace appeared to have come to Italy and the world.

Jewish coins unearthed in ancient Tarragona is evidence of an early settlement of Jews in Spain. They spread over the Pyrenean peninsula after the third century. The animosity and anti-Christian activities of the Jews in the Roman empire prompted the Christian councils in Spain of the early fourth century to enact decrees prohibiting the Christians from living with the Jews. King Recared (586-589), after his conversion to Christianity, prohibited the Jews from owning Christian slaves (Council of Toledo, 589) and barred them from holding public office. He made the circumcision of a slave or of a Christian punishable by the confiscation of property. The Visigothic nobility, however, ignored the decrees of Recared and protected the Jews in the traffic of Christian slaves, and refused to enforce the laws against them generally. King Sisebut, a successor of Recared, however, made an earnest effort to enforce the laws and ordered the Jews to release their Christian slaves within a given time and forbid the Jews to hold any slaves in the future. The obstinacy of the Jews finally outraged Sisebut and, in desperation, he ordered all Jews to submit to baptism.
within a year or leave the Visigothic Kingdom forever. Some 90,000 professed to embrace Christianity, but many left the country rather than submit to such an odious fate. During the reign of Suintala, however, the fugitives returned and the baptized Jews repudiated Christianity and returned to Judaism. As a result of these events Suintala was forced to abdicate to be succeeded by Sisenand.

The council called at Toledo by Chintila not only confirmed the laws against Jewish enslavement of Christians, but decreed that no Jew might henceforth remain in the country, and that every future king, at his accession to the throne, must take an oath to enforce the laws in respect to the Jews. The pseudo-Christians presented the king with a written declaration vowing that they would henceforth live as good Catholics. The king took them at their word and permitted them to remain in the country. With the accession of Chindaswind, however, they again repudiated Christianity and returned openly to Judaism. King Receswind, exasperated at their hypocrisy, resorted to extreme measures, more in keeping with the barbarity of the times than with the doctrines of Christianity. Again the Jews vowed that they would comply with the laws and observe Church regulations, but, as before, they continued in their accustomed manner. The laws for the regulation of the indigestible elements within their midst were accepted by the twelfth Toledan Council, presided over by Archbishop Julian of Toledo, a former Jew himself.

Egica, in the beginning of his reign, was favorably inclined toward the Jewish communities, but their treasonable alliance with Arabs who threatened his kingdom compelled him to take drastic action against them. As has been the practice against traitors from the beginning of time, the king confiscated their property.

Witiza, the son of Egica, apparently a convert of the Jews, or merely corrupt, recalled the exiled Jews, granted them extraordinary privileges, and placed them in public offices. The Jews, in alliance with their brethren in Africa, conspired with the Mohammedans and opened the door to them for the conquest of Spain. The Jews fought the Spaniards with fanatical zeal at the battle of Jerez (711) under Kaula al-Yahudi. The last Gothic King, Rodrigo, and his nobles were slain and the conquerors Musa and Tarik were everywhere victorious. As a reward for their treachery the Arabs gave the Jews of Cordova, Malaga, Grenada, Seville, and Toledo full charge of those cities. Reenforced by the Jews who had followed the Arab conquerors, the Spanish Jews now became the dominant power in the territories they governed. Southern Spain became a mecca for the Jews from Northern Spain and elsewhere.
Under the Mohammedan rule of southern Spain the Jews achieved great influence and power. Hasdai ben Isaac Ibn Shaprut became court physician and minister to Abd al-Rahman. Moses ben Enoch was appointed rabbi of Cordova. Spain became the center of Talmudic study, and Cordova the center of Judaism.

The intrigue that attended the struggle between Sulaiman ibn al Hakim and Mohammed ibn Hisham for the seat of power vacated by the downfall of Al-Hakim, reacted to the detriment of the Jews, Mohammed had the support of the wealthy Jewish merchants, who through their money and influence sought and obtained for him the aid of Count Ramon of Barcelona. Sulaiman looked on their partisanship as treachery and expelled them from the country (1013).

The fall of Banu Amir marked the end of Mohammedan power in Spain. The califate of Cordova was divided into twelve minor states under as many califs.

* * * * *

Samuel ha-Levi ibn Nagdela (Nagrela) won the favor of the vizier of King Habus of Grenada and became his private secretary. At the death of the vizier the king made Samuel his minister and entrusted him with the administration of diplomatic affairs. Upon the death of Habus, Samuel threw his influence on the side of Badis and against his elder brother Balkin. He was an important factor in making Badis king over Balkin who legally should have succeeded his father. Samuel continued his position of influence under Badis and was thereby enabled to advance the position of the Jews within the kingdom.

Jekuthiel ibn Hasan held a similar position in Saragossa. Abu Husain Joseph ibn Nagdela (Samuel's son) succeeded his father as minister to the king in Grenada. Both Jekuthiel and Abu Husain were found guilty of treason. Abu Husain had held office for eleven years. The Moslems crucified him before the gate of Grenada in December of 1066. The populace were inflamed and fell upon those Jews who had not fled. It is reported that fifteen hundred families fell victim to the rage of the Mohammedans. Islam did not move to protect them. As a result of this incident all the Jews left Grenada.

Abu al-Fadl ibn Hasdai became vizier in Saragossa. Isaac ibn Albalia was appointed astronomer to Mohammed al-Mu'tamid in Seville. Joseph ibn Migas was employed by Al-Mu'tamid on diplomatic missions.

Jewish influence continued in Islam.

* * * * *

Yusuf ibn Tashfin was the victor at the battle of Zalluka (1086) and the sovereign power fell to the Almoravides. Yusuf ibn Tashfin endeavored to win the large and wealthy community of
Jews of Lucena to Islam without success. Under the reign of Yusuf's son, Ali (1106-43) many Jews were appointed “Mushawirah” —collectors and custodians of the royal taxes. Others secured positions as “viziers” or “nasi.” The Jewish communities of Seville, Cordova and Grenada prospered.

Abdallah ibn Tumart and his armies swept along North Africa scoring victory after victory, carrying by sword and flame the “true” teaching of Mohammed. Abd al-Mu’min succeeded to leadership upon Tumart’s death, and invaded southern Spain for the conquest of the Almoravides. Within a year the whole of Andalusia was in the possession of Almohades. In Spain, as in Africa, the Jews were compelled to accept the Koran and the faith of Islam. Jewish educational institutions were closed and the synagogues, which had attained magnificence, were everywhere destroyed.

The treachery of the Jews against the Christian princes of Spain long remained in Spanish memory. The Jews, therefore, did not fare well under the first kings of Leon. In their struggle against the Moors the Spaniards did not spare the Jews. But the Christian leaders realized the power and influence of the Jewish financiers and, as the struggle with Islam became more desperate, they sought their uncertain support. Garcia Fernandez, Count of Castile, made many concessions and similar actions were taken by the Council of Leon in 1020, presided over by Alfonso V. Treachery and double-dealing on the part of the Jews, however, forced the Council of Coyanza (1050) to revive some of the old Visigothic laws.

Alfonso VI, the conqueror of Toledo (1085), in an attempt to win over the wealthy and influential Jews who continued to support the Moors in their conquest of Spain, made further concessions and provided special privileges for them. The example set by Alfonso was followed in Aragon and Navarre. Thus sharp competition for the Jews’ uncertain favor stimulated the Christians and Islam. In spite of royal protection and the establishment of special privileges, or perhaps because of them, the populace of Toledo, after the disastrous battle of Ucles, fell on the Jewish community and killed many of them, burning their dwellings and synagogues. Alfonso was helpless to defend them. After Alfonso’s death new riots occurred in Carrion and many Jews were slain or imprisoned. The Spanish populace thoroughly distrusted the Jews, and the lavish concessions conferred on them by Alfonso further exasperated them as the struggle against the invading Moor continued to go against them.

Alfonso VII became Emperor of Leon, Toledo and Santiago upon the death of his father, and at first curtailed many of the special privileges granted the Jews by Alfonso VI. Jewish influence won him over and he soon restored the former privileges and granted
additional ones. Judah ben Joseph ibn Ezra (Nisi) gained great influence with him, and, in addition to making him commander of the fortress, the king appointed him his court chamberlain. He was able not only to persuade the king to admit into Toledo the Jews who fled from the Moors, but to provide dwellings for the fugitives in Flascala and other places.

Under Alfonso VIII the Jews gained even greater influence, due to the king's romance with the Jewess Rachel (Fermosa) of Toledo. The Spanish populace attributed the king's defeat at the battle of Alarcos by the Almohades under Yusuf Abu Ya'kub al-Mansur to some treachery of Rachel, and she and her relatives were killed by the nobility in Toledo.

The emir Mohammed al-Nasir, after the victory at Alarcos, devastated Castile and threatened the whole of Christian Spain. With the assistance of the Crusaders and money borrowed from the wealthy Jews, particularly from Nasi Joseph ben Solomon ibn Shoshan—the sum of 18,000 golden maravedis—the Moorish tide of conquest was stopped.

Ferdinand III united the kingdoms of Leon and Castile. Neither Ferdinand III nor James I of Aragon trusted the Jews, but both monarchs turned to them in time of war, and rewarded them by appointing them secretaries and tax-collectors. Both kings permitted them to erect synagogues—Cordova in Castile, and Valencia in Aragon.

Alfonso X, Ferdinand's son, appointed Meir de Malea and his sons, Isaac (Zag) and Joseph, as his treasurers. He appointed many other Jews as tax-collectors to the great indignation of the Christians who paid the taxes. He lavished special privileges on them, and gave them permission to build a magnificent synagogue in Toledo. He assigned houses, vineyards, and lands to the Jews who settled in St. Maria del Puerto. Before he died he condemned to death Zag de Malea for giving the infante Sancho a large sum of money from the treasury. The Jews threw their influence behind the infante and succeeded in dethroning Alfonso. His son succeeded him as Sancho IV.

The Jewish source of wealth in Spain, as in other parts of the Christian world, was money-lending. The Christians paid them from twenty to twenty-five percent. The high rates of interest charged plus the minute exactations of collection did little to endear the Jews to their customers. In addition, it was the Jew who was the tax-collector. The Christian therefore could hardly look upon this peculiar people without a sense of pain. They appeared alien; although they spoke Spanish they were not of Spain. Growing protests against their rapacious usury and ruthlessness in tax-
collecting arose throughout Spain until the Cortes might no longer disregard the clamor. The kings, however, because of greed as well as need, continued to bestow special privileges and honors on the Jews who served them, and to extend those privileges and honors to the Jewish communities as additional favors.

Among the special privileges conferred on the Jews was criminal and civil jurisdiction over their communities. The exercise of judicial authority contrary to the law of the land has always been a chief demand wherever the Jews have settled in numbers great enough to support it. The concept of a “nation within a nation”—such except in cases of imposition by a dominant power over a conquered as exists under this type of dispensation—has rarely been possible or subservient nation. The denial to Jews of the privilege of juridical authority has always been greeted by the familiar Jewish cry of “persecution.” The “oppression” by the Christians is, in many cases, the refusal of nations to accede to these unreasonable and totally incomprehensible demands. Spanish kings were generous on the whole, in granting these powers to the Jews, to the indignation of their native subjects.

Maria de Molina succeeded to the throne of Ferdinand. Although she continued to employ Jewish tax-collectors and had a Jew, Rabbi Don Mosse (Moussi) as her steward of the household, she took all civil and criminal processes away from the rabbis and ordered all such matters to be brought before local magistrates for adjudication. John Manuel, however, at the request of Judah ben Isaac ibn Wakar of Cordova, restored the criminal jurisdiction to the rabbinate.

Only the Christian clergy appeared to side with the Christian artisans and peasants who labored under the burdens imposed by the Jewish money-lenders and tax-collectors. The clergy, immersed in theology and understanding more of Jewish motivation than the lay Christian, foresaw a rising Jewish domination over Spain that threatened the very existence of Christianity. The rise of synagogues of great splendor throughout the cities of Spain, the private law courts, the wealth and position of great Jewish families often goaded the Christian population to acts of violence against the Jews.

In Seville the popular feeling against the Jews grew in smoldering intensity. Alfonso XI of Castile extended his protection, but increased the Jewish taxes. Nevertheless he appointed Joseph ben Ephraim Benveniste ha-Levi as his “Almoxarife”. Beneviste’s influence with Alfonso was so great that the Cortes of Madrid complained about it. A deep bitterness seized the Spaniards and spread to the grandees, who endeavored to rid the government of Benveniste. Instead Benveniste was elevated to a higher position:
treasurer. Meanwhile the king’s physician and favorite, Samuel ibn Wakar, had obtained permission to mint coins. Both Benveniste and Wakar were convicted of having stolen from the government, their fortunes were confiscated, and they were imprisoned. Two other Jews, Moses Abudial and Ibn Ya’ish, escaped the same fate by the use of large sums of money.

Pedro I, followed his father, Alfonso XI. Under his reign the Jews virtually governed the country. He is known in history as “the heretic,” and “the cruel,” and, because he surrounded himself with Jews his court was referred to as “the Jewish court.” His reign is chiefly distinguished by civil war. Samuel Levi was Pedro’s chief treasurer, confidant and companion. Levi, of course, was particularly despised by Pedro’s subjects, and the popular feeling against him intensified the general ill-feeling toward the Jewish population. Involved ultimately in a conspiracy Levi was arrested and taken to Seville where he was imprisoned and died. He had amassed a fabulous fortune, which was confiscated by the state. His relatives, several of whom were tax-collectors, were also arrested, and their great fortunes also confiscated. Vast hordes of silver and gold were found secreted in underground cellars of the “Palacio del Judio,” Levi’s palace, by his successor, Martin Yanez de Sevilla.

Pedro was beheaded by Henry and Du Guesclin on March 14, 1369.

Henry de Trastamara ascended the throne as Henry II. He was very bitter against the Jews because of their support of his half-brother Pedro, but he found that he could not dispense with their financial assistance. He employed many wealthy Jews as financial councilors and tax-collectors. Joseph Pichon of Seville became his chief tax-collector. The Cortes of Toro in 1371 resounded with protests against Jewish domination of the court and the grandees. Henry made a few concessions but refused to withdraw the exercise of criminal jurisdiction from the rabbinate.

In the Cortes of Soria (1380) it was decreed that rabbis, or heads of aljamas would henceforth be forbidden to inflict upon Jews the penalties of death, mutilation, expulsion, or excommunication. In civil matters the Jews were permitted to select their own judges. Jewish prayers cursing Christians were forbidden. In spite of these reforms, or perhaps because of them, hatred of the Jews grew in such intensity that the king, in order to protect them, imposed an arbitrary fine of 6,000 maravedis on any town in which a Jew was found murdered. In 1365 the king, against his wishes, issued an order prohibiting the employment of Jews as financial agents or tax-farmers.

In 1391 riots against the Jews broke out in Seville and Cordova.
Two of the mob leaders were ordered arrested and publicly whipped by the governor of Seville, which inspired the populace to greater exasperation. Jews were attacked everywhere; Jewish homes, factories and warehouses were burned. Spanish police and authorities did everything within their power to protect the Jews, but the long smoldering grievances of the oppressed and victimized Christians had reached the saturation point. Many Jews fled the country and many submitted to baptism.

John I of Aragon ran down twenty-five leaders of the anti-Jewish rioters and had them publicly executed in Barcelona.

The Inquisition was inaugurated for the purpose of checking on converted Jews. Thousands had accepted baptism and posed as Christians (the Marranos). Many actually became Christians, and some, such as Solomon ha-Levi (Paul de Santa Maria) and Joshua Lorqui (Geronimo de Santa Fe) became the most bitter critics of the Jews.

Abraham Benveniste became the adviser and confidant of John II. Jews were again appointed tax collectors. Jewish religious and internal affairs were reorganized. The Jewish judicial system was reestablished. If a Jew instituted proceedings before a Christian judge he was liable to a heavy fine. The Jews again prospered in Castile.

The Spanish Jews were fond of luxury. Their women wore expensive clothing and were adorned with costly jewels, which caused considerable envy and jealousy among the less fortunate Christians. They were quarrelsome and arrogant. Many were inclined to robbery and often attacked and insulted each other even in the synagogues and prayer-houses, frequently inflicting wounds with the rapier or sword which they usually carried. Many Jews had two wives, which privilege, however, was conferred by royal permission.

Frequent sentences of excommunication were imposed by the rabbis on members of Jewish congregations. Vigorous persecution of the Karaites (a Jewish sect) by the Jews was carried on until they were totally suppressed.

Under Henry IV of Castile (1454-74) and John II of Aragon (1456-79) the Jews again came to positions of influence and power. The various enactments of the Cortes against the Jews were ignored by the king, the dukes and the grandees. Even bishoprics employed Jews as tax-collectors.

The dawn of the fifteenth century dimly illuminated a dying world. Western Europe cast grotesque shadows before the dancing flames of expiring Christendom. Islam was on the march.
Christianity was crumbling under repeated blows that increased in steady crescendo. The Turks were over-running Asia Minor and lower Hungary. They were in control of most of the Balkans, By mid-century they would be masters of Constantinople and Greece. The insistent cries of the Popes, calling on the rulers of Europe to unite for the defense of Christendom, went unheeded.

The Spaniards would never forget that it was the Jews who invited the Mohammedans into Spain, and opened the gates of the cities to the invaders. The Spaniards were driven into the little kingdom of the Asturias in the mountains of the north, from where they prepared for the reconquest of their country. Meanwhile the hordes of Islam invaded France along the Mediterranean, to be stopped at last by Charles Martel.

Spain, however, was still lost to Christendom. The voice of Pope Innocent III was finally heard and ten thousand knights and a hundred thousand infantrymen arrived from France and Germany to reinforce the armies of Castile and Aragon. The Saracen hordes went down to defeat in the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa in 1212. At the beginning of the fifteenth century the Mohammedans held only Grenada, but it was protected by formidable strongholds and constituted a continuous threat to Spain. Unlimited reinforcements and supplies were available to the Moors from Africa and Spain's seven hundred years of sacrifice trembled in the balance so long as Islam retained its foothold in the country.

The political unity Ferdinand and Isabella brought to Spain supplied the lacking ingredient needed to complete the reconquest of Spain. The task of unification, however, was not an easy one. The country was neither of one race nor religion. The Jews constituted an indigestible element, refusing to assimilate; they were powerful and arrogant. The Marranos (so-called by the Jews from the Hebrew "Maranatha", meaning "the Lord is coming"), who professed Christianity but continued as "secret" Jews, numbered about three million of the population. They were extremely influential, possessed most of the wealth and political power, and controlled taxation. The Spaniards distrusted them, knowing that they despised Christianity. It was generally believed that they were in full sympathy with the Moors and that they would again betray Spain should a safe opportunity present itself.

In June of 1485 the Jews and Marranos conspired to seize the city of Toledo during a procession on the feast of Corpus Christi. The plot was discovered in time and the conspirators were punished by the Inquisition. In 1488, on Good Friday, a rabbi and several Jews threw a large wooden crucifix into the dust at Casar de Palomero.

The reports of Jewish ritual murders continued throughout the
centuries with nagging persistency. The Spanish Christians firmly believed these stories. It is said that the Jews gave vent to their deep hatred for Christ and his teachings by crucifying Christian boys on Good Friday, or using wax images for the purpose when they might not safely abduct a child. The Jews have insisted that these stories were Christian fabrications for the purpose of stirring the people to do violence to the Jewish communities. While it may be reasonably conceded that such charges were made from time to time without justification, all of them cannot be summarily dismissed on the grounds of fanaticism and vindictiveness. The fact is that Jews were actually tried and convicted of such crimes. Bishop Juan Arias de Avila, a son of Jewish converts, pronounced the sentence of guilty on seventeen Jews of Segovia in 1468 for the crucifixion of a Christian boy.

The crucifixion of a Christian boy at La Guardia—the Santa Nino “Juan, son of Alonso Pasamontes and Juana La Guindera”—by certain Jews and conversos, appears to have been established by evidence that would support such a finding in a court of law today, in spite of the use of torture and the methods of the Inquisition. Two juries reviewed the evidence and unanimously found the accused guilty as charged. The first jury was composed of Spain’s most eminent men, several of whom were famous Renaissance scholars occupying the principal chairs at the University of Salamanca. The second jury was composed of five men in Avila. Twelve men, highly educated and bound by the most solemn oath, passed on the evidence and unanimously voted for conviction.

Jewish writers, and particularly Dr. Meyer Kayserling, claim that Fernando was the grandson of a Jewess, Paloma of Toledo, but there is little historical evidence to support their contention. Zurita (Anales de la corona de Aragon) says that Fernando’s maternal grandmother was Dona Marina de Cordoba. It would appear that the Jewish claim is founded solely on gossip. There is evidence that Paloma of Toledo was the wet-nurse of one of the ancestors of Fernando’s grandfather, the Admiral Don Fadrique, a century before, in the reign of Pedro the Cruel. The Semitic characteristics attributed to Fernando appear in only one portrait and are not indicated in the others. Why Jewish authors desired to plant Jewish blood in one of the monarchs who expelled the Jews from Spain is something of a mystery.

The Catholic monarchs, Ferdinand and Isabella, had little fondness for the Jews. The “conversos”, (the Marranos—Jews who had pretended to accept Christianity) constituted the greatest problem at the beginning of their reign. Ferdinand commanded all “conversos” to reconcile themselves with the Inquisition by the end of 1484 or suffer the consequences. The Moors held only a feeble
grasp on Granada, but the monarchs and the people of Spain still feared an alliance of the Jews with their ancient enemy. Granada fell at last and Ferdinand and Isabella issued their joint decree expelling the Jews. (March 31, 1492.) One of the reasons given for the edict was that the converted Jews relapsed because of the proximity of the unconverted Jews who continually attempted to seduce them from Christianity. Isaac Abravanel offered the monarchs 600,000 crowns to withdraw the decree of expulsion, but the offer was refused. It is estimated that about 200,000 Jews left the country.

Spain rose to its greatest glory after the expulsion of the Jews in 1492. A century later it became a world power under Phillip II. In 1580 the New World, Spanish Netherlands, and Portugal were under Phillip's banner.

In 1858, during the republic, the edict of expulsion of the Jews was repealed through the influence of H. Guedalla of London.

The historical position of Jewry in Europe is confused by both Gentile and Jewish historians, who, in strange servility on the part of the Gentile, and in the inherent pretense of the Jew, would picture the European Christian a blood-thirsty persecutor, and the Jewish sojourner an innocent victim. Such historical divisions as the "Dark Ages," the "Middle Ages," "Medieval," etc., conjure up impressions of the sinister, the cruel and barbarous. These appellations used in connection with the history of the Jews in Europe paint a bleak picture. Against this sullen background the Jew stands forth as a martyr. The boastfulness of the Jews—their great pretense; all this is understandable—and their historians merely run true to form. But why Christian historians would wish to distort history—or be willing to do so—is incomprehensible. Of course, this is not to say that all Christian historians have been guilty of this vice—and this too is a singular fact—the works of these historians are never in general circulation and their books are always difficult to find.

For the first eighteen hundred years of Jewry's sojourn in Europe, the indicia of nationality was consanguinity. The place of birth was merely a statistical incident. That the accident of the place of birth should ipso facto confer the privileges and duties of nationality would have been unthinkable. The nations of Europe slowly developing from the blood-ties of family-tribal relations, were deeply steeped in the concept of adherence and cohesion through consanguinity. This concept was not only shared by the Jews; it was the major premise on which their very existence depended. It was the one important point of agreement between
the Christian nations of Europe and the Jewish nation. A kitten
born in an oven, as Wellington observed, does not make it a biscuit.
Consequently the mere accident of the birth of a child of English
or Jewish parents in Paris did not, of itself, confer French
nationality. It is only within the last two hundred years that the
place of birth has been recognized as conferring citizenship
privileges and duties. And, again, this new principle is entirely
unilateral; extended on the part of Christian nations to all races
and nationalities, but rejected in essence by organized Jewry. Not
that the Jews do not take full advantage of the privileges thus
conferred. They do. But at the same time they vociferously insist
that they are a separate nation; distinct and different—a nation
within nations, and as such, still entitled to special and greater
privileges than the ordinary citizen.

Few reasonable men will attempt to refute the proposition that
"a people within a people" (or a "state within a state") is in-
compatible with social tranquility and the security of the state
itself. Yet this is the exact situation that existed in every European
country where the Jews resided. The Jews were not persecuted by
Europe; Europe was persecuted by the Jews.

What right did the Jews have in Europe? No one, so far, has
attempted to establish a vestige of right for them in the countries
they sought to exploit. Having no legal right in the nations of
their sojourn, and being suffered to remain by Christian fore-
bearance, what did the Jews do to justify the privilege? Did they
behave in a manner designed to endear them to the Christian
people they sought as neighbors? Why did they insist on living
in the midst of a people whom they despised, and who, in turn,
obviously disliked them? Were the peoples of England, Spain,
France and Germany under some sort of obligation to these un-
invited people? To ask these questions, of course, is to answer
them.

Christian Europe recognized the disruptive antagonism of Juda-
ism. And Europe, in its various stages of development, was already
overburdened with complex problems of survival. The Jewish
question was an irritating factor that added an element of annoy-
ance to the burden. Yet, Jewish apologists would have the modern
world believe that the Christian nations of Europe had nothing
better to do than mistreat the innocent Jews. These writers would
leave the impression that the governments of Europe possessed
no public revenues except from tax-levies upon Jews; that there
was no money except Jewish money, and no learning except
Jewish learning.

The people of Italy, Spain, France and Germany regarded the
Jews in their midst as a persistent fly that insists on lighting
on one's nose on a hot day when both hands are busy. These
BEASTS OF THE APOCALYPSE

people were preoccupied with the business of making a living—building cathedrals and castles, houses, roads and public works. They were fighting wars, tending flocks, ploughing fields, making love, marrying, bearing children, and dying. Occasionally the persistent fly on the nose had to be brushed away. At times it stung so sharply that attention from the work at hand was distracted, and resort to the fly-swatter became necessary.

The Jews, excepting only themselves, condemned the whole human race. That general and conclusive condemnation not only put the Gentile out of the Jewish concept of the divine order of things, it placed all Gentile humanity in the category of a commodity open to exploitation. He who would reap the harvest must seek the fields of productivity. So the Jews moved into the lucrative lands of Europe.

France became conscious of its Jewish question in the centuries beginning with Pepin. The Jews were expelled three times and finally exiled in 1394. These alien people, living by their own laws, yet exploiting the country by trade and money-lending, never learned from one expulsion to the next that there were excesses that ultimately strained Christian forbearance to the breaking point. Yet Jewish apologists weep copious tears over these expulsions, indicting France as cruel and barbarous in its “persecution” of the Jews!

Why has no one shed public tears over the expulsion of the Jesuits from France—and the other countries of Europe? Who, today, weeps at the wailing wall over the plight of Christians caught in the cross-currents of French political intrigue—Christians who fled the land of their birth, suffered exile and death, and whose property was confiscated when they were on the losing side of the argument? When the number of Christians who so suffered is tabulated it towers in gigantic proportions over the comparative infinitesimal number of Jews who allegedly suffered at the hands of Christian Europe. Yet these Christians sleep unwept and unmourned in the annals of apologetic history.

In Spain the Jew was on the side of the Moslem invader, even though the Moor had expelled him from Grenada in 1066. While unquestionably there was greater affinity between the Jew and the Moor, Jewish sympathy for Islam was not derived from a sense of love for the followers of Mohammed; it was because Jewry despised Christianity more intensely. The centuries had proved that the Jew was as incapable of living in tranquility with the Moors as he was in living with the Christian. Jewry had been expelled from northern Africa and Moorish Spain from time to time, especially in what the Jews have called the Almohade “persecution” in 1146. Omar, the second Caliph, had banished all the Jews from Holy Arabia in 640. In 1172 they had been run out
of Yemen. And they had not fared better in Persia, Babylon and Egypt. The expulsions of the Jews from Spain in 1492—estimated as between 160,000 and 200,000—has been the melancholy tale of Jewish writers ever since; a sad, sad story, depicting simultaneously the incredible cruelty of Ferdinand and Isabella and the Catholic Church, and the noble innocence of the Jews! Yet, a century later, Spain expelled a million Moriscos from its borders—two hundred thousands of whom perished in the exodus! The fact that this decree of banishment fails to solicit the sympathy and hot tears of the world can only be explained by the lack of clever propagandists in Islam.

In view of their treachery to the Spaniards it would appear that the Jews of Spain fared very well indeed until their perfidy and deceit so aroused the authorities that their expulsion and the Inquisition were decreed. As has been seen, the heads of the Jewish communities, whether princes or rabbins, exercised both religious and civil authority, and maintained a full judicial tribunal in criminal as well as ecclesiastical matters. They had the power to pass sentences of capital punishment, and never hesitated to do so when occasion demanded. As late as 1391 they condemned to death Don Joseph Pichon. The Cortes and some of the monarchs had sought to deprive the Jews of this judicial power. John I finally put an end to the unconscionable policy.

What caused the Jew to be so universally detested? He was unable to live in peace in Asia, Africa, or Europe. He came into Europe uninvited, and no one asked him to stay. He was always invited to leave, and always had to be driven out. He had no errand, no mission, no message for Europe. He had nothing in common with Europeans. As a matter of fact he despised them, and held nothing but contempt for their religion, their governments and their institutions. He was in Europe solely for his own purposes—to get a living through exploitation of the naive and gullible goy. He was a living parasite, drawing his sustenance from a long suffering host. And in coming he announced that he was the chosen of God; that he had given the Christian his Christ, and permitted the Christian to use the Jews' ancient Bible. All that the Christian had, averred this uninvited guest, he had received from the Jews. In his braggadocio he claimed everything Christian except Good Friday and Easter.

It is not good public relations to pose as being "superior" among any people. It is downright stupid to do so in the midst of utter strangers. Particularly when you have not been invited. Superiority hardly needs a press agent. People have a faculty for recognizing superior qualities. The Europeans found nothing superior in their uninvited guests. On the contrary, they saw only greed, avarice, dishonesty, sly cunning and deceit in the peculiar
people who were the chosen of Jehovah. They soon learned that in dealing with them they must be eternally alert. They ultimately concluded that this people of the Book had abandoned morals in pursuit of empty ceremonial.

There was nothing tolerant about the Jew. Given the power he would have crushed Christianity into the dust and exterminated every Christian he might not sell into slavery. Whatever may be said concerning the methods of Christians in their attempts to cleanse heretical and subversive elements from Church and State may be said of the Jews whenever they had the opportunity and the power. And weighing the humanities the scales tip on the side of Christian compassion, a balance unknown to Judaism outside the circle of the circumcised. Many Jews, pursued by the angry mob, have found refuge in the monastery, and safety behind the robes of the Bishop. Tolerance, however, was unknown in Israel.

Baruch Spinoza (born Benedict de Spinoza, 1632-1677), is a case in point. He was the grandson of Abraham Michael de Spinoza, who was one of the leaders of the Sephardic community of Amsterdam. Baruch was an ardent student. He pursued the usual Jewish educational courses—Hebrew, the Bible, the Talmud, the Jewish philosophers—Maimonides, Gersonides and Hasdai Crescas and others. His cabalistic knowledge is considered doubtful. After leaving the Jewish school at the Pereira Yeshibah, he studied Latin, mathematics, physics, mechanics, astronomy, chemistry and medicine. During these studies he became acquainted with the school of thought developed by Saint Thomas Aquinas.

Shortly after Spinoza left the Pereira Yeshibah rumors became persistent that he had given utterance to heretical views, “such as had led Urill Acosta and Orobio de Castro into trouble.” When his father died December 5, 1654, his relatives refused to give him any share in the estate, making it necessary for him to resort to legal proceedings to secure his rights. Having had his share of his father’s estate established, he only claimed a bedstead as a heirloom.

Spinoza was called before the beth din (the legal arm of the Synagogue) where he freely confessed his opinions. His former teacher, Saul Morteira, offered him, on behalf of the congregation, a pension of one thousand florins a year provided he would not give public utterance to his heretical views. Spinoza refused. Jewish feeling was so aroused against him that a fanatical Jew attempted to stab him as he left the Synagogue. He was excommunicated and banned.

A superior race! Superior cunning, superior avarice, superior experience, superior hate—all this—but not a superior race! Certainly the Jew had learned much in his wanderings from country to country through the ages—much about money, trade,
commerce, usury—and he was superior in these fields. He was superior because he dealt in dual morality, or rather without morality, in his relations with Christian Europe. His ethics and morals never left the synagogue or the ghetto, hence he plunged into finance and trade without the burdensome fetters that restrained his Christian victims. Yes, he was superior here. But compared to the world-conquering Spaniard, the chivalrous, empire-building Frenchman, the idea-creating German or the world-circling Englishman, he was a pigmy of infinitesimal dimensions. Compared with the cathedral builders, the creators of line and color, of great art, and the authors of beauty of word, poem and music that emerged from the Christians of Europe, these people are indeed pitifully inferior. Unless one is so utterly depraved as to have lost all sense of value, it must be admitted that there are more noble pursuits than usury, finance, buying and selling slaves, cornering the gold and diamonds of the world, and monopolizing the narcotic traffic.

One of the most important reasons for European Christian contempt for the Jew is found in his hypocritical attitude to his own vaunted Law. The Christian, taking the prohibition from the Jews' own Book, did not deal in usury. To do so was a sin—and the taking of profit in trade was religiously despised. Yet the Jew—to whom the Law was originally given—had no scruples in demanding thirty-three and fifty percent on loans to Christians. The European Christian did not read the Old Testament carefully. Had he done so he would have learned that the Law of Moses did not forbid usury, but only forbade a Jew taking usury from a Jew.

Expelled, restricted, regulated—the Jew always came back, if he could. Often he paid heavily in gold for the privilege of returning. Certainly, observes the thoughtful person, something is very strange and puzzling here! Would a persecuted people actually pay for the privilege of returning to the scene of their former persecution and suffering? It hardly makes sense, and, the answer, of course, is obvious. The stories of Jewish persecution in Europe are strictly propaganda; invented myths for Christian gullibility. Abraham Senior, chief rabbi of Castile, and Isaac Abravanel are said to have offered Isabella and Ferdinand great sums of money to revoke the edict of expulsion of the Jews from Spain—life under the Holy Inquisition being preferable to life elsewhere.

Life, generally, in developing Europe was difficult. Except for the well-to-do and the very wealthy, most everyone suffered in bad times, during wars, famine and plagues. Life was no bed of roses for the Christian serf and peasant. But they survived, and their descendants built the greatest civilization known to recorded history. They found the other half of the world, explored its most remote corners, and out of the new wilderness forged great cities,
nations and industries. They carried the Cross to the most remote
places of the globe. And the Jew followed with his knap-sack and
continued to garner the harvest that was no part of his planting.
In the overall picture, the Jew fared not only well, but exceedingly
well in Christian Europe. If Jewish mythology is to be believed,
the Jews of Europe had a monopoly on all the wealth of Christen-
dom. The fact is, however, that they certainly had more than their
share of it, and consequently escaped the sufferings of poverty that
was the common lot of the overwhelming majority of their
Christian neighbors. Christian Europe was good to the Jews.
Unless some apologist comes up with a better reason, this is why
the Jews were willing to pay for the privilege of living there.

* * * * *
MAURICE SAMUEL in his amazingly frank book “You Gentiles” (Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1924), declares that the gulf between Jew and Gentile can never be bridged. It is not a matter of religion, he asserts, except incidentally. A baptized Jew remains a Jew, and even an atheistic Jew remains a Jew. This phenomenon accounts for the Jewish Communist, who, while abandoning his faith in God, is, at the same time, a vigorous Zionist. Thus, Moses Hess, ardent disciple of Marx, is capable of writing a handbook for modern Zionism, and, at the same time, acting as an organizer of communist cells for the revolutionary overthrow of Christendom. The first communist parties of Poland and Russia were organized by Khazar Jews. The public at large has not been permitted to know that the splitting of the communist movement of Russia into the Bolsheviki and Mensheviks (major and minor) sections was the result of a disagreement of the comrades on the question of Jewish nationalism. There never has been, and there does not now exist, any disagreement between these two revolutionary sections on ideology, tactics, or objectives.

A Jew is, therefore, something more than an adherent of Judaism. While a Jew is a Semite, ethnically speaking, he is still something more again. If he abandons his orthodoxy he does not submerge himself into the Semitic races. He still remains part and parcel of that Hebrew branch into which he was born. Heinrich Heine (1797-1856), after being baptized and outwardly accepting Christianity, wrote to Mose Moser: “From my way of thinking you can well imagine that baptism is an indifferent affair. I do not regard it as important even symbolically, and I shall devote myself all the more to the emancipation of the unhappy members of our race. Still I hold it as a disgrace and a stain upon my honor that in order to obtain an office in Prussia—in beloved Prussia—I should allow myself to be baptized.” So it is that the Jew remains a Jew in spite of either his apparent political orientation or his religious attitude. There are, of course, exceptions, but it is the exception that proves the general rule.

Maurice Samuel, referred to above, differentiates between “loyalty” as understood and practiced by Gentiles, and “loyalty” as understood and practiced by Jews. “To the Jew,” he writes, “naked loyalty is an incomprehensible — a bewildering thing.” Loyalty to a government, therefore, is not within the nature of the Jew. Loyalty to the promise of Israel, yes. But not to the temporal government of the Gentiles. Because the chief Gentile institution
is the very social structure itself, Samuel declares, “it is in this that we (the Jews) are most manifestly destroyers.”

The unbelieving and radical Jew, Samuel asserts “is as different from the radical Gentile as the orthodox Jew from the reactionary Gentile. The cosmopolitanism of the radical Jew springs from his feeling (shared by the Orthodox Jew) that there is no difference between Gentile and Gentile.” In this frank confession is an important key to Jewish evaluation of Gentile-Jewish relationships. The Jew, regardless of assertions to the contrary, looks upon all Gentiles with the same jaundiced eye. Between Jew and Gentile, “religion itself is but practical expression of the difference” between them, and “not the cause of it.” “It is true,” declares Samuel, “that the expression of a view serves to strengthen it, as the exercise of a faculty serves to develop it. But expression does not create a view nor exercise a faculty. Even conscious adherence to the Jewish people is but partial expression of our Jewishness: it was not a conscious desire to remain a people which gave us the will to endure: it was our unavoidable commonality of feeling which made us and continued us a people.”

The following excerpts from Samuel’s book “You Gentiles”, sums up the Jewish attitude toward the Gentile world succinctly and accurately:

“Repudiation of the Jewish religion or even of Jewish racial affiliation does not alter the Jew. Some of us Jews may delude ourselves as some of you Gentiles do. But in effect modernization seems to have done nothing to decrease the friction between us. The dislike continues: and though your masses may not know why they dislike us, there must be sufficient reason . . .

“We joined your armies and fought in them beyond our numbers: yet Jewish pacifism and Jewish pacifists gave the tone to the world’s pacifism. We have joined your capitalistic world in deliberate emulation and rivalry: yet Jewish socialism and Jewish socialists are the banner bearers of the world’s armies of liberation! Three or four million modernized Jews, a ludicrously small number, have given to the world’s iconoclastic force its chief impetus and by far its largest individual contribution.

“The Jew, whose lack of contact with your world had made him ineffective, becomes effective. The vial is uncorked, the genius is out. His enmity to your way of life was tacit before. Today it is manifest and active. He cannot help himself: he cannot be different from himself: no more can you. It is futile to tell him: ‘Hands off!’ He is not his own master, but the servant of his life-will.

“Our very radicalism is of a different temper. Our spur is a natural instinct. We do not have to uproot something in ourselves to become ‘radicals,’ dreamers of social justice. We are this by instinct: we do not see it as something revolutionary at all. It is tacit with us. But with you it is an effort and a wrench. Your very ancestry cries out against it in your blood . . .
“It is our very cosmopolitanism that gives our national character. Because we are the only ones who are cosmopolitan by instinct rather than by argument we remain forever ourselves . . .”

* * * * * *

The longer Mohammed (569-632) studied the Jews the more he became convinced of the irreconcilable differences between their religious system and his own. Mohammed made Abraham an Arab when he got around to the Koran. He attacked the customs and belief of the Jews, and accused them of misinterpreting and concealing the true meaning of the Scripture. The Jews, asserted Mohammed, “are asses who carry books.”

The Jews did not hesitate to openly attack the Mohammedans. A Jewess, Asma, wrote satirical verses about the battle of Badr (won by Mohammed over the Kuraish), and another Jewish poet named Abu ‘Afak also wrote offensive material about the Prophet and his new religion. As a result Islam attacked the Banu Kainuka, one of the Jewish tribes at Medina. The conquered tribe was banished. Still the Jewish poets continued their attacks. When Mohammed and his forces were defeated in the battle of Uhud by the Meccans, the Jews were exultant and taunted the wounded Prophet, saying that if Badr was a mark of divine favor, Uhud must be proof of disfavor. Mohammed again replied with an attack on Banu al-Nader, another of the Jewish tribes in the vicinity of Medina. The Jews surrendered and were allowed to migrate with all their possessions.

At Khaibar a Jewess named Zainab, put poison in a dish she prepared for Mohammed. One of the Prophet’s aids died almost immediately after eating from the dish, but Mohammed, who had eaten sparingly, survived.

The Jews were to live under the Crescent, as they lived under the Cross. They would show no more loyalty to Islam than they had shown to Christianity. Where it suited their purpose they would play Crescent against Cross and Cross against Crescent. Jewish slave-traders would carry Moslem slaves to Christian slave markets, and on the return trip carry Christian slaves for Islam. They would be money-lenders to either. The Holy Wars were to be grist in the Jewish mill, and Jewry was always the victor. The centuries that were to come would find Jewish influence at the side of the sultans, just as that influence had invaded the chambers of Christian monarchs. In the end, the old feud between the followers of the Prophet and the sons of Abraham would flare and explode again. History has not yet tolled the numbers of Christians and Moslems who will have died in that war so that Israel may live.

* * * * * *
Jews are believed to have lived in Turkey at the time of Alexander the Great. The first settlement was at Brusa, the original Ottoman capital. Sultan Urkhan conquered the city in 1326 and it is reported that he drove out the inhabitants and repopulated the city with Jews from Damascus and the Byzantine empire. The synagogue built at Brusa by the Jews is said to still exist and is considered the oldest in Turkey. Under Sultan Murad I (1360-1389) the Turks crossed over into Europe, and the Jews of Thrace and Thesaly came under Ottoman dominion. About fifty years after the conquest of Adrianople, a Jew, Torlak Kiamal, became a leading participant in an insurrection of dervishes. He advocated communism and preached communistic doctrines. He was hanged by Sultan Mohammed I (1413-1421).

Sultan Murad II (1421-1451) gave influential positions to the Jews within his domain. Ishak Pasha became the Sultan's physician-in-chief. He was followed by a long list of Jewish physicians who were in continuous attendance upon the succeeding Sultans. The relationship thus created gave the Jewish physician great power and influence over the Sultan, which, of course, extended to many diverse matters that had nothing to do with the Sultan's health. Sultan Murad II granted Ishak Pasha a firman exempting his family and descendants from all taxes. Mohammed the Conqueror (1451-1481) extended the same extraordinary exemption to his Jewish physician, Moses Hamon. Mohammed also appointed a Jewish physician, Ya'Kub, his minister of finance.

The office of hakam bashi became of considerable importance during the reign of Mohammed the Conqueror. Moses Capsali was the first to fill this position. He took his place in the Turkish divan (state council) beside the mufti (chief of the Ulema), and ranked above the Greek Patriarch. In this position Moses became the representative of the Jews before the Turkish government. He apportioned and collected taxes from the Jews, appointed rabbis acted as judge, and administered the affairs of the Jewish communities.

The Turks distrusted their Christian subjects because of their known sympathies with the Christian powers. Because of the well known hatred of the Jews for Christianity in general, and Christian nations in particular, the Turks instinctively turned to the Jew in matters of finance and business to protect their interests against Christendom. The internationalism of the Jew in Gentile affairs, and his utter lack of a sense of loyalty to his land of adoption was balanced, in the Moslem mind, by his well developed sense of self-interest and inborn Talmud-nourished hatred of Christianity. Hence
the Sultans utilized their Jewish subjects for their own purposes, and the Jews used the Sultans for theirs. As a result the Jews labored diligently in behalf of the Moslems and, in addition to special privileges and other rewards, they derived the satisfaction of knowing that their efforts added to the discomfort and destruction of Christianity. It is said that they instructed the Turks in the manufacture of gun powder, cannon and other implements of war. Jewish exiles were especially valuable to the Turks because of their vast knowledge of the fortresses, defenses and military strength of the Christian cities in which they had resided.

The orthodox Moslem opposed the conquest of Egypt, but the Jews, with their ancient hatred of that land and its people, strongly supported the venture and persuaded the Turkish government to launch the attack. When Egypt was conquered (1517) Abraham de Castro was appointed master of the mint. Salim I (1512-20) reorganized the administrative system of the Jews in Egypt, and abolished the office of nagid.

Turkey reached its apex of power under Sulaiman the Magnificent (1520-66). Like his predecessors, his physician, who accompanied him on his campaigns, was a Jew—Moses Hamon II. The Jews were prosperous and held many of the most important positions in the government and at court. They were so influential with the Sultan and his court that Christian ambassadors were usually compelled to find a Jewish intermediary to intercede for them and their cause. Nearly all the commerce of Turkey was in Jewish hands, and their maritime trade rivaled that of Venice (which was also in Jewish hands).

Joseph Nasi was the nephew of Donna Gracia Mendesia. It was Moses Hamon who had persuaded the Sultan to act in Donna Mendesia's behalf when she was detained in Venice. We have seen that the Sultan's curt demands were effective. Arriving in Turkey the Jewess immediately plunged into Turkish affairs. Joseph, through his Jewish connections among the Marranos in Europe, was able to furnish the Sultan with confidential information concerning the plans and activities of the Christian courts. He soon became the Sultan's counselor on such matters. When the succession of Salim Sulaiman's throne was trembling in the balance of court intrigue and politics, Joseph threw his influence to him and thus won Salim's everlasting favor. Sulaiman conferred the city of Tiberias and its surrounding territory on Joseph. He rebuilt the walls and, planning a Jewish colony in Palestine, invited the Jews of Europe to migrate. His wealth was so great that he was able to furnish ships for the transportation of the Jews who
desired to come. There is no record of the number of Jews who responded to Joseph's call, but his scheme to establish a Jewish colony in Tiberias failed.

Salim II (1566) made Joseph Duke of Naxos and of the Cyclades Islands. In 1567 Joseph received an offer of a fixed yearly salary from the Austrian government in return for his good-will. In 1568 the Sultan empowered him to seize the cargos of French ships in Turkish waters in order to repay the debt the French government allegedly owed the Mendesia family. By 1569 Joseph had seized sufficient cargos to cancel the alleged debt. The protests of the French government fell on deaf ears in Turkey and the efforts of the French ambassador to undermine Joseph's position at the Turkish court were equally futile. A few years later the Sultan declared war on Venice at Joseph's request. Emperor Ferdinand of Austria again solicited Joseph's good-will. William of Orange wrote him a letter, requesting him to declare war on Spain. Joseph would have liked nothing better than war with Spain but the grand vizier, Mohammed Sokolli, won the argument and the Sultan for once, refused to shed Turkish blood against the Spaniards for the sake of the Jews.

Solomon Ashkenazi succeeded to Joseph's influential position and became even more powerful than Joseph had been. He worked through the grand viziers rather than directly on the Sultan. The war on Venice, begun by Joseph, was terminated by Ashkenazi. Delegated by the Porte to arrange peace terms, Ashkenazi proceeded to Venice. As distasteful and humiliating as it was, the Christian Venetians received the Turkish Jew with all the honors reserved for such occasions.

While the Turks were tolerant in the extreme of their Jewish subjects, their patience was sorely tried at times. Sultan Murad III became so exasperated and angered at the Jewish display of ostentation and luxury, that he ordered the execution of all the Jews in the empire. It took all of the ability of Ashkenazi and the other influential Jews, in addition to large sums of money, to persuade the Sultan to change the death sentence to a law restricting dress. The Sultan relented and the Jews thereafter were required to wear a sort of skull cap instead of a turban, and were prohibited from using silk in the making of their garments.

Esther Kiera became a confidante of Baffa, wife of Murad III (mother of Mohammed III). The harem was notorious for its overwhelming influence on prominent men, and the favorite of the Sultan often altered the course of history. To influence the Sultana was to influence the Sultan, and the Jewesses of Turkey were not
unmindful of the opportunities thus presented. Esther Kiera, through her position as an intimate of the Sultana Baffa, became all-important to the Jews in their diplomatic intrigues. Esther carried on a lucrative traffic in army posts and amassed a great fortune. Her influence carried through the reigns of three sultans. She was not adverse to shady dealings and she frequently resorted to bribery. Many of the appointments to important military positions secured through Esther’s unscrupulous methods, created widespread bitterness among the Spahis (Turkish soldiers) and their personal hatred and frustration was directed toward her. Harem intrigues set in motion by Esther’s ingenuity on behalf of the Jews became notorious and exasperated the people. According to one account a mob led by the Spahis overcame the palace guard and killed Esther, and, cutting off her limbs, nailed them to the doors of the dwellings of those officials who had obtained their positions through her influence. According to another account, Khalil Pasha had her brought to his palace and killed her with his own hand. Her great fortune was confiscated by the Turkish government.

* * * * *

Cabalistic doctrines spread throughout the Jewish communities of Turkey in the sixteenth century. The appearance of the sinister David Reuben and his tale of a fabulous Jewish kingdom in the East reawakened Jewish hopes of the immediate coming of the “true” Messiah, who would establish the Covenant and bring the Gentile world under Jewish domination. Joseph Caro went to Palestine believing that he was destined to take part in the Messiah’s coming. He saw visions and dreamed dreams. The cabalistic leaders who succeeded Caro turned Galilee into wild scenes of mysterious religious rituals and ceremonies, while demoniacs, conjurers and miracle-workers spread throughout Turkey and Europe. Isaac Luria communed with departed spirits, and talked with animals and angels. The Zohar attained equality with the Talmud and the Bible. Jewish demonstrations in expectancy of the “Messiah” in 1648 provoked the Moslems to a massacre of AshkenaI Jews.

* * * * *

The Treaty of Passarowitz (1718) between Turkey and the German Empire, contained a provision which permitted the citizens of the one country to live in the country of the other and to have the protection of that country’s government. Jews in Turkey took advantage of the clause and passed themselves off as Turkish subjects in order to settle in Vienna, a privilege which was forbidden to native Austrian Jews.

* * * * *

In 1887 the minister plenipotentiary from the United States was
a Jew, Oscar S. Straus. He was succeeded by another Jew, Solomon Hirsch. Straus was again minister from 1897 to 1900.

Because of the Turkish war on Christian nations the Jews generally supported the Turkish government. The Turks did not trust them sufficiently to permit them to serve in the army, but accepted their financial aid. The Jews of Adrianople, in the war of 1885, supplied 150 wagons for the transportation of Turkish ammunition. In the war of 1897 the Jews of Constantinople contributed 50,000 piasters to the Turkish army fund.

Turkish governments prohibited Jews remaining in Palestine for more than three months. When the Khazar Jews of Russia started their amazing immigration in 1882, American Jews had enough influence in Washington to pressure the Turkish government to revise its laws so that the Russian Jews might settle in Turkey. It was believed that the open door to Turkey would prove to be the back door to Palestine. The Turks resisted the pressure and in 1888 the Porte again declared that the Jews might not remain more than three months in Palestine. The Jews of the United States, Great Britan, and France bludgeoned their respective government into action, and the Porte was confronted with official “notes” protesting his “discrimination against creed and race.” The Turkish government was already aware of the Khazar plan to colonize Palestine and to oust the Arabs from their ancient lands. The Porte attempted to explain the political situation, and steadfastly adhered to his policy. In 1895 the Jews attempted to purchase real estate in Jerusalem in pursuance of their plan to oust the Arabs and take over the Holy Land. Again the Porte refused to change Turkish policy and withstood the formidable pressures the Jews were able to bring against him through the respective governments they either controlled or strongly influenced.

It would take a world war to batter down Turkish resistance to Jewish colonization of Palestine, and a second world war would be necessary to establish a Jewish state, but world Jewry was girding itself for the task and it would be accomplished.

The Jews were probably in France (Gaul) before the fourth century, but history does not note the fact. A decree of the Emperor Theodosius II and Valentinian III addressed to Amatius, prefect of Gaul, which prohibited Jews and pagans from practicing law and from holding public office, appears to have been written in July of 425. Because the Jews placed Christian food under their ban, Christian clergy were prohibited from accepting Jewish food, lest the Christians appear inferior.

The Jews were principally merchants, slave-dealers, tax-collectors and physicians in early Gaul. The fourth Council of Orleans (541)
prohibited a Jew from owning Christian slaves under penalty of forfeiting all of his slaves. The decree, as usual, was ignored.

The early history of France in relation to its Jews is much the same as the history of the Jews in other nations. The princes and the kings took them under their protection and the populace resented them. Passing years brought greater resentment on the part of the people, and some governments took drastic measures against them, which measures were usually ignored, partially executed and ultimately forgotten. In some instances the Jews received greater protection and regard from the king than that given or afforded the Christians. This fact is illustrated by an incident that occurred in Lyons (circa 822) when Agobard, bishop of the diocese of that city, protested to the court of Louis concerning the law which prohibited the baptism of slaves owned by the Jews. He was repulsed. The Bishop was also concerned with the “Chosen People” myth and protested that ignorant people think that the Jews are the only people of God and that the Jewish religion is therefore better than their own. The king paid little attention to these protests.

Philip Augustus recalled the Jews to France in July of 1198, and legalized their operations in banking and pawn-brokering. Their business, however, was controlled and the rate of interest was set by the crown. While this arrangement was not completely satisfactory to the Jews they nevertheless appear to have prospered under it. Pope Innocent III, in protesting to the king in 1205, pointed out that the Jews of France through their usurious practices had gotten possession of the goods of the Church, occupied castles, acted as stewards and managers for the Christian nobles, and had Christian servants and nurses. He complained that the civil authorities attached more faith to a deed signed by a Christian debtor at the moment of the loan than to the witnesses whom the Christian produced denying the deed. At Sens the Jews had been permitted to erect a synagogue higher than a Church near which it stood and the Pope stated that they sang so loudly as to disturb the service in the Church. It was reported that on Easter Day the Jews walked in the streets and offered insults to the faith, maintaining that He whom their ancestors had crucified had been only a peasant. Their houses remained open till the middle of the night and served to receive stolen goods. The Pope wrote in the same vein to the Duke of Burgundy, the Countess of Troyes and the Count de Nevers, but his efforts were of no avail.

As in other matters involving Christian necessity, the Jewish financiers were not unmindful of the opportunities offered by the Crusades. In preparation for long campaigns and the necessity of securing arms and equipment the Knights of the Cross were
compelled to turn to the Jews for loans. In France, as elsewhere in Christendom, much of Christian property was pledged to the Jews at staggering rates of interest. Pope Innocent III, in an effort to relieve the Crusaders from the crushing debts thus incurred, took them under his protection and exempted those who set out for Jerusalem from the payment of the interest due their creditors. Eudes, Duke of Burgundy, having been informed by Philip Augustus of the Pope’s action, refused to accept the order, and advised Philip Augustus to resist such “innovations.”

Louis VIII (1223-1226) entered into an arrangement with the Jewish financiers, whereby the loaned capital would be paid within three years, without the payment of the interest, and such debts placed under the control of the lords. The debts were thus collected, whereby the lords made handsome commissions.

Nicholas Donin of La Rochelle was a Jewish convert to Christianity. He lived at Paris during the first half of the thirteenth century. Because he had expressed doubt as to the authenticity of Jewish oral tradition, he was excommunicated by R. Jehiel of Paris in the presence of the whole congregation.

Excommunication of a Jew, during Talmudic times and the Middle Ages, meant utter prohibition of all intercourse with society. Immediate death, under the circumstances, might have been more humane. The purpose to be achieved was the continued solidarity of the Jewish nation, and its main object was the strengthening of the authority of the Synagogue. Among the offenses made punishable by excommunication on authority of the Talmud, the following may be mentioned: dealing lightly with any of the rabbinic or Mosaic precepts; selling one’s real estate to a non-Jew; testifying against one’s Jewish neighbor in a non-Jewish court where the neighbor may suffer loss of money, and sundry offenses involving the selling of meat and holiday or festival omissions and profanations.

After having lived for ten years in a state of excommunication, Donin embraced Christianity. He joined the Franciscan Order. In 1238 he went to Rome and presented Pope Gregory IX with thirty-five charges against the Talmud. The Pope, shocked by Donin’s revelations, had copies of the charges made and sent them to Church authorities, ordering them to seize all copies of the Talmud. He ordered an investigation of Donin’s charges and decreed that all copies of the Talmud be burned if the accusations proved to be true. The Pope’s order was generally ignored, except in France. Louis IX ordered four of the most prominent rabbis of France to answer Donin’s charges of blasphemy and immorality. The commission before whom the arguments were heard were
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convinced of the truth of Donin's charges and, after a second hearing, ordered the burning of all copies of the *Talmud* that had been surrendered by the Jews to the Dominicans and the Franciscans.

Rabbi Jechiel, the most prominent of the Jewish rabbis who debated the subject with Donin at the Paris Disputation, did not attempt to deny the scandalous references to Jesus in the *Talmud* as listed by the Franciscan. There were, of course, Christians who were also Hebrew scholars, and Jechiel dared not deny the written word. He countered therefore with the feeble assertion that the Jesus of Nazareth referred to in the *Talmud* was another Jesus—a fiction pounced upon by subsequent Jewish writers. Modern Jews, however, freely acknowledge Jechiel's trickery, although they call it by another name. Dr. Levin, in his prize essay, *Die Religious Disputation des R. Jechiel von Paris, etc.*, states "we must regard the attempt of R. Jechiel to ascertain that there were two by the name of Jesus as unfortunate, original as the idea may be."

While at Lyons the Pope granted an audience to a delegation of rabbis who complained that they could not understand the Bible or the Jewish laws without the aid of the *Talmud*. The Pope, apparently impressed with the rabbis' appeal, requested Eudes de Chateauroux to re-examine the *Talmud* from the Jewish viewpoint, and ascertain whether or not it might be tolerated as harmless to Christianity. Eudes informed the Pope in the negative, and on May 15, 1248 the *Talmud* was condemned for the second time.

After nine years of banishment the Jews were permitted by Louis X to return to France for a period of twelve years, upon the payment of 122,500 livres. (July 28, 1315). Among the conditions imposed was a prohibition against lending on usury. Pawn-broking was permitted on the condition that the Jews did not take more than two deniers in the pound a week, and they were to lend only on pledges. The king declared that they were to be under his special protection, and that they were to have their persons and property protected from all violence, injury, and oppression.

Philip V the Tall (1316-1322) continued the Jewish policy of Louis X, and went further in granting them special privileges. In spite of the royal protection the Jews were attacked by the people, and during Philip's reign were terrorized by the Pastoureaux, young peasants and herdsmen. At Troyes Jews were reported to have entered the Churches. Complaints that the Jews shouted so loudly in their synagogues that divine services were disturbed in adjacent Christian Churches continued to be reported to the Pope and the king. Philip directed the bailiff of Troyes to punish the offenders and put a stop to such outrages.

A Jew was accused of throwing poison in the river at Tours. Letters were found allegedly written by the kings of Tunis and
Grenada to the French Jews, offering commissions for their services in poisoning the Christians' drinking water.

The Jews were again expelled from France on June 24, 1322 by Charles IV.

* * * * *

Under the regency of Duke Charles of Normandy, the Jews were permitted to return to France for a period of twenty years. (March 1, 1350). They returned as money-lenders, although the maximum rate of interest was fixed by the conditions of the edict of their return. King John permitted them to practice medicine and surgery, if and when they had successfully passed an examination of proficiency. Apparently the provision requiring the examination was ignored, as the privilege was later withdrawn. John also decreed that the Jews were not any better than native Frenchman and ordered that henceforth they were under the jurisdiction of the French courts. Count of Etampes frequently interposed in their behalf in the Parliament of Paris and in other civil and ecclesiastical tribunals in attempts to release the Jews from French civil and criminal jurisdiction.

In spite of ordinances against compounding interest, the Jewish money-lenders continued with the practice. The public prosecutors proceeded against the guilty ones. The Jews, of course, complained to the king, who immediately put a stop to the prosecutions, by imposing an order of “perpetual silence” on the officers of the law, and granting the Jews immunity from all prosecutions for a period of ten years. The French people were understandably outraged, and complaints continued to mount against the Jews. On September 17, 1394 Charles VI published an ordinance in which he declared that the complaints of the people against the Jews provoked by their excesses and misdemeanors compelled him to again order their expulsion from his domain. This edict was enforced with determination. The Duke of Pamiers endeavored unsuccessfully to maintain them in the duchy. The only exception was the case of Dauphine, and the Jews remained there until the end of the sixteenth century undisturbed in their special privilege. Most of them, however, had emigrated before the time of Louis XI (1461-1483). They had been charged with excessive usury and with dealing with the king’s enemies while he was in Flanders, and the fine imposed on them was too heavy for them to pay.

* * * * *

Through the efforts of a group of Jews headed by Cerf Berr in 1784, the ban of exclusion was lifted and permission was given the Jews to settle in all parts of France. Count Mirabeau and the abbe’ Gregoire claimed full citizenship rights for the Jews. The Royal Society of Science and Arts of Metz offered a prize for the best essay in answer to the question: “What are the best means to make the Jews happier and more useful to France?”

* * * * *
The fall of the Bastile marked the beginning of disorders everywhere in France. The animosity of the people in Alsace against the Jews was particularly bitter. The Jews here had engaged in unscrupulous transactions in government bonds and had persisted in smuggling specie prohibited by law into the country. Abbe Gregoire demanded full citizenship rights for the Jews in the National Assembly, but the members did not act and the matter was postponed. A few days, however, before the dissolution of the National Assembly (September 27, 1791) Duport of the Jacobin Club was successful in securing the passage of the proposition. This action did little to appease the people, and the disorders against the Jews continued. The worship of Reason supplanted the worship of God, and the attack on Christianity was extended in some places to the Synagogues. Jewish bankers in Bordeaux, involved in the cause of the Girondins, escaped with their lives by the payments of great sums of money. In the war of the Republic against the attacking European coalition, most French Jews were still able to escape military duty.

Napoleon frankly did not trust the Jews. He could not consider them as patriotic Frenchmen. When he returned from Austerlitz (1806) charges against the Jews for their ancient crime of excessive usury were laid before him. The Jewish financiers, however, had friends at court, and the restrictive measures contemplated by Napoleon were not made law. Napoleon, nevertheless, on May 30, 1806, issued a decree by which the execution of judgments rendered in Alsace and the Rhenish provinces in favor of Jewish money-lenders were suspended for one year. At the same time he summoned an assembly of prominent Jews for the purpose of attempting to learn the basis of their peculiar amorality in dealing with non-Jews. The Jews declared that Judaism was under attack, which has since become a stock propaganda defense for any criticism of their questionable activities. The Jews were well prepared, and, under the leadership of Abraham Furtado, succeeded to a considerable degree in disarming Napoleon's suspicions. As a result of this conference the Emperor called a Sanhedrin on February 9, 1807. Like the ancient Great Sanhedrin it consisted of seventy-one members, two-thirds of which were rabbis.

The results of the Sanhedrin convention were apparently satisfactory to Napoleon, and, although a series of laws restricted them in some of their practices, the Jews had attained an integrated status in France. The obligation to support the empire was believed established by a law that prohibited a Jew drafted for the military service to avoid such service by hiring a substitute. It was one obligation of “citizenship” that did not appeal to the Jews, and, after many complaints the Jews of Paris and other districts of France were exempted from the prohibition.
The minister of education proposed a measure on November 13, 1830 to place Judaism upon an equal footing with Catholicism and Protestantism. In January of 1831 the proposition was passed in the Chamber of Peers by a vote of 89 to 57. It was ratified by King Louis Philip on February 8, 1831. The importance of the proposition was not only in the fact that France recognized Judaism as the equal of Christianity, but that henceforth the support of the rabbis and the synagogues would be shouldered by the taxpayers of Christian France. The rabbinical college at Metz was recognized as a state institution and was granted a subsidy. The government also liquidated the debts that had been contracted by the Jewish communities before the Revolution.

France was destined to have its Jewish officials. Leon Blum, rich Socialist, would be one of them. He was elected to the chamber of deputies in 1919 and became the undisputed leader of the Socialist Party by 1925. He refused participation in non-Socialist governments, but accepted leadership of the Popular Front, which coalition included radical socialists, socialists, and communists. On June 4, 1936 he became the first socialist premier of France. He was the author of a book, Du Marige, in which he advocated incest between brother and sister, and recommended that girls throw off their “virginity gayly and early.”

Francis Yeats-Brown, writing about the Jews of France ("European Jungle," page 193), sums up the situation with the following: "From morning to night . . . the French citizen pays his tribute to the tribes of Israel. His coffee comes from the Cohens of Haifa; his bread has been handled by Louis-Dreyfus; when he listens to his radio he enriches the half-Jew Louis Mercier; his newspapers are full of Jewish advertisements, especially of the patent medicines of Levi and Vidal; the Intransigent is owned by L. L. Dreyfus, the Populaire by Lazarus Brothers, the Petit Parisien and Excelsior by M. Braun, and the Stock Exchange swarms with Levi, Lazards, Rothschilds, Cohens, Davids, Weils, Mayers, Sterns, Blochs, Baumanns, and their friends and relations."

The first Jewish community of Germany dates from about the year 321. The Jews enjoyed the same legal status here as they did elsewhere in the Roman Empire. They were prohibited from owning Christian slaves and they were not eligible to hold public office. Otherwise they were free to follow their inclinations. Money-lending, however, gradually became their chief occupation. There was little change in their way of life in the Germanic Kingdoms under the Burgundians and the Franks. They were generally exempt from military service, and trade and commerce came into their hands. When the Church enforced its prohibition against usury, the Jewish money-lenders obtained a monopoly in this
While the calling of money-lending was looked upon with contempt, the services of the business were indispensable, and, although avoided as disreputable and unscrupulous, the Jewish financier exercised great influence. As elsewhere he was hated and feared by the German people, and protected by the rulers.

Continuous and intensive study of the Talmud created a fanatical zeal in the Jews of Germany and kept alive the smoldering coals of hatred for the Christians. The Crusades supplied the sparks that caused this hatred to burst into the open fire that resulted in riots and massacres. The Jews were charged with having conspired with the Mongols and to have supported their war against Christianity. Expulsions were frequent, and their return equally frequent. They were expelled from Vienna and the archduchy of Austria by Emperor Leopold I in 1670. Their influence and power continued to develop along the same lines so successfully followed elsewhere. They ultimately attained full citizenship rights, gained great wealth in the field of finance, and became influential with government officials.

There were no Jewish communities in England prior to the Norman invasion. The Jewish slave-traders who imported English slaves to the Roman market had, of course, visited its shores in furtherance of their business. William the Conqueror unquestionably brought the first Jews from Rouen to England.

The Jews generally fared very well in England. Under Henry II they amassed great wealth, lived in ostentatious palaces, and exerted great influence among the English upper classes. The Crusades, while intensifying the concealed hatred of the Jews for the Christians, and arousing resentment against the Jews, did not result in the widespread violence that swept over other Christian countries. But England was not without its incidents. The Jews at Lynn, shortly after Richard I departed for the Holy Land, incited a riot by attempting to attack a baptized Jew who had taken refuge in a Church.

As elsewhere, the Jews of England were usurers. They were protected by the king and the nobles from the native population and in addition to enjoying the rights and privileges of Englishmen, they were given certain special privileges, such as baronial rank. Complaints against the rapacious rates of interest charged by the Jewish money-lenders were continuous and clamorous. Edward I (1275) determined to solve the Jewish question by forbidding the Jews to lend on usury, and opened to them commerce, handicrafts and agriculture. Some of the Jews resorted to ingenious strategies in their attempts to avoid the law, such as lending sums and extorting bonds that included both interest and principal. Others resorted to highway robbery, while still others took to
clipping coins, a practice which had been initiated by them centuries before. As a result of these crimes against the crown many Jews were arrested and convicted.

The insolence and contempt manifested by many Jews for things sacred to Christians is an ever-amazing incident of their history. In 1268 a Jew seized a Cross that was being carried in front of a procession at Oxford, and committed blasphemies of similar nature on other occasions. Reports of these incidents caused the various popes to remonstrate with the Christian monarchs who appeared to tolerate them. Edward I, being confronted with the multitudinous complaints, and finally convinced that the Jews would not intermingle with their fellow citizens as artisans, merchants, or farmers, and that their talents were usury and crime, came to the conclusion that the only course open to him was their expulsion from the country. On July 18, 1290 he issued writs decreeing that all the Jews should leave England before All Saints’ Day of that year. Of the 16,000 who left, about one-fifth went to Flanders, their passage being paid by the king.

* * * * * *

An attempt was made in 1310 to repeal the edict of expulsion but it failed. Some Jews, posing as Lombards, risked the edict and carried on trading operations in England. Permits were issued on occasion permitting certain Jews to visit the country, but it was not until the expulsion from Spain that Jews in any considerable number sought refuge in England. Among these was Rodrigo Lopez, physician to Queen Elizabeth, who is said to be the original of Shakespeare’s Shylock. A group of Morano merchants settled in London about the middle of the seventeenth century and formed a secret congregation headed by Antonio Fernandez Carvajal. They conducted a vigorous business with the Levant, East and West Indies, the Canary Islands, Brazil, the Netherlands, Spain and Portugal. They became an important link in the network of trade spread throughout the Spanish and Portuguese world by the secret Jews. They became important to Cromwell as they were able to give him confidential information concerning the plans of Charles Stuart in Holland, and of the Spaniards in the New World. Outwardly they passed as Spaniards and Catholics, but met as Jews at Cree Church Lane.

The English were greatly influenced in permitting the Jews to return to England by a book written by Manasseh ben Israel entitled “Hope of Israel,” and published in 1650. The theme of ben Israel’s book was to the effect that the Messiah could not appear until the Jews were in all the lands of the earth. According to one Antonio de Montesinos, the Ten Tribes of Israel, lost these many centuries, had been discovered in the North American Indians and England was the only country left in the world from which
the Jews were excluded. If England would re-admit the Jews, the Messianic age would be imminent. Cromwell believed that the Spanish Jews in Holland would be useful to him. Meanwhile the war with Spain compelled the Morranos to declare their true status in order to avoid arrest as Spaniards, and, because they were already in England Cromwell gave his permission for them to remain. The Jewish question was thus apparently settled in England.

William III is said to have borrowed two million gulden from Antonio Lopez Suasso, who, afterwards, became Baron Avernes de Gras. William denied a petition to expel the Jews from Jamaica. During his reign the London and Amsterdam Jewish communities were enabled to operate with greater ease, and laid the foundation for the transfer of European finance from the Dutch to the English capital. In the early part of the eighteenth century representatives of the chief Jewish financiers of northern Europe were already established in London. Among these were representatives of the Mendez da Costas, Abudientes, Salvadors, Lopezes, Fonsecas, and Soixas. Sir Solomon de Medina ingratiated himself with Marlborough and is said to have paid him an annual subvention. An original Jewish capital of a million and a half pounds increased to over five million by the middle of the century. Jewish influence was so great with the government that Parliament in 1723 passed an act permitting the Jews to hold land. The special act of Parliament permitted the Jewish land owner to omit the clause “upon the faith of a Christian” from the oath at the time of registering title. The clause “upon the faith of a Christian” was still necessary, however, for all officers, civil or military, under the crown or in the universities, and for all lawyers, voters and members of Parliament. It was not until July 26, 1859 that this last barrier was broken. On that day Baron Lionel de Rothschild took his seat as the first Jewish member of Parliament. He substituted “so help me, Jehovah”, for the usual Christian clause. In 1885 Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild was elevated to the upper house as Lord Rothschild. Baron Henry de Worms as Lord Pirbright, and Sydney Stern as Lord Wandsworth, followed. By 1890 a Jew could hold any office in the British Empire, with the possible exception of that of monarch.

The Khazar Jews of Russia stirred in 1881. The English Jews, now highly influential in the government and controlling unlimited finances, immediately publicized the “persecution” of the Russian Jews. The political background of the Russian situation was deliberately obliterated under the guise of “religious” persecution. The Russians were persecuting Judaism! A mass meeting was held at Mansion House in London on February 1, 1882, which
became a pattern for thousands of such meetings in the future. More than a hundred and eight thousand pounds was raised for the purpose of settling the Khazar Jews in the United States! This technique was repeated again in 1891 at the Guildhall, while more than a hundred thousand pounds was collected for the same purpose.

* * * * *

The Jews were not unmindful of the Crown colonies. They carried Jewish finance and influence into Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, and other colonies. Nathaniel Levi became involved in coal and beet-sugar activities in Victoria. Sir Julius Vogel became premier of New Zealand. New South Wales was represented by Sir Saul Samuel and Sir Julien Salomon, who became agent-general. Mosenthall Brothers and Jonas Berghoff turned their attentions to Cape Colony and Natal. Jews—and more particularly Barnato Brothers, Wernher, Beit & Company—controlled the gold and diamond industries of the Rand.

* * * * *

The Portuguese victory over the Dutch in South America was the immediate cause of the first Jewish invasion of what was to become continental United States. While there is some evidence of the presence of Jews in the colonies before, the twenty-three Jews aboard the bark St. Charles that entered the harbor of New Amsterdam in September of 1654, appear to be the first sizeable group to arrive. They were Sephardic Jews. Their ancestors had probably been among those expelled from Spain in 1492. Many of these Spanish Jews had found refuge in Holland, and, later, some of their descendants had sought to exploit the Dutch colonies in South America. The Portuguese victory had, of course, closed these colonies to them, forcing most of them to return to Amsterdam, where Jewish financial interests and influence assured their protection. New Amsterdam (which was to become New York) was a Dutch colony under the administration of Governor Peter Stuyvesant.

The Jews who had established themselves in the British colonies had not endeared themselves to their neighbors. Peter Stuyvesant long before had complained bitterly to the directors of the Dutch West Indies Company in Amsterdam about them. Their business techniques and unscrupulous competition methods were ruinous to New Amsterdam, said the Governor. Some of these Jews, it was said, insisted on keeping their shops open on Sundays—the Christian Sabbath. It is quite understandable, therefore, that the Governor should have strenuously objected to receiving the twenty-three Jewish arrivals from South America. He wrote to Amsterdam demanding that “the deceitful race be not allowed further to infect and trouble this new colony.” The Jews, of course, also
wrote to Amsterdam. The Jewish influence was, as might be expected, greater than that of Stuyvesant, and the directors ruled in favor of the twenty-three. They informed the Governor in a reply dispatched in April of 1655 that to deny the Jews a place in New Amsterdam "would be unreasonable and unfair, especially because of the considerable loss sustained by the Jews in the taking of Brazil, and also because of the large amount of capital which they invested in the shares of this company . . ." The directors finally decreed that "these people may travel and trade to and in New Netherlands, and live and remain there, providing the poor among them shall be supported by their own Nation."

Under the British, the General Assembly of the colony passed legislation in 1727 providing that the phrase "on the true faith of a Christian" might be omitted from the oath of abjuration, or allegiance to Great Britain, when taken by a Jew, thus opening the way for naturalization and further separating Church and State.

There were approximately two thousand five hundred Jews in the thirteen colonies at the beginning of the Revolutionary War. Nearly all of them were of Sephardic origin. They were, as elsewhere, merchants and traders, international in outlook, and in continuous contact with the Jews of other nations. They congregated in the most populous sea-coast towns and, exploiting to the fullest their international Jewish connections, imported fast selling items for the colonial market. Before the Revolution Aaron Lopez owned thirty ships, sailing back and forth between the West Indies, Europe and the Colonies. Jacob Rodriguez had a virtual monopoly of the sperm oil industry. Trading with the Indians was very lucrative. Hayman Levy engaged in this commerce, and made a fortune exporting furs to Europe. It is said that he was the first employer of John Jacob Astor, paying him one dollar a day for beating furs.

The first Jewish settlers in Newport, Rhode Island, had relatives and business partners in the West Indies. To the ordinary commodities of import and export of staples and furs from and to Europe, these Jewish merchants soon added traffic in African slaves.

Benjamin Franklin was sent to Europe to raise funds for the Colonies in their struggle for independence against Great Britain. Writing on November 26, 1781, from Passy to John Adams regarding his efforts to obtain a loan through a Jewish banker in Holland, Franklin said: "It seems to me that it is principally with Mr. Neufville we have to do; and tho' I believe him to be as much a Jew as any in Jerusalem, I did not expect that with so many and such constant Professions of Friendship for the United States with which he loads all his Letters, he would have attempted to inforce
his Demands (which I doubt not will be extravagant enough) by a Proceeding so abominable.”

On December 14, 1781 Franklin reported again: “By this time, I fancy your Excellency is satisfy’d that I was wrong in supposing J. de Neufville as much a Jew as any in Jerusalem, since Jacob was not content with any per cents, but took the whole of his Brother Esau’s Birthright, and his Posterity did the same by the Canaanites, and cut their Throats into the bargain; which, in my Conscience, I do not think Mr. J. de Neufville has the least inclination to do by us—while he can get anything by our being alive.”

J. de Neufville demanded the Thirteen Colonies with all their “income, revenue and produce” as security until the loan was paid with interest.

Jewish writers and organized Jewry have ranted against a statement attributed to Benjamin Franklin made at Philadelphia, and allegedly contained in the Journal of Charles Coatesworth Pinckney of South Carolina, reporting the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention of 1789. On June 14, 1892, a Mrs. Henry Crane Robinson with her daughter visited the Franklin Museum in Philadelphia and there saw publicly exhibited behind a glass-covered showcase a portion of Pinckney’s Journal containing the statement attributed to Franklin. Mrs. Robinson, in her daughter’s presence, is said to have copied the statement in her note book. Later the daughter, then Mrs. Edward Nelson Dingley, verified, before a notary, her mother’s penciled copy of the Franklin statement. In 1892 a Frank P. Illsley is said to have compared the copy of Pinckney’s Journal with one in England. He visited the Franklin Museum and is reported to have found the Pinckney exhibit precisely as described by Mrs. Dingley. The Journal disappeared somewhere between 1892 and 1929. The Congressional Record (February 27, 1929, page 2713) states that Mr. Barkley favorably reported that $37,500.00 be provided for the Library of Congress to acquire from Harry Stone, 24 East 58th Street, the whole or any part of the papers of Charles Coatesworth Pinckney . . . relating to the Constitutional convention. The list of the papers from Stone did not include the Franklin notes.

The Jews contend that the Franklin statement is a forgery over the name of a great American to discredit the Jews. A forgery, ordinarily, is something that passes as an original. It is characterized by the fact that it so closely resembles the real thing that the average person accepts it without question. By raising the question of “source” the real issue of the truth of a statement is generally lost in the heat of the diversionary controversy. Whether or not Franklin uttered the sentiments contained in the Convention statement is actually of little importance. The real issue is
whether or not the statement is true; whether or not it is based on historical fact and experience. The statement is as follows:

“There is great danger for the United States of America. This great danger is the Jew, Gentlemen, in which ever land the Jews have settled they have depressed the moral level, and lowered the degree of commercial honesty. They have remained apart, and unassimilated, oppressed; they attempt to strangle the nation financially as in the case of Portugal and Spain.

“For more than seventeen hundred years lamented their sorrowful fate, that they have been driven out of their mother land; but Gentlemen, if the civilized world would give them back Palestine and their property they would immediately find pressing reasons for not returning there. Why? Because they are vampires, they cannot live among themselves, they must live among Christians and others not belonging to their race. If they are not excluded by the Constitution, within less than one hundred years they will stream into this country in such numbers that they will rule and destroy us, change our form of government, our party, and our personal freedom, for which we Americans shed our blood and sacrificed our lives. If the Jews are not excluded, within one hundred years our children will be working in the fields to feed the Jews, while they remain in the Counting House rubbing their hands.

“I warn you, Gentlemen, if you do not exclude the Jews now and forever, your children's children will curse you in your graves. Their ideas are not those of Americans, even when they have lived among us for ten generations. The leopard cannot change his spots. The Jews are a danger to this land; if they are allowed to enter they will imperil our Institutions. They should be excluded by the Constitution.”

Haym Salomon was a Polish Jew. He arrived in the Colonies in 1772 and married Rachel Franks, a daughter of Moses Franks of New York. Rachel was related to Jacob Franks, commissary to the British during the French and Indian War. She was also related to David Franks of Philadelphia, and the latter's daughter, Rebecca, who married General Sir Henry Johnson. Other relatives were David Solesbury Franks and Colonel Isaac Franks. Armed with these connections, Salomon was able to ingratiate himself with Robert Morris, the Superintendent of Finance of the Colonial Government. Morris permitted Salomon to call himself "Broker to the Office of Finance," and so records in his diary. He was also broker to the French army in America. Through these “connections” Salomon was able to float about two hundred thousand dollars worth of securities for which he was paid commissions.

* * * * *

In Collier's magazine, May 11, 1940, a Jew by the name of Dr. D. H. Dubrovsky, onetime intimate of Lenin and the Jewish architects of the Russian Revolution, Trotsky, Zinovieff, et al, describes the efforts of the communists to persuade him to collect
from the United States government several million dollars allegedly
due to the heirs of Haym Salomon, celebrated by American Jews
as the “Financier of the Revolution.” At that time, Dubrovsky
was the head of the Soviet Red Cross in the United States. That
Haym Salomon was the “Financier of the Revolution,” is, of course.
Jewish mythology. Max James Kohler, a prominent Jewish lawyer,
in an open letter to Congressman Emanuel Celler of New York
presented a mass of evidence showing that Salomon was little
more than a broker for Robert Morris, the true financial genius
of the Revolution, and that, for his services, Salomon had been
paid as brokers are usually paid—by a commission on all trans-
actions in which he had a hand.

* * * * * *

At the close of the Revolutionary War there were about three
thousand Jews in the United States. By 1840 their number had
increased to about fifteen thousand—Sephardic Jews for the
greater part, bearing Spanish and Portuguese names. These Jews
were undoubtedly the aristocrats of all Jewry. The centuries of
contact with Spanish culture and Christian civilization had been
a refining and polishing process, in spite of the tenacity with which
they adhered to their Jewishness. The appearance in the United
States of the Ashkenazic Jews from northern and central Europe,
with their crude and uncultured mannerisms, shocked and humiliated
these Jews from Spain and Portugal. Although they could not
keep these new-comers from their synagogues, it was many years
before the Ashkenazic Jew was permitted to inter-marry with the
Sephardim.

* * * * * * *

Thomas Jefferson, fearing the alien mind, customs and culture,
on the new nation, was opposed to unrestricted immigration. “But
are there no inconveniences to be thrown into the scale against the
advantage expected from a multiplication of numbers by the
importation of foreigners?” he demands in his Notes On Virginia.
“It is for the happiness of those united in society,” he answers,
“to harmonize as much as possible in matters which they must of
necessity transact together. Civil government being the sole object
of forming societies, its administration must be conducted by
common consent. Every species of government has its specific
principles. Ours perhaps are more peculiar than those of any
other in the universe. It is a composition of the freest principles
of the English constitution, with others derived from natural right
and natural reason. To these nothing can be more opposed than
the maxims of absolute monarchies. Yet from such we are to
expect the greatest numbers of emigrants. They will bring with
them the principles of the governments they leave, imbibed in
their early youth; or, if able to throw them off, it will be in ex-
change for an unbridled licentiousness, passing, as is usual, from one extreme to another. It would be a miracle were they to stop precisely at the point of temperate liberty. These principles, with their language, they will transmit to their children. In proportion to their numbers, they will share with us the legislation. They will infuse into it their spirit, warp and bias its directions, and render it a heterogeneous, incoherent, distracted mass."

The German or Ashkenazic Jew came to America as part of a general German migration which began in 1815 and continued into the nineties. Within that period—1815 to 1890—about two hundred thousand Ashkenazic Jews migrated to the United States. In 1890 there were a quarter of a million Jews in the country, the greater part of which were in New York City. The Sephardim was now almost lost in the teeming Ashkenazim. Very few Khazar Jews—from Russia and Eastern Europe—had set foot in the United States before 1880. Thousands of the German Jews who found refuge in America had participated in the revolutions that had shaken Europe, and fled the wrath of the governments they had sought to destroy.

The Independent Order B’nai B’rith (Sons of the Covenant) was organized in 1843. Its purpose to keep alive the promise of world domination is evident in its name. It was established by twelve Ashkenazic Jews. The secret ritual was in German—as, indeed, was the first name of the order—Bundes Bruder. The ritual was translated into English later, and by 1858, the membership had grown to three thousand. During the Civil War it had twenty-thousand members. Only Jews, of course, were eligible to membership. The Anti-Defamation League was the Order’s ultimate creation. The international character of the B’nai B’rith is evidenced by its rapid spread to foreign countries. A lodge was chartered in Berlin in 1882. England, Palestine, Turkey, Austria and other countries followed. By 1930 there were seven Grand Lodges in the United States and eight abroad. B’nai B’rith Hillel Foundations are now found on the campuses of most of America’s universities.

The Free Sons of Israel was organized in 1849.

The Order Brith Abraham came into being in 1859.

Then came Kesher shel Barzel, the Independent Order Brith Abraham, and many others.

Judah P. Benjamin was born in the West Indies. He was a brilliant lawyer. He served in the United States Senate before the War between the States, and later served as Attorney General, Secretary of War, and Secretary of State of the Confederacy. John Slidell was a fellow Senator of Benjamin’s from Louisiana. He became Confederate envoy to France soon after the war began.
It was not certain whether Slidell was Jewish but he was accepted by the leading Jewish families of Paris. Benjamin, of course, was a Jew.

Slidell was able to persuade the Jewish banking house of Erlanger et Cie to make a loan to the Confederacy. Whether the marriage of Slidell’s daughter, Matilda, to Erlanger’s son influenced the banker is not known, but the loan speaks for itself. It is estimated that Erlanger made about $2,700,000 on the deal. The Confederacy obtained about two and a half million dollars from the bond issue for which it had pledged payment of fifteen million in capital and seven percent in interest.

When the Confederacy fell Judah P. Benjamin fled to England where he was soon embarked upon a new career of distinction and profit.

The Northern Jews apparently presented a serious problem to the Union during the Civil War. On page 330 of Series One, Vol. XVII, Part II, of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies, there appears a communication from Major General U. S. Grant to Major General Hurlburt, then stationed at Jackson, Tennessee. Writing at La Grange, Tennessee, November 9, 1862, General Grant commanded: “Refuse all permits to come south of Jackson for the present. The Israelites especially should be kept out . . .”

On November 10, 1862, Grant wrote to General Webster at Jackson: “Give orders to all the conductors on the road that no Jews are to be permitted to travel on the railroad from any point. They may go north and be encouraged in it; but they are such an intolerable nuisance that the department must be purged of them.”

On December 17, 1862, from the Headquarters of the Thirteenth Army Corps at Oxford, Mississippi, Grant addressed the Assistant Secretary of War, C. P. Wolcott:

“I have long since believed that in spite of all the vigilance that can be infused into post commanders, the specie regulations of the Treasury Department have been violated and that mostly by Jews and other unprincipled traders. So well satisfied have I been of this that I instructed the commanding officer at Columbus to refuse all permits to Jews to come South, and I have frequently had them expelled from the department, but they come in with their carpet-sacks in spite of all that can be done to prevent it. The Jews seem to be a privileged class that can travel anywhere. They will land at any woodyard on the river and make their way through the country. If not permitted to buy cotton themselves they will act as agents for someone else, who will be at a military post with a Treasury permit to receive cotton and pay for it in Treasury notes which the Jew will buy up at an agreed rate, paying in gold.”

General Grant ultimately lost his patience and issued General Order No. 11, as Commander of the Thirteenth Army Corps, Department of Tennessee. The Order reads as follows:
The Jews, as a class violating every regulation of trade established by the Treasury Department and also department orders, are hereby expelled from the Department within twenty-four hours from the receipt of this order.

Post commanders will see that all of this class of people be furnished passes and required to leave, and any one returning after such notification will be arrested and held in confinement until an opportunity occurs of sending them out as prisoners, unless furnished with permit from headquarters.

No passes will be given these people to visit trade headquarters for the purpose of making personal application for trade permits.

"By order of Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant
"Jno. A. Rawlins,
"Assistant Adjutant-General."

Organized Jewry was on its way to Washington almost as soon as the Order was posted. Its influence was immediately effective. On January 4, 1863, the General-in-Chief, H. W. Halleck, addressed General Grant as follows: "A paper purporting to be General Order No. 11, issued by you December 17, has been presented here. By its terms it expells all Jews from your department. If such an order has been issued, it will be immediately revoked." On January 7, 1863 Grant revoked the order.

Meanwhile other Union generals were complaining of the Jews. Brigadier General L. F. Ross wrote to Major General John A. McClernand: "The cotton speculators are quite clamorous for aid in getting their cotton away from Middleburg, Hickory Valley, etc., and offer to pay liberally for the service. I think I can bring it away with safety, and make it pay to the Government. As some of the Jew owners have as good as stolen the cotton from the planters, I have no conscientious scruples in making them pay liberally to take it away."

General W. T. Sherman, in a letter written from Memphis, July 30, 1862, says, in part: "I found so many Jews and speculators here trading in cotton, and secessionists had become so open in refusing anything but gold, that I have felt myself bound to stop it. The gold can have but one use—the purchase of arms and ammunition. . . Of course, I have respected all permits by yourself or the Secretary of the Treasury, but in these new cases (swarms of Jews) I have stopped it."

Jewish influence on the government of the United States became manifest in 1840. Instructions were dispatched to John Gliddon, consul at Alexander, Egypt, by Secretary John Forsyth on August 14, 1840, directing him to assist the European powers in their efforts to pressure the Egyptian government concerning the treatment of their Jewish subjects. The same instructions were dispatched to David Porter, United States Minister to Turkey, in reference to the Jewish subjects of that country. It was probably the first time that the United States officially intervened on behalf
of aliens. Not one of the Jews in question were citizens of the United States. Public meetings were called by American Jews in New York, Philadelphia, and Richmond. Christian Americans, who knew absolutely nothing about the political questions involved, were induced to attend these meetings and add their names to petitions for United States intervention. Among the Jews responsible for this agitation were J. B. Kursheedt and Theodor J. Seixas of New York; Jacob Ezekiel of Richmond, and Isaac Leeser and John Moss of Philadelphia.

In 1850 A. Dudley Mann negotiated a treaty with the Swiss Confederation. Among other things the treaty contained a clause which provided that only Christians were entitled to the privileges granted by Switzerland. The treaty was transmitted to the Senate February 13, 1851, by President Fillmore. Influential Jews had prevailed on the President to take exception to the “Christian clause” in his message of transmittal. The Jews immediately set up a vigorous protest against ratification by the Senate and succeeded in enlisting the support of Daniel Webster and Henry Clay, who went on record as opposing ratification. Isaac Leeser, David Einhorn, J. M. Cardoza, and Jonas P. Levy led the Jewish pressure group and they were successful in recruiting Christian opposition to the “Christian clause”.

The treaty, after being amended, was ratified by the Senate, November 9, 1855.

In 1857 an American Jew by the name of A. H. Gootman, was ordered to leave Chaux-de-Fonds, in Neuchatel, having resided there illegally. The treaty, although amended, clearly provided for the exercise of this power. Immediately American Jews called public meetings in Pittsburgh, Indianapolis, Charleston, Baltimore, and elsewhere. Isaac M. Wise publicized the affair and protested in his publication “The Israelite”; David Einhorn and Isaac Leeser did likewise in their respective papers, “Sinai” and “The Occident.” A delegation appointed by a Jewish convention in Baltimore called on President Buchanan and demanded that the treaty be abrogated. The President promised to do what he could. Through Jewish influence many newspapers of general circulation were induced to express vigorous editorial protests against the treaty.

For the first time in history the Jews, who claimed to be a separate nation, demanded, on the basis of its alleged citizenship in one nation, the right to live in another nation that had exercised its sovereignty in excluding them from its domain. American Jews, having found a soft spot in the political system of the United States, extended their demands to include the Jews of all nations to reside in Switzerland! Theodore Fay, the American minister, was persuaded to take up the case of Gootman, and initiated considerable agitation on his behalf until he was recalled in 1860. Through Fay’s intervention Gootman was permitted to remain at Chaux-de-Fonds by the canton of Neuchatel. Fay
wrote a paper entitled “Israelite Note,” which he transmitted to the Federal Council of the Swiss Confederation in 1859. As a result of the continuous agitation, several cantons repealed the laws excluding Jews from their territories. The Board of Delegates of American Israelites, of which Henry I. Hart was president and Myer S. Isaacs was secretary, continued its agitation in the United States. Hart was successful in persuading Secretary of State Seward to exert diplomatic pressure on Switzerland, and Fogg, Fay’s successor, was instructed to vigorously pursue the subject with Swiss officials. As a result the restrictions were abolished by the Swiss Constitution of 1874.

The techniques so successfully employed against the Swiss Confederation were to be employed with varying success against other countries, notably Servia, Turkey and Russia. In subsequent cases, pressure for United States’ intervention lacked the original pretext of United States citizenship. The Board of Delegates of American Israelites asked Secretary Seward in 1863 to use his official office on behalf of the Jews of Morocco. The Secretary in compliance, instructed the United States Consul at Tangier to assist Sir Moses Montefiore who was already in Tangier on behalf of the Moroccan Jews. It appears that nine or ten Jews had been charged with murder and were imprisoned at Safi. An account of their plight was dispatched to Sir Moses Montefiore and the Board of Delegates of British Jews, and following the usual agitation, Montefiore was enabled to secure the support of the English government and hastened to Morocco. The pressures on the Sultan were successful and the Jews were liberated.

In 1867 the Board of Delegates of American Israelites again asked the United States to intervene on behalf of foreign Jews—this time in Roumania. As usual the government responded but, in this instance, without any notable success.

The Russian problem presented many factors that distinguished it from other territories. Many of the “American” Jews arriving in Russia either had been expelled or had fled from that country because of their revolutionary activities. These Jews had sought refuge in the United States and, in due course, had been naturalized. Armed with American credentials and protected by the American Flag they returned to Russia to carry on their revolutionary activities. When Russian intelligence became aware of the stratagem it acted to protect itself. The treaty of 1832 between the United States and Russia was made at a time when there were very few Jews in the United States and it is doubtful if any of them were Russian Jews at that time.

In addition to the strictly political aspects of the Russian problem there was the very important matter of domestic policy—policy that had been meticulously enforced since the earliest days of the empire. The exclusion of the Khazar Jews from Holy Russia had been
deemed essential to the preservation of both Christianity and the government. Russia's amazing Jewish population, as has been seen, grew out of the annexation of territories acquired as a result of the various partitions of Poland. Russian law excluding Jews from Russia proper had been extended to these teeming Jewish populations and had brought about the establishment of the Pale of Settlement. In 1832, at the time of the treaty with the United States, the Russian government could not have possibly foreseen the difficulties that the treaty would present after 1880. That the Khazar Jews—either driven from Russia because of criminal and revolutionary activities, or having fled to avoid arrest, should return as Americans was a development that no one might have foreseen. That these Jews should prove to be powerful enough to force the United States government to intercede for them under the circumstances was a phenomenon that sorely tried the diplomatic skill of Russia. The American Jews were successful in convincing United States officialdom that Russia's attitude was predicated solely on religious intolerance. Apparently no one questioned the peculiar desire of a naturalized citizen to return to and live in a land from whence he had fled and from whence he had been excluded by law for centuries.

The Jews of the United States, Great Britain, and France, utilized every channel of propaganda in publicizing the "religious" intolerance and discrimination of Czarist Russia. To the age-old techniques of "back-stair" diplomacy and the bribing of public officials, American, British, and French Jews added the power of the press. Where Jewish merchants maintained great retail establishments, newspaper advertising became highly important to their operations, and an economic necessity to the newspapers. Large advertising accounts merited editorial consideration, and Jewish propaganda societies were quick to take advantage of this new channel of influence. The newspapers that carried the greatest number of advertisements of Jewish merchants usually echoed Jewish agitation editorially. This medium of public-opinion-molding would increase through the years, until the editorial policies of the great American newspapers would be determined in the council-chambers of organized Jewry, rather than in the newspaper offices of the country's great newspapers. The periodicals of the eighties and nineties probably accepted the Jewish "handouts" on Russia without question or investigation. Russia was far away, and if the local Jewish community was upset about the "religious discrimination" of their "co-religionists" in that mysterious land and wanted something said about it in the newspapers—well, it increases circulation, doesn't it?

While Jewish agitation in the United States and Europe created an unfavorable impression of Russia and laid a sinister groundwork that ultimately contributed to its down-fall, the Czar's
government refused to yield to the pressures exerted on it. Henry M. Goldfogle, a member of Congress from New York, kept up the agitation in the House of Representatives and presidents and secretaries of state continued to bombard Russia with the customary notes of protest.

* * * * *

The Khazar Jewish invasion of the United States began in 1881. They poured in not only from Russia, but from Poland, Galacia, Roumania and Eastern Europe. Between 1881 and 1920—a period of forty years—two million Khazar Jews entered the United States. During eight of those years a hundred thousand Jews a year passed through Ellis Island.

The Jewish population increase in the United States is out of all proportion to the national population increase. While the population of the United States as a whole increased 325 percent in the period from 1790 to 1840, the Jewish population increased 400 percent. During the next forty years the national increase was 200 percent, while the Jewish population increased 1400 percent, or seven times as fast as the population of the country as a whole. From 1880 to 1920 the general increase was 112 percent, while the Jewish increase was 1300 percent, or eleven times as fast as the population of the nation as a whole.

The Khazar Jews spoke Yiddish, and very few of them were able to speak the tongue of the land from whence they came. They were fanatical in their Judaism. As Jefferson had predicted, the liberty of the United States proved a strong wine for many of them. In Russia and Eastern Europe they had either bribed, assassinated, or fled from the authorities. In the United States they could join a political party and vote for a president. In Eastern Europe the Khazar Jew might not too openly call for the destruction of the government. In America it was part of the right of free speech. One might not too openly sneer and blaspheme Christianity in Poland and Russia, but it was considered rather smart and clever under the American Flag.

There is little wonder, therefore, that when the bronze plaque was placed at the base of the Statue of Liberty in New York harbor it bore the sonnet of the Jewess Emma Lazarus. No American Christian was found worthy of the honor.

* * * * *

The twentieth century found the Jews firmly entrenched in the economic and political life of every Christian nation. Thoroughly organized in the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany and other nations, Jewry influenced and directed public officials, and largely controlled international diplomacy. Through its concerted economic pressures Jewry influenced and directed the editorial policies of the major newspapers and periodicals, and thus
became a potent factor in directing public opinion. The development, operation and control of motion pictures, radio and television were in Jewish hands from the beginning, and as the twentieth century unfolded Jewish propaganda molded the course of history.

* * * * *
“When we sink, we become a revolutionary proletariat, the subordinate officers of all revolutionary parties, and at the same time, when we rise, there rises also our terrible power of the purse.”

“The Jewish State”, Theodor Herzl
CHRISTIANITY was still a powerful force at the dawn of the nineteenth century. Tides of doubt had swept across Europe, lapping at its foundations, but the Cross stood fast. The onslaught of the flood-waters of the Reformation and the Renaissance had threatened its very existence for a time, but when the waves receded the rock on which the Church had been founded was intact in its age-old strength. True, its solidarity had been broken, but its doctrines, culture, and the civilization it had wrought, prevailed. If its message of humanity and good-will had not touched and redeemed all men, its influence had softened and restrained them. Most of all it had raised man from an insignificant lump of clay and had given him a position of equality before God and the laws of the land. It had endowed him with an immortal soul. The most humble had found a mantle of dignity. An universal sense of freedom under God pervaded the minds of men; the concept that God had created all men equal before Him; that every man was endowed by his Creator with certain rights that no man or group of men might justly violate.

Christianity had withstood the attacks of the Romans and the Jews; its adherents had met martyrdom, and the Cross had risen triumphant over the pagan world. It had turned back the fanatic thrust of the Moslem, and had met the challenge of Judaism. It had defended its faith on the field of battle and in the places of learning. Its missionaries had carried its message to the far and unknown places of the world. Its cathedrals adorned the cities of Europe and its art, learning, and culture enriched all mankind. Through the night of the Middle Ages it kept alight the torch of knowledge. Eternally harrassed by its ancient enemies, it sought to defend itself in the manner and spirit of the times, and, because its sons were also human, it often made mistakes of policy. For the greater part it dealt with an enemy whose nature it refused to understand; an enemy whose very existence depended upon the utter destruction of Christianity.

The *Jewish Encyclopedia* informs us that the Jews have been prominently identified with the modern Socialist movement from its very inception. While this statement is true as far as it goes, it does not tell the whole truth. The fact is that the Jews authored so-called modern “scientific” socialism, and consistently have been its most vigorous propagandists and leaders.

Although Karl Marx is entitled to dubious credit for the fermentation he called “socialism”, he only may lay claim to having originated its alleged “scientific” aspect. The term “socialism” was first used in England and France in 1830 to describe the work and teaching of Robert Owen in Great Britain, and Francois Charles Fourier and Comte Claude Henride Rouvroy Saint-Simon in France.
Marx took generous portions of Owenism, Fourierism, Saint-Simonism, Hegelianism, the atheism and materialism of Feurbach, the anarchy of Proudhon, the Nihilism of Russia, the terror of the French Revolution, and mixing the batch thoroughly in Talmudic dialectics, brought forth a sinister concoction he called “scientific socialism.” The ingredients were the works of others, but the formula was singularly Jewish. With the birth of Marxism all other doctrines and movements bearing the name “socialist” became targets of Marxism criticism and attack. The “Utopian” socialists—Owen, Fourier, Saint-Simon and others—were (and are) considered “unscientific”, and the advocate of Marxism is more vituperative and vicious in his attacks on these “separate ingredients than he is in his tirades against capitalism.

To the unsavory mess he called “socialism”, Marx added the theories of another Jew, Lasselle, out of which came the identification of socialism with the working-class movement. The theory of “historical materialism” created the “proletariat versus the bourgeoisie” and the “class struggle.” The creation of “class consciousness” and the necessity of smashing by revolutionary violence all existing traditions, religions and cultures, became the immediate tasks of “scientific” socialism.

Marx and Engels used the terms “socialism” and “communism” without any attempt to distinguish one from the other. After the publication of the “Communist Manifesto” in 1848 the terms actually merged and became nearly synonymous in general usage.

The appearance of the “Communist Manifesto” marks the beginning of modern socialism. The second stage in its development may be said to date from 1864 with the formation of the First International. Marxism, of course, contemplates world domination and world government. The First International was called the International Working Men’s Association. When the Socialist and Social Democratic parties in France, Germany and elsewhere were organized on a permanent basis, the word “socialist” was added so that it became the First Socialist International (1875). The International Socialist Bureau was founded in 1900 for the purpose of linking up the socialist parties throughout the world.

*Utopia* is a Greek word, meaning “no place.” It is the title that Sir Thomas More selected for his book, published in Latin in 1516. In *Utopia*, poverty and misery have been eliminated by the operation of an ideal state where everything is worked out for the happiness of all mankind. The title of Sir Thomas More’s book has since been applied to all subsequent concepts of ideal states created by social philosophers and visionaries.

It has been said that the influence of Utopian writings has generally been inspirational rather than practical, but, nevertheless,
such works have had an immense force in the history of thought. The name *utopia* has been applied retroactively to various ideal states described before More’s work. Thus Plato’s *Republic*, and St. Augustine’s *City of God*, are considered Utopian.

Among the important Utopias before the nineteenth century are *The City of the Sun* (1623) by Tommaso Campanella, *The New Atlantis* (1627) by Francis Bacon, and *Oceana* (1656) by James Harrington. Cabet’s *Voyage en Icare* (1840) attempted to depict a fully developed ideal state, *Icaria: Looking Backward* (1888) by Edward Bellamy has had a strong influence on economic thinking in the United States. In England *Erewhon* (1872) by Samuel Butler, *A Dream of John Ball* (1888), and *News from Nowhere* (1891) by William Morris, exerted considerable influence on English idealism. Theodor Hertzka’s *Freeland* (1890), spread Utopian ideas in Austria.

The twentieth century released a torrent of Utopias. The advance of science had its effect upon modern imaginary states and most of them in the twentieth century are “scientific Utopias.” Machines now resolve all the ancient problems and take over most of the tedious work of making a livelihood so that mankind is enabled to enjoy life-long leisure. H. G. Wells has authored a number of such works.

Jean Jacques Rousseau and others gave considerable impetus to the belief in the ideal state. Generally these writers harkened to an imaginary primitive time when all was allegedly quiet and peaceful, when poverty was unknown, and force and oppression unthinkable. This same blissful condition would still exist, according to these writers, if civilization with its ideas of private property had not come along to corrupt it. Hence, it would follow that civilization should be abolished. But this belief in *natural order* and the *innate goodness* of man served to prompt the spread of a sort of visionary idealism which came to be known as *Utopian socialism.* In this form the idea found response in the thinking of many Christians, and thus opened the way for the subsequent acceptance of Marx’s Jewish socialism.

Saint-Simon, Etienne Cabet, Charles Fourier, and Pierre Joseph Proudhon in France, and Robert Owen in England, were the outstanding leaders of the Utopian socialists. Practical experiments in Utopian social communities were tried in Europe and the United States, all of which floundered and died in a short time.

These Utopian, humanitarian socialists were eventually shoved into obscurity by the rapid sweep of Marxism across Europe.

Isaac and Émile Pereire were followers of Saint-Simon. Both were Jewish railroad promoters and financiers. Émile (Jacob) founded the *Credit Foncier de France*, and the *Société Générale du Credit Mobilier*. He was the editor of *“Le Globe”* (1831-32), the
ideological publication of the Saint Simonists. Isaac was the owner of the Paris daily “La Liberte” (1876-1880), in which he propaganda-dized his political and industrial program. In 1880 he offered a prize of 100,000 francs, divided into four series, for the best works on social economics.

Lob Baruch (1786-1837) was a German-Jewish political writer and satirist. He is said to have embraced Christianity and changed his name to Karl Ludwig Borne in 1818. He worked for “political freedom and social reforms.” He became a leader of a literary party known as “Young Germany,” and engaged in a bitter controversy with Heinrich Heine, another German Jew.

Claude Henry de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon (1760-1825) was a French philosopher. He fought with the French army during the American Revolution and supported the French Revolution. He advanced what he termed a new science of society to do away with the inequalities in the distribution of property, power and happiness. Love for the poor and lowly was the basis for the reforms he advocated. On his return to France from America in 1783 he went in for land speculation and amassed a considerable fortune, which he ultimately lost in various experiments. His theories were developed by his disciples into a system known as “Saint-Simonism.” While there is very little in common between Saint-Simon and Karl Marx, other than the name, Saint-Simon is regarded as the founder of French Socialism.

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) was born in Stuttgart, Germany and died in Berlin. His philosophy is known as Hegelianism. Strange as it may seem, Hegel may be said to have laid the ground-work for Marx and modern so-called “scientific socialism.” Whether Hegel intended to establish the postulate that everything that exists is worth destroying is beside the point; the “Young Hegelians” and the “Professors Club” so concluded. It followed that “truth does not simply exist; it is always in the process of being.” Consequently nothing is sacred merely because it exists, and existing institutions are only the prelude to other and better institutions that must follow. This theory, of course, went one step beyond Nihilism.

Hegelianism is both a doctrine and a method, and the two are held to be logically inseparable. The method is precisely the formulation of the doctrine, and the doctrine is precisely the detailed expression of the method. The method is the dialectic, which, formally, is constituted by the triadic dialectic of thesis, antithesis and synthesis. The ramifications of this method-doctrine are extremely difficult to follow and understand. Jews became particu-
larly enamored of the Hegelian system because of its minute pil-pulistic approach and Talmudic reasoning. It supplied the mental machinery for the Jewish theological reform movement as well as the mental gymnastics for Marx’s world communism. Hegel’s method in the interpretation of history, therefore, is not only a fundamental doctrine for the communist conquest and domination of the world, but also “the basis for assigning to Israel a peculiar task, a mission . . .”

Samuel Hirsch became the most noted Jewish Hegelian.

So-called Christian Socialism—or at least the basic elements on which it rests—made its appearance in Europe before Marx and Engels wrote the “Communist Manifesto.” The hardships of the workers caught in the birth pangs of the industrial revolution stirred the compassion of individuals and groups within and without the Christian Church. Many Christians turned to the humanitarian tenets of the Church and sought to alleviate the suffering of the workers by applying those principles to the problem. Caught in the flood-tide of rabbinical Marxism, many of these well meaning people became more socialistic than Christian. Others, particularly in Germany and Austria, recognizing the Jewish origin and leadership of Socialism, deliberately espoused certain Marxian tenets in a futile effort to combat the Jewish conspiracy lurking behind the movement.

* * * * *

De Lamennais, a French Catholic priest, born in 1782, was the first to be known as a Christian Socialist. He looked upon kings as oppressors of the people, and sought the assistance of the Church in a campaign against them. He conceived the Church as the soul of the economic world as well as of the religious world. He advocated that the Church call into existence a grand cooperative association of laborers, to have as its objective the destruction of the power of the capitalist and the landlord. Pursuant to his plan De Lamennais sought an audience with Pope Leo XII, which was granted. He was well received and the Pope was impressed with his ideas, apparently believing that the plan had merit. De Lamennais, growing impatient, published his “L’Avenir” which contained the slogan: “Separate yourselves from the King, extend your hand to the people.” He called upon Pope Gregory XVI, Pope Leo’s successor, to support him in this treasonable propaganda, and upon the Pope’s refusal, he resigned from the Church. He added fuel to Marx’s sputtering fire with the publication of “The Words of a Believer,” in which he attempted to describe the wrongs inflicted upon the workers by the rulers and capitalists. He concluded that the plight of wage earners was worse in many respects than that of chattel slaves.
The Christian Socialist trend in England was more significant in the destiny of western civilization than the movement started by De Lamennais. Frederick Denison Maurice and Charles Kingsley were the founders and leaders of the movement.

Maurice was the son of a Unitarian minister. He was born in 1805. As a member of a debating club that had grown out of an Owenite society, he became impressed with the socialist propaganda of the Chartist movement. His economic philosophy followed that of Owen, and differed widely from the political chartists. He condemned the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people as atheistic and subversive. His visit with John M. Ludlow at King's College marked a turning point in his life.

Charles Kingsley was born in 1819. He was a minister. He was an aggressive revolutionary in his economic philosophy. Where Maurice was mild and unobtrusive, Kingsley was enthusiastic and bombastic. They met on common ground, however, in their conception of the function of religion. They looked upon the world as a manifestation of God's order. Man, in his greed and selfishness, had caused deviation from God's original principles. Only the reestablishment of a universal, practical Christianity could check the trend toward chaos. "We are teaching," Maurice wrote, "true socialism, true liberty, brotherhood and equality—not the carnal dead level equality of the community, nor the spiritual equality of the Church idea, which gives every man an equal chance of developing, and rewards every man according to his work."

Maurice and Kingsley, though plowing a deep trench in the English mind that must some day permit the filthy waters of Marxism to overflow its thinking, sought to infuse a spirit of Christian brotherhood into the terrible conditions of their time. Consequently the "socialism" they preached cannot be included in the Marxist school.

The Chartist movement came to an end in 1848, the same year that saw the publication of the "Communist Manifesto." It had started in 1838 after the failure of the Reform Bill of 1832—a proposal to extend the vote to the working class of England. The movement took its name from the "People's Charter," a document drafted by William Lovett and Francis Place. An economic depression had served to bring about wide-spread approval of the proposal. The trade unions and such labor leaders as Feargus O'Connor supported the movement, which was the first of its kind in England. A general strike was called and rioting added to the turmoil. Some reforms came out of the agitation, but the movement died out with the return of prosperity.

John M. Ludlow, after visiting in Paris, returned to England and told Maurice that he believed Socialism had become a powerful
factor in the world. Its Jewishness and its appeal to all the lower instincts in human life must eventually destroy Christianity. Both men were convinced that civilization could only be served if the concept of socialism was directed to higher moral instincts. The brotherhood of man, they believed, would be possible if socialism was “Christianized”.

The manufacturing of clothing has always been a Jewish industry. In Kingsley’s England the plight of the workers in these Jewish “sweat shops” was deplorable. Kingsley’s investigations of this industry resulted in his book “Cheap Clothes and Nasty.” It is said to be one of the most powerful indictments of the “sweating” system in all literature. The book and an article in Fraser’s Magazine by Maurice created great excitement. Ludlow urged the establishment of cooperatives such as he had seen in Paris. Although the name “Christian Socialism” had been first used in Robert Owen’s “New Moral World” November 7, 1840, the work of Maurice and Kingsley resulted in its adoption generally after the appearance of “Cheap Clothes and Nasty” and Maurice’s pamphlets. “That is the only name,” they declared, “which will define our object and will commit us at once to the conflict we must engage in sooner or later with the unsocial Christians and the un-Christian socialists.”

Maurice wrote the first tract for the movement. Anyone who recognized the principles of cooperation as being stronger and truer than those of competition was justly called a socialist, he declared. He included Owen, Fourier and Louis Blanc as falling within his definition. Owen had regarded the influence of environment as being of paramount importance in the development of political and economic destiny, and Maurice later attempted to disprove this view, contending that there is nothing incompatible between Christianity and socialism and that the two should work together.

A building was rented in London and the Working Tailor’s Association was organized, starting with twelve tailors under the leadership of Walter Cooper, a former chartist. Within a short time there were seventeen such cooperatives operating in London. The first successes were remarkable. The “Christian Socialist,” a weekly publication edited by Ludlow, was launched in the fall of 1850. Opposition quickly developed. Advertisements were refused by the newspapers of general circulation. The “Christian Socialist” was barred by France, and English book-sellers refused to sell copies of the organization’s publications. A committee from King’s College was appointed to make an investigation of the movement. In 1852, however, protection of law was extended to cooperatives, recognizing them as separate entities for the first time in history. In January of that year the “Christian Socialist” was replaced.
by the “Journal of Association,” edited by Thomas Hughes, author of “Tom Brown’s School Days.” The name of the society was changed to the Association for Promoting Industrial and Provident Societies.

The inevitable collapse of the cooperatives, traceable to the defects inherent in the theory, occurred at the close of 1853. Many of the members were robbed of their funds. Internal dissension and indifference destroyed some of the ventures, and rival and competitive cooperatives contributed to the general decline and decay. A philanthropist who became interested in the movement, E. Vansittart, assisted financially, but the outlay was too great and he was soon compelled to withdraw his support. Maurice and Kingsley, probably concluding that the movement’s chief weakness was the lack of education among its members, opened the Workingmen’s College in 1854.

By 1855 the Christian Socialist movement had ceased to be an issue in England.

The results of the conceded good intentions of Maurice and Kingsley were two-fold. The immediate effect was to bring to the minds of the leaders and laymen of Christian Churches the deplorable conditions and sufferings of the workers of England. At the same time these leaders and laymen accepted, either consciously or otherwise, the idea that the basic principles of socialism were compatible with Christian principles. The second result was a long range effect; a sort of corroding acid that must take years to complete its destructive task, but the day-to-day progress of which is now clearly discernible in retrospect. The Christian principles of compassion and benevolence that had opened the portals of the mind to the suffering and hardships of the English worker, also permitted easy access to the atheism and despotism of Jewish Marxism. The advocacy of Maurice and Kingsley of the basic principles of socialism, mild and honest as they were, was actually a compromise between Christian justice and compassion, and the tyranny and slavery of Marxism. While Maurice and Kingsley were wrestling with the economic problems of their day and thinking in terms of the socialism of Owen, Fourier and the other Utopians, rather than in terms of the sinister doctrines of Marx, they nevertheless prepared the English mind for the future acceptance of a type of socialism that they had condemned as atheistic and subversive. The socialism they conceived did not bear the materialistic brand that would characterize the “scientific socialism” of Marx. But once the term was fixed with approval in the Christian mind, its refinements and definitions must eventually cancel out the “Christian” adjective. Materialism must banish God and Christ, so that only Marx might remain.

Both Maurice and Kingsley have been accused of suffering from
"a morbid craving for notoriety," but there is every reason to believe that they were both honest and sincere men, devoted to the basic principles of Christianity as they understood them. Unwittingly certainly, but none the less deadly, their work became the most disastrous application of the psychological Trojan Horse principle since the fall of Troy. Under the guise of Christianity the Pandora box of atheism and hate was easily concealed in the Church vestry. When the lid was opened and the congregation infected, the doors of the Church opened wide for the triumphal entrance of Marx's disciples.

The Christian clergy, both Catholic and Protestant, made strenuous attempts to interest their respective Churches in the problems of the working class in Germany and Austria. The Bishop of Mainz, Baron von Kettler (1811-1877), accepted many of the ideas of the social democrats, and advocated labor legislation and the development of productive cooperatives under Catholic auspices with state financial support. F. C. J. Moufang, Franz Hitze, Adolph Kolping and others were active in various movements of this nature.

Karl Lueger (1844-1910) adopted the program of the German Catholic cooperators and organized the Austrian Christian Socialist Party. He and his followers in Austria impressed and alarmed by the Jewish character of the labor and socialist parties, apparently hoped to counteract the rising tide of Jewish Marxism by adopting some of its principles and dubbing the result "Christian"—a fatal strategy. The Austrian Christian Socialist Party exerted such strong opposition to the Jewish-led Marxist organization that Lueger and his followers were soon smeared by the Jewish groups as "anti-Semitic." Lueger was elected Mayor of Vienna in 1897 and held that post until his death.

Albert de Mun (1841-1914) organized a similar group in France, the Action Liberale Francaise, virtually the Catholic Socialist Party of France.

Stocker, the Court preacher of the Hohenzollerns, organized the Christian Social Workingman's Party in Germany to oppose the Jewish Marx-Lassalle groups. Stocker looked to labor legislation and urged the monarch to take the lead in social reforms. He was primarily interested in bringing the people back to the Church.

Friedrich Naumann, in the nineties, unsuccessfully sought to capture German Protestantism for the radical social reform movement.

* * * * * *

In the eighties the Rev. Stewart D. Headlam in England organized the Guild of St. Matthew, and edited its organ, the Church Reformer. He was an outspoken advocate of Christian Socialism. In 1889, the Christian Social Union was founded under the leader-
ship of the Bishop of Durham. Bishop Gore, Bishop Stubbs and many others became members. About the same time Dr. John Clifford, among others, formed the Christian Socialist League.

In recent years many hundreds of churchmen in Great Britain have identified themselves and their faiths with the British Labor Party, the Guild Socialist League, the Independent Labor Party, and many other socialist organizations.

* * * * *

Christianity in the United States was not to escape the insidious infection of Jewish socialism. The virus spanned the Atlantic before Russia disgorged its revolutionary Khazar hordes through America’s open gates at Ellis Island. The Christian Labor Union was organized in 1872, and such names as the Rev. Josiah Strong, Professor Richard T. Ely, George D. Herron, Washington Gladden and others gave it prestige. In 1889 an Episcopal clergyman, the Rev. W. D. P. Bliss, organized the American Christian Socialist Society. Within the first quarter of the twentieth century additional “Christian” organizations would tend to make atheistic socialism respectable. Among these would be the Collectivist Society, (with such men as Rufus W. Weeks of the New York Life Insurance Company listed as a vice-president); the Christian Socialist League; Church Socialist League; Church League for Industrial Democracy; Fellowship of Reconciliation, and the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order.

Walter Rauschenbusch (see Committee Reports on Un-American Activities), for years Professor of Church History in the Rochester Theological Seminary, worked incessantly to bring socialism to the Church. His name has been found on the letterheads of many organizations cited by official legislative committees as communist-fronts. He is the author of Christianity and the Social Crisis, Christianizing the Social Order, and others. He has declared that “the Father of Jesus Christ does not stand for the permanence of the capitalistic system . . .”

Professor Harry F. Ward (see Committee Reports on Un-American Activities), Bishop Spaulding, Bishop Paul Jones, and many others, have worked with untiring zeal to harmonize Christianity with socialism. Some, like Bishop Oxnam, have out-Rauschenbusched Rauschenbusch.

* * * * *

As has heretofore been indicated, the basic idea behind Christian Socialism was the application of Christian principles to the social order for the purpose of eradicating economic ills. The early Christian socialists had little or no conception of the rabbinical doctrines of Marx—so-called “scientific socialism”—and took their philosophies from the Utopians and the doctrines of Robert Owens, Fourier, Saint-Simon and others. These early Christian socialists urged modification and reform under the existing capitalist system,
and, for the greater part, would have been horrified at the thought of overthrowing it. On the practical side of their movements they turned to the producers' cooperatives—to self governing and self-financed workshops. In every instance these cooperative movements failed, because cooperatives are governed by the same inexorable laws of economics that govern private industry. To be successful, cooperatives must be financed and managed in the same manner as successful private industries, and when this happens they cease to be cooperative. Only under state ownership, slave labor, and fixed prices could the idea be made to work—certain missing ingredients that would remain unknown until Marx's dictatorship became a reality in Soviet Russia. Our early Christian socialists were on a merry-go-round, had they but known it; they pursued a vicious circle that always ended in oppression and slavery.

Although it is quite true that the early Christian socialists drew more heavily on the Utopians than on Karl Marx, it would be a serious mistake to associate them with each other. The Utopians conceived a commonwealth that they believed should be imposed on all of society. They had no confidence or trust in the masses—the proletariat. The “people”—from the Utopian viewpoint—would be incapable of remedying injustices; because of their ignorance they were instinctively cruel and brutal. An Utopian would never permit the so-called “lower-classes” to take over and direct governments. In their systems it was the well-born, natural leaders of society who alone were capable of establishing and maintaining the reforms their commonwealths contemplated. The failures, the vulgar and the ignorant had no place in their schemes of government. Kings and Queens, industrialists and financiers, the educated and the nobles—the successes in life—once they understood, were the men and women who would employ their talents for the building of Utopia. The early Christian Socialists probably shared these Utopian views. Modern Christian socialists, however, follow the view of the Marxian socialist and, although they would deny it, their hopes of the future are necessarily based on the greed, hate and violence of the masses.

* * * * *

Throughout the ebb and flow of the various types of socialism, Marxism appears to have remained constant. Although it cannot be said that Marx influenced the Utopians or the early Christian socialists who came before him, the ideas Marx took from them and fused into his Talmudic doctrine of "scientific socialism" influenced all who came after him whether they called themselves "Christians" or not. After 1848, although modified, revised, renamed, and reinterpreted, Marxism formed the great sinister river into which all socialistic streams, whatever their origin or their names, ultimately found they way.
Karl Marx was the son of a Jewish lawyer. He was born at Treves in 1818, and died in England in 1883. He came of a long line of Jewish rabbis and his writings are strongly influenced by the dialectics and subtlety of rabbinical hair-splitting. "The chapters on the theory of value in his principal work 'Das Kapital,'" ventures the Jewish Encyclopedia, "suggests by their subtle analysis an inherited Talmudical bent . . ."

It was the controversies of the socialists with the old school of democrats, and the dissensions among the divergent socialistic schools themselves, that directed Marx's attention to the study of political economy. Although he would never be capable of earning enough money to support either himself or his family, he was to become a world expert on telling the world how it was done. It is not surprising that his economic theory should be based on his own life experiences. As he had lived off the bounty of his friend Friedrich Engels, his economical theories advocated a similar plan for the world proletariat. The immediate outcome of his studies was the "Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei" ("Manifesto of the Communist Party") written on the eve of the Paris revolution of 1848 in collaboration with Engels. This work laid the foundation for his theories. In 1867 the first volume of his life work "Das Kapital" appeared. It became the "Bible" of Socialism.

Marxism is both evolutionary and revolutionary. The evolutionary aspect is the basis for its claim to the "scientific." The Utopians and the Christian Socialists hoped for a better world because men of good will would desire it for its beauty, its peace, and its happiness. Marx contends that men will get a socialist world whether they want it or not. To him the industrial revolution was actually an evolutionary process of capitalistic society which leads unerringly to socialism. Ethics and religion have nothing to do with it. Moreover, he contends, the industrial process molds ethical standards in conformity with the industrial tendencies of the times. Marx's socialism, therefore, becomes a sort of predestined eventuality. The opinions of men and the armies of the world are incapable of halting this evolutionary process. While there is no way of avoiding the ultimate victory of a world socialist society, its coming may be accelerated by wars and revolutions. It is therefore the duty of every socialist to advance the great day by a resolution of differences through conflict and violence. The old bears the new within itself, and capitalism is its own grave-digger. Wars hasten the death of the old economy and gives strength and birth to the new. Every contention creates its counter-contention; every interest its opposite interest. Religion must be set against religion so that no-religion may be born. Race must be pitted against race in
order that no-race may emerge. Government must destroy government so that only socialism shall remain. And so throughout the entire scale of human relations, thought and culture.

Marx was nicknamed "the Moor" by his father, and the name stuck throughout his life. The name is rather symbolical. Marx was to become the infiltrating and invading "Moor" for the reconquest of an expanded "Spain"—all of Christendom. He attended the universities of Bonn and Berlin. In 1842 he married Jennie von Westphalen, and that same year joined the staff of the Rheinische Zeitung at Cologne. His journalistic efforts resulted in his exile from Germany. From Paris he was deported to Brussels. He participated in revolutionary activities in Germany in 1848 and was again expelled in 1849. He found refuge in London, where he worked for world revolution until he died in 1883. Engels virtually supported him and his family throughout most of Marx's adult life. Two of his daughters committed suicide.

A table in a coffee house in Berlin became known as the "Professors' Club." In addition to Karl Marx, the members included Bruno Bauer, Dr. Karl Friedrich Koepper, Dr. Rutenberg, and Dr. Arnold Ruge. "Young Hegelians" all, the members met to drink coffee and discuss the political, religious and philosophical questions of the day. The revolution of 1830 in France and Germany had created a back-drop for intense intellectual re-evaluation of heretofore accepted traditional doctrines—and the members of the Professor's Club were convinced that they were "intellectuals".

David Friedrich Strauss published his "Life of Jesus" in 1835 in which it was said "he unsparingly stripped the gospels of their haloes" and deprived them of the right to claim historical value. He attempted to prove "by strictly scientific methods of investigation" that the Christian tradition was but "myth or saga." The result of Strauss' work was declared to be "stupendous". Whatever its effect was elsewhere, it was eagerly discussed by the members of the Professor's Club. It was hailed by Marx and his colleagues as a formidable attack against the "hypocrisy and romanticism" of Christianity. They were only disappointed that the "shot" was not quite properly "aimed," and that the wound inflicted was not mortal.

Bruno Bauer (1809-1882) was undoubtedly impressed with Marx during the early days of the Professor's Club. He, like the others, was carried along on the anti-theological wave, and gave profound attention to the young Jew's views on Christianity. Marx finally argued that Hegel himself was an atheist, but it is doubtful that Bauer was able to go along with this absurdity. Ultimately the "professors," including Bauer, broke with Marx and later became his eternal enemies. Bauer wrote articles published in the 'Deut-
sche Jahrbucher” on the Jewish question, which were republished with additions in 1843 under the title “Die Judenfrage.” Bauer contended, among other things, that the Jews never contributed anything to civilization. Spinoza, he declared, ceased to be a Jew when he wrote his “Ethics.” He did not consider Maimonides and Mendelssohn thinkers at all.

Marx later referred to Bauer as “that feather-pate”. His first book, “The Holy Family, Bruno Bauer and His Accomplices,” was an attack on Bauer.

Ludwig Feuerbach went beyond Strauss in his “Wesen des Christentums” (Essence of Christianity, 1843), thereby supplying the “Young Hegelians” with a new intellectual weapon—“materialism.” He had published (in 1839) his “Kritik der Hegelschen Philosophie,” in which, it was averred, he stripped Hegel’s “absolute spirit” bare of its mysteries, and revealed it to be the “departed spirit of theology”, “a metaphysical spook”, a “theology made over into logic,” a “rational mysticism,” and several other things. The God of the Utopians was destroyed. Materialism had been placed on the vacant throne! Things had not been created by God in harmony and beauty and then disordered and spoiled by man! Things are as they are! Everything that exists is the result of evolution—of growth; nothing was created as it is. “Religion,” declared Feuerbach, “is the dream of the human mind.”

Even Hegel was violently hurled from his marble pedestal. “Who has annihilated the dialectic of concepts, the war of the gods which the philosophers alone knew?” demanded Marx in unfeigned enthusiasm. “Who has put man in place of the old lumber, and in place of the infinite consciousness as well? Feuerbach, and no one else! Feuerbach, who completed and criticized Hegel from a Hegelian standpoint, resolving the metaphysical absolute spirit into the real man standing on the foundation of nature, was the first to complete the criticism of religion—inasmuch as, at the same time, he undertook a critique of Hegelian speculation, and thereby sketched the great and masterly outlines of all metaphysics.”

Karl Ludwig Borne (1786-1837), Born Lob Baruch, lashed out at authority from France, publishing a series of criticisms, polemics, and pamphlets. This Jew, although living in Paris, became a leader of the new literary party, “Young Germany.” Like his fellow Jew, Heinrich Heine, he lampooned the police, and poked fun at constituted authority.

The Professors’ Club eventually became the Society of the Free, attracting a wide assortment of radicals. Friedrich Engels, serving his military service as an artilleryman in the guards, became a
Engels (1820-1895) was the son of a wealthy textile manufacturer in Germany, with interests in a factory near Manchester, England. As the radical and subversive character of the “Rheinische Zeitung” became more and more obvious as its circulation increased, the authorities were compelled to take action. An order for its suppression was issued January 21, 1843. Marx retired from the staff on March 17, 1843. He declared that the government had “set him free” so that he might devote himself exclusively to the study of economics.

Moses Hess, “the communist rabbi” accompanied Arnold Ruge to Paris. Marx and his wife followed. Hess, already a revolutionary of some reputation—he had helped establish the “Rheinische Zeitung” and thus had met Marx—introduced Ruge and Marx into the revolutionary socialist circles of Paris. Here Marx also met Heinrich Heine and George Sands (Armandine Aurore Lucie).

Hess (1812-1875) was born at Bonn, Germany. He was the son of a prosperous Jewish manufacturer. He collaborated with Friedrich Engels in editing Gesellschaftsspiegel (1845-1846). He was a strong supporter of Proudhon’s anarchistic theories.

In 1840, speaking of the Jews, he wrote:

“We shall always remain strangers among the nations; these, it is true, will grant us rights from feelings of humanity and justice; but they will never respect us so long as we place our great memories in the second rank, but in the first principle, ’ubi bene, ibi patria’.”

He occupies a unique place in history. He is, at one and the same time, the visible initiator of two sinister movements which at first glance appear diametrically opposed to each other—political Zionism and world communism. When organized Jewry finds it expedient it declares that “Jews have been prominently identified with the modern Socialist movement from its very inception” (Jewish Encyclopedia), and when it serves its purpose to be disassociated with it, declares that communism is incompatible with Judaism and Zionism. Hess, however, found nothing inconsistent in his Jewishness and his urge for the destruction of Christian nations. It is interesting to see the strength of this Communist’s Jewish consciousness. Advocating the overthrow of all Christian governments by force and violence, this socialist writer and leader advised his Jewish brethren to sacrifice emancipation, if emancipation should be found to be irreconcilable with Jewish nationality! He held that it was impossible to eradicate the Jewish national consciousness, and the Jewish type was bound to persist. Heinrich Graetz, the Jewish historian caught the spirit of Hess when he wrote (1864): “The Jewish race is approaching,
and under our very eye, a rejuvenescence which would formerly not have been thought possible. The enemies of the Jews look upon it with implacable rage, the Jews of cosmopolitan tendency secretly shake their head, the followers of the letter of the law associate deceptive hopes with it—all are dumbfounded at its appearance.”

Hess was about thirty years old when Marx met him in Cologne. He already had won fame among the radicals by the publication of his book “Socialism” (or “Communism”). “Dr. Marx,” wrote Hess, “my idol, is still quite a young man, twenty-four at the most. He combines the deepest philosophical earnestness with biting wit. Imagine Rousseau, Voltaire, Holbach, Lessing, Heine and Hegel all fused in one person—and I mean fused, not lumped together—and you have Dr. Marx.”

Through Hess, Marx and Ruge became acquainted with a number of French socialists—Louis Blanc, Dezamy, Considerant, Leroux, Proudhon, and others. Marx, desirous of making a “Gallo-German” alliance and establishing the “Deutsche-Franzosische Jahrbucher” failed to make much headway with the French radicals. All of them suffered from the occupational disease of the so-called “liberal”; they had no use for anyone else’s theories. They were not only intolerant of “new” and rival ideas, they were virtually unaware of their existence. The intense preoccupation of the intellectual revolutionary in his own world-shaking theories makes him oblivious to the theories of others. Marx, the German Jew, already exhibiting the dominating spirit that was to alienate him from everyone with whom he came in contact, probably did not impress the French radicals. Nevertheless the new “Deutsche-Franzosische Jahrbucher” made its first and last appearance in February of 1844. Under the title “Introduction to a Critique of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right”, Marx pointed to the first target of revolutionary attack—religion. “The fight against religion is, therefore, a direct campaign against the world whose spiritual aroma is religion,” he wrote. “Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the feelings of a heartless world, just as it is the spirit of un-spiritual conditions. It is the opium of the people.” He goes on to say that people will never be happy until they have been deprived of “illusory” happiness by the abolition of religion. “The weapon of criticism,” he thunders, “cannot replace the criticism of weapons. Physical force must be overthrown by physical force; but theory, too, becomes a physical force as soon as it takes possession of the masses.”

Friedrich Engels, on his way from Manchester to Barmen, spent ten days in Paris. Here he met Bakunin for the first time. He had first met Marx in Cologne for a brief interview. Since their
first meeting they had carried on some correspondence, and they renewed their acquaintance during Engels’ stay in Paris.

Strauss’s *Life of Jesus* apparently was the turning point in Engels’ career. “These colossal ideas,” he wrote, “exercised a formidable influence upon me.” As a matter of fact the book turned him completely from Christianity and he henceforth was an atheist. He gained his first reputation as a radical with a polemic (published anonymously) entitled *Schelling and the Revelation, a Criticism of the Reaction’s Latest Onslaught upon the Freedom of Philosophy*. Thereafter he was numbered with Bruno and Edgar Bauer, Koppen and Buhl, Stirner and Meyen, Rutenburg and Jung, and the others.

When his military year had been completed Engels returned to Barmen by way of Cologne, stopping in the latter place on his way. Here he met Moses Hess who converted him to communism. Hess, writing in 1843, said: “Last year, when I was about to start for Paris, Engels came to see me on his way from Berlin. We discussed the questions of the day, and he, a revolutionist of the Year One, parted from me a convinced communist. Thus did I spread devastation.” Engels admitted that Hess had been “the first to make communism plausible to me and my circle.”

Hess spent considerable time with Marx in Cologne. He had developed the theory that money, profit and property are the source of all evil. Marx contributed the theory of “eternal dialectic,” i.e., “a system disappears only when the seeds of destruction which it carries within itself have already destroyed it like a devouring cancer.” Thus, and only thus, declared Marx, does an existing condition give birth to its own negation—a thesis to its own anti-thesis. Hess agreed, but Marx was unwilling to accept Hess’ definitive version of socialism.

* * * * * *

In 1840 four books appeared that had a profound effect on the *Professors’ Club* in Berlin. *What is Property* (“property is theft”) by Pierre-Joseph Proudhon; *Etienne Cabet’s Journey to Icaria; The Organization of Labor*, by Louis Blanc, and *European Triarchy*, by Moses Hess. After reading and discussing these books, the Professors decided that, having abolished God, they would now abolish poverty!

* * * * * *

Marx also contributed an article on the Jewish question to the ill-fated *Deutsche-Französische Jahrbucher.* The fierce attack of the Young Hegelians on Christianity had, of course, brought joy to the hearts of the Jews, and they, in turn, had been enthusiastic in making common cause with the “liberals” and the revolutionists. The theories of Mendelssohn were in the air and there was much discussion of Jewish “emancipation.” If the German Jews, said Marx, desire political and social emancipation, they must learn
that the State cannot emancipate itself as long as it is Christian. Bruno Bauer had contended that if the Jew wished to be free he must first become a Christian, and must then transcend Christianity. Marx insisted that it was the other way about. The individual, he states, leads a double life: one life politically and another life as a private individual. Man is for man the highest and he must mount the throne of history. The gods have been abolished. Only the objectively socialized and subjectively communalized human being will be able to effect the emancipation of mankind, thus becoming master of his own fate.

He was saying bluntly that the first Jewish aim is, not equality with Christians, but the total destruction of Christianity! “Do Jews demand to be put on equal footing with the Christian subjects?” he inquires with tongue in cheek. “If they recognize the Christian State as based on law (right),” he speculates, “they recognize the rule of general bondage. Why (then) does their (own) special yoke irritate them when the general yokes please them? The Jew has within himself the privilege of being a Jew. He has, as a Jew, rights that the Christian does not have.”

Marx, after reminding his brethren of their duty for racial warfare, points out the means by which the Christian state is to be destroyed:

“The most rigid form of opposition between the Jew and the Christian is the religious opposition. How does one get rid of an opposition? By making it impossible. And how make impossible a religious opposition? By suppressing the religion.” and:

“If they want to be free, Jews must not become converted to Christianity overnight, but to a dissolved Christianity; that is, to philosophy, to logic (criticism) and to its result: to a free humanity.

“The Jew is already emancipated, but in a Jewish manner. The Jew, for example, who is merely tolerated in Vienna, determines by his sole financial power the future of all Europe. The Jew who, in the smallest of the German States, may be without rights, decides the future of Europe.

“The Jew has been emancipated, not only by making himself master of the financial market, and because, thanks to him and by him, gold has become a world power, and the practical Jewish spirit has become the spirit in practice of the Christian people. The Jews have been emancipated in precise measure as the Christians have become Jews.”

The acquaintance between Marx and Proudhon ended in the inevitable breach. On the other hand, Marx and Heinrich Heine established strong sentiments of esteem for each other. Both were Jews, and shared similar political views. Heine, writing on June 15, 1843, avowed his support of communism. “The communists are the only party in France that is worthy of respect,” he wrote. “I might, indeed, claim respect for the vestiges of
Saint-Simonism, whose champions still linger under strange de­vices, and also for the Fourierists, who are alive and kicking; but these worthy persons are moved only by words, by the social problem as a problem, by traditional ideas; they are not urged onward by elemental necessity, they are the predestined servants through whose instrumentality the supreme world-will carries its titanic resolves into effect. Sooner or later, the scattered family of Saint-Simon and the whole general staff of the Fourierists will go over to the growing army of communism, and, equipping crude necessity with the formative word, will, as it were, play the part of the Fathers of the Church.”

Marx’s subversive activities in Paris did not go unnoticed. Heine and the others were also under surveillance. The Prussian am­bassador in Paris reported the activities of the German-Jewish revolutionaries to his government in Berlin. While Heine confined himself to lampooning German officials (“Ode to King Louis of Bavaria”) Marx had boldly called for revolution in Germany. As a result of these reports, orders were issued to immediately arrest the traitors on the charge of lese-majesty in the event of their return to Germany.

There is little question concerning the nature and purpose of the Verein fur Cultur und Wissenschaft der Juden, which had been established in 1819 by Edward Gans and Moses Moser, and of which Heine was a member. The “culture and education” sought by this Jewish secret society was the destruction of Christianity. Although the organization announced its dissolution in time to avoid its forcible suppression by the police, it is believed that it continued in its operation secretly thereafter. Marx, through Heine, undoubtedly became a member during the former’s stay in Paris. Edward Gans (1798-1839), who was one of the organizers of the Verein, was also a professor of criminal law at Berlin University, and Marx attended his classes. The German police were well aware of these activities and probably had obtained a list of the names of the most prominent and active members.

Marx and Heine contributed several articles to Vorwärts, a German language newspaper published in Paris by a Jew named Bornstein. As a result of these inflammable diatribes the Prussian government protested to the French authorities, complaining that journalistic attacks on Prussia coming out of Paris were “increasing in impudence and coarseness.” Alexander von Humboldt finally persuaded Francis Guizot, Premier of France, to take action against the revolutionaries. Bernays, the editor of Vorwärts, was sentenced to two months in jail and had to pay a fine of three hundred francs. On January 11, 1845, it was decreed that Marx, Ruge, Bakunin, Bornstein and Bernays were to be deported from
France. Heine, through his close contact with the House of Rothschild, had too much influence for the authorities and was not included in the order. Bornstein and Ruge knew how to pull the right strings, and were thus able to have the order cancelled as to them. Marx, however, had to leave. He moved to Brussels.

Marx, the Jew, never ceased in his attack on Christianity. Cleverly amalgamating the greed, envy and distress of the so-called proletariat, he attempted to indict the gentle principles of Christ as the cause of the world’s woe. Writing from Brussels, he said:

“The social principles of Christianity have now had eighteen hundred years for their development, and do not need any further development at the hands of Prussian consistorial councillors. The social principles of Christianity find justifications for the slavery of classical days, extol mediaeval serfdom, and are ready in case of need to defend the oppression of the proletariat—somewhat shamefacedly perhaps. The social principles of Christianity preach the need for a dominant and an oppressed class, expressing the pious hope that the former will deal kindly with the latter. The social principles of Christianity declare that all infamies will be spiritually compensated in heaven, the assertion being made a justification for the continuance of these infamies on earth. According to the social principles of Christianity, all the misdeeds wrought by the oppressors on the oppressed, are either a just punishment for original sin and others sins, or else are trials which the Lord in his wisdom sends to affect the redeemed. The social principles of Christianity preach cowardice, self-contempt, abasement, subjection, humility, in a word, all the qualities of the mob; whereas for the proletariat, which does not wish to allow itself to be treated as a mob, courage, self-esteem, pride, and independence, are far more necessary than bread. The social principles of Christianity are obsequious, but the proletariat is revolutionary.”

The hypocrisy of this venomous and untrue attack on Christian principles is best understood by a study of the conditions of the workers under Marx’s “dictatorship of the proletariat” in the Soviet Union. Here, without God or Christian principles, the proletariat has been reduced to a new kind of slavery that, by comparison, makes the “slavery of classical days” and “medieval serfdom” preferable in many respects. Here, in Marx’s “Workers’ Paradise”, without God or Christian principles, rules the dominant class exercising its unrestrained force and power over the oppressed class. Here, without excuse or apology, except by decree of Marx and his prophet Lenin, all infamies are justified in the name and sign of the hammer and sickle. Here, without God or Christian principles, death, slavecamps, starvation and misery, and all of the multiplied misdeeds wrought by the communist oppressors on the oppressed proletariat are necessary revolutionary
punishments on behalf of the proletariat, or else the trials and tribulations attendant on the birth of the brave new socialist world as it wrenches itself free from dying capitalism. Here, without benefit of God or Christian principles, man is bereft of soul and dignity; reduced to an infinitesimal and not too consequential cog in a gigantic wheel, without courage, self-esteem, pride or independence. Here, without God or Christian principles, the revolutionary proletariat is finally the victim, the slave and the hopelessly unredeemed faceless man. Whereas there was hope so long as God was in His Heavens and Christian principles in the earth, the proletariat of Soviet Russia is now deprived of that last solace.

Moses Hess took up a collection for Marx in Westphalia when Marx was compelled to leave France. Later Hess joined him in Brussels.

The first Communist Party came into being gradually and informally. Without being quite fully aware of its significance Marx and Engels began referring to themselves as the Communist Party. True, Moses Hess had used the term in writing of his conversion of Engels to communism. At this time there was no socialist party of any kind in the German speaking world. Marx and Engels asked others to join with them in the movement. Thus it was that the “party” came into existence in Brussels. The membership was ultimately increased to seventeen. Among those who became members were Ferdinand Freiligrath, Moses Hess, Edgar von Westphalen, Joseph Weydemeyer, Herman Kriege, Weerth, Dronke, Seiler, Heilberg, Ernst Wolff, Ferdinand Wolff, Gigot, and Wilhelm Weitling. The first two genuine working men (proletariats) to join were two typesetters from the German newspaper in Brussels. Fifteen of the seventeen were writers and fourteen of the lot were bourgeoisie. The first act of the “party” was the establishment of a Communist Correspondence Committee.

Marx’s domineering disposition soon won him the title of “proletarian dictator.” Because Weitling leaned a little toward the compassion of the Utopians Marx decided to expel him from the “party.” Hess attempted to intercede on Weitling’s behalf and ultimately resigned himself. Marx’s rage knew no limits. Engels immediately spread the rumor that Hess had gonorrhea and that his wife was nothing but “a common slut.” The “party” was in a turmoil. Marx, suddenly conceiving himself as the all-knowing, infallible prophet of the new order in the world, fought viciously with everyone who dared express an opinion.

The “party” was officially known as the Workers’ Educational Society, and probably included the more radical elements of the
Democratic League. Brussels rapidly became the revolutionary headquarters of the world. Wrote Marx: “... there is more to be done in little Belgium than in big France.”

One of Bakunin’s followers described Marx as he dominated the revolutionary scene in Brussels:

“Marx is of a type composed of energy, a strong will, and inviolable convictions; of a very remarkable type, too, in externals. He has a thick crop of black hair, hairy hands, an overcoat buttoned awry; but he looks like one endowed with the right and the power of demanding respect, however he may look and whatever he may do. His movements are awkward, yet bold and self-confident. His manner conflicts sharply with the ordinary conventions of social life. He is proud, somewhat contemptuous, and his harsh voice, with a metallic ring, is admirably suited to his revolutionary opinions about persons and things.”

“He called me a sentimental idealist,” Bakunin said, “and he was right. I called him gloomy, unreliable, and vain, and I was right, too.”

* * * * * *

As a result of the French Revolution of 1830 a subversive secret revolutionary underground movement developed in Paris and spread an invisible network of conspiracy over the country. The greatest activity, of course, was in Paris. Bernard, Barbes and Blanqui were among its more prominent leaders. The Champions of the Rights of Man, Society of Families, Friends of the People, and the Society of the Seasons, were names of some of these secret and illegal organizations. All of these groups called for the “dictatorship of the proletariat,” and feverishly prepared for a new revolution. Jewish elements from Germany were actively at work in the underworld of revolt. Most of them were members of the Exiles’ League, founded in 1834. In 1836 the Exiles’ League became the Federation of the Just. Schuster, Venedey, Schapper, Bauer, and Wilhelm Weitling were some of the leaders of the Federation. The central committee of this revolutionary movement was transferred to London after May of 1839.

In January of 1847 Marx and Engels were invited to join the Federation of the Just in view of the determination of the members of the organization to adopt the theoretical doctrines of the two Communists. The Federation held a congress in London in 1847, but Marx was unable to attend. A second congress was called for December and Marx and Engels were present. They had gone to London primarily as delegates from the Democratic League of Brussels to participate in the meeting of the Fraternal Democrats who were celebrating the Polish revolution.

The second congress of the Federation of the Just was held in the headquarters of the Communist Workers’ Educational Society in Great Windmill Street. It lasted ten days. It adopted Marx’s
revolutionary views in their entirety. At the close of the congress, Marx and Engels were requested to draft a manifesto embodying the communist principles of the newly constructed revolutionary platform. The result was the Communist Manifesto. This call to sanguinary class-warfare closed with these words:

"Communists scorn to hide their views and aims. They openly declare that their purposes can only be achieved by the forcible overthrow of the whole extant social order. Let the ruling classes tremble at the prospect of a communist revolution. Proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Proletarians of all lands, unite!"

The careful student of Marxism soon discovers that the terms "socialism" and "communism" are interchangeable, and, for all practical purposes, mean the same thing. Lenin, in interpreting Marx, explains that "socialism" is merely an aspect or degree of "communism"; and vice versa. All communist ideological writers use the terms synonymously. Marx and Engels actually never attempted to define either word, and there is nothing definite in their writings that distinguishes one term from the other. Theoretic speculation attempts to make "socialism" respectable by separating the "evolutionary" from the "revolutionary" aspects of Marx's dialectics, meaning that socialism, as the highest order of social and economic development, emerges automatically and unassisted from the decayed and dying body of capitalism. The communist, on the other side of the Marxist coin—argue these "respectable" socialists—is the revolutionary—the blood-force-and-violence socialists; who contend that history requires a push now and then, and that the emerging socialist order is in need of a midwife—the "vanguard of the proletariat"—to kill off the old and succor the new. The "respectable" socialist also wants to believe in freedom for the individual and in "democracy"—and hence is caught on the horns of a dilemma, because freedom and "democracy" are incompatible with socialism. Compulsion is the vital ingredient in the socialist scheme of things so long as a substantial number of the people retain their individualities. The "planner" is always faced with the choice of inevitable failure, or the application of force. Unless the overwhelming majority of human beings are reduced to the intellectual level of the zombie in advance of the socialist state, force is required for his obedience. Hence socialism and communism, in spite of the Marxian apologist, is ultimately one and the same thing.

It will have been noted that the development of Marxism followed a similar evolutionary process. First the humanitarians, the utopians, the republicans, the democrats, the Saint-Simonians, the Christian Socialists, and, finally, the communists. Each group of advocates abandoned certain fundamentals as they trod the
pages of history, until Marx, in his frustration and hate, stood free of God and compassion. The modern socialist merely retraces the paths of history—but at an accelerated pace.

The phenomenon of communism is explained by social unrest and economic fermentation. No sane and honest person would endeavor to prove that we live in a perfect world populated by just and fair people. On the other hand no sane and honest person will contend that all men and women are evil, unjust and cruel. The development of economics, like the development of industry itself, has been uneven and erratic. The transition from the feudal system to the assembly-line did not take place overnight, although it came suddenly in certain industries and later in others. The “horseless carriage” did not immediately replace the horse-drawn vehicle, and whip manufacturing, carriage factories, and blacksmith establishments did a sharp business for several decades after the first wheezing automobile chugged down a dusty road. The industrial revolution, however, eventually crept into the consciousness of men, and the inequality of the distribution of wealth resulting therefrom ultimately captured their conscious. Moreover the inexorable law of economic supply and demand never ceased operating. When the skilled laborer suddenly realized that his box of hand-tools had been replaced by the machine-tools of industry, the world seemed to come to an end for him. As a “hand” on the assemblyline his labor, at first, counted for little. There were a thousand untrained applicants for a single job that did not require training. In these pains and tribulations of the birth of mass production it was the laborer and his family who suffered. The future was inscrutable and certainly bleak. A thousand necessary adjustments were ahead that would bring undreamed benefits to the workers, but, although they might be anticipated, they were little consolation for an empty stomach and a starving family. Nevertheless, these labor pains were transitory. With the full growth of mechanized industry the workman must necessarily achieve his greatest economic status. It is an inescapable fact that labor is the greatest consumer of the goods of industry. Labor must be economically able to purchase the products of manufacture, or industry goes out of business.

There were many men of the type of Robert Owen at the birth of the industrial revolution; men who were conscious of the hardship and distress of the displaced workers. These men were moved by the same compassion that moved Saint-Simon and they did what they could, within their means, for the alleviation of the deplorable conditions. There were others, of course, who saw not and cared not. But who, in his right mind, is willing to accept the sweeping indictment by Marx and his Jewish revolutionaries
that all Christendom was willing to crush the worker beneath the wheels of the new machines in order to squeeze out the last possible penny of profit?

It was the driving power of industrial revolution that Marx and his disciples sought to harness for their mental engine of destruction. If an Owen and a Saint-Simon sought to better the lot of workers, Marx sought to use them for his own purpose. Owen and Saint-Simon searched for practical means to solve a sordid problem; Marx sought sordid means to aggravate a practical problem.

The directional conduit, supplied by Marx and his followers, is the channel of "class consciousness." This term includes a number of connotations, chief among which is active, vicious naked hatred for bosses, landlords, capitalists, bourgeois governments and Christianity. Unless the proletarian is fully conscious of his "class" he is incapable of communist activity. Through this "class-consciousness" he strikes at the extant social order and helps usher in the "brave new world of socialism". The emphasis on class-consciousness creates the "vanguard of the proletariat"—the conscious will of the workers to free themselves from "wage-slavery". It is this "class consciousness" that gives evolutionary movement to the uninitiated masses, ultimately creating the revolutionary aspect of socialism. Conflict is the indispensable element of Marx's dialectic system. Against the thesis capitalism, is arrayed its anti-thesis—the class-consciousness of the proletariat. The resultant conflict produces the synthesis, socialism. This result is not immediate and the process must be repeated at every opportunity. Only a little socialism may be produced by a single conflict, but capitalism is weakened by every encounter, so that the inevitable result is assured. The same formula is applied by the Marxist theoretician to every social, political and economic relationship. The doctrine gives the movement a sort of inevitableness; a kind of predestination beyond the control of man or God. With the communist it becomes a "fixed" principle, or law of history that harnesses all mankind to the socialist chariot. The "conscious" socialist may become a casualty in the process, but he is convinced that the cause cannot be lost. Hence the emergence of the zealot—the fanatic.

The fallaciousness of this reasoning appears too obvious to deserve detailed analysis in a work of this kind. It should be noted in passing, however, that the assumed elements are present, though undefined. It is assumed that the conflict between capital and labor ultimately produces socialism. It is further assumed that socialism is better than capitalism. It is assumed that socialism abolishes "wage-slavery". It is assumed that collective ownership of the means of production abolishes "profit" and thus en-
riches the worker. It assumes many other un-named and undefined elements. In the first place the worker must necessarily work, whether he works for private industry, the state, or in a co-operative collectivity. It does not follow by any law yet conceived that the conflict between capital and labor must produce socialism. It may conceivably produce some economic system not yet known. The development of communism in Russia has not produced a single result "scientifically" deduced by Marx or his followers. Collective ownership actually means no ownership at all. What theoretically belongs to everybody cannot be any one's property. Ownership contemplates the choice of use, consumption and disposition of property. No one person may determine the use, consumption or disposition of property that belongs to everybody. Hence collective ownership is a fiction.

Carrying Marx's dialectic system a step beyond the Soviet result, we find that the machines of industry are owned by the state, and that the workers are still chained to them in "wage-slavery." As a result of achieved socialism the worker has lost his former right to bargain for his wages and to strike for better conditions. Because of the myth of "collective ownership of the means of production" the worker has no right to bargain with himself, and if he goes on strike, it is a strike against himself. So that he may be protected against such "unsocial acts" his socialist government has made these bourgeois activities "crimes against the people." Hence if the worker protests, endeavors to get more money for his services, or goes on strike, he is arrested, sent to a slave-labor camp, or shot. As these socialist conditions progressively get worse the Marxian dialectic process may conceivably be reversed. To the thesis, socialism, may be opposed the anti-thesis, the proletariat; and from the resultant conflict may come the synthesis capitalism. The assumptions in this analysis are no more absurd or unreasonable than the assumptions tacitly accepted by the Marxist.

"Collectivism" may be said to be the corner-stone of Marxism. The theory is neither strictly political, scientific nor economic. It is a new concept of society and social relationships. While the doctrine contemplates a tacit willingness on the part of mankind to merge its individual units into one homogenous mass, its practical application means that society is to become a vast conscription where every man and woman will have a place and number, like a soldier, a pauper or a convict. The underlying element of collectivism is the necessary dialectic negation of the individual, because socialism is utterly impossible in a society of individuals. In the beginning (propaganda stage) the humanitarian side is emphasized, while the atheistic aspect dominates. It is man standing in place of God reaching for man! In the clasped hands of collectivism the humanitarian and the atheistic
become solidified; allies against the enemy—capital and religion. After the destruction of the enemy the atheistic element destroys the humanitarian, because the humanitarian element cannot survive so long as it remains merely humanitarian. The source of socialist strength lies in this natural and self-impelled confraternity of collectivism. Having abandoned God and placed composite Man on the divine throne, man has no where to turn except to man. And he is actually afraid! No longer can he remain alone in the dark. No longer does he have the quiet courage of self-confidence. He must be assured and reassured and only his new god Man—and he needs many of them—can sustain him in his eternal fright. Whatever the sect calls itself—“socialist”, “communist”, “social democrat”, or what-not—confraternity becomes a matter of life and death. Whether the group be “Fabian”, “labor”, “new deal”, “cooperative”, the urge for confraternity is irresistible. These sects may criticize each other, but they close ranks in face of the common enemy. Even this confraternity is a fiction. The collectivity is the object of concern. Its units standing alone or in isolated groups are of no value and may be ignored or destroyed. Thus is created the “brotherhood of man”, characterized by the lack of a common father and the absence of the sentiments of brotherhood.

Only the overlord of the confraternity remains aloof in the final shown-down; remains aloof, because it alone is its own confraternity.

* * * * *

Thus, out of Jewry, the seven headed beast, whose deadly wound had been healed, had emerged a second beast with two horns—Communism and Zionism. Karl Marx and Moses Hess had not only created a two-pronged threat to Christianity and free men everywhere; they had jointly established Neo-Messianism—the conquest and domination of the world by the genius of Jewry itself. Where the pseudo-Messiahs had failed, Israel would succeed! Bar Kokba’s magic in blowing burning tow from his mouth was a simple trick compared with the flames that went forth from the mouth of Marx. The fires he kindled would sweep over Christian Europe, engulf the East and burn across the oceans until all Christendom was consumed. If Bar Kokba was able to hurl back with his knees the stones of the Roman engines, Marx’s magic would turn the Christian engines of war against Christendom. As Marxism wrought its havoc against the Gentile world, Hess’ Zionism would lead the Jews back to Palestine. Together Zionism and Communism would forge a world parliament from the broken Gentile nations and Israel would sit again in the ancient seat of power and rule the world! What Bar Kokba, Sabbatai, and all
the Jewish Messiahs were incapable of doing, Israel, as the chosen of Jehovah, would accomplish as a nation! The Age of the Jewish Messiah began with Hess' Zionism and Marx's Communism.

* * * * *
BEASTS OF THE APOCALYPSE

II

As long as Napoleon’s star of destiny burned brightly, the Rothschilds posed as great friends of the French and loyal servants of the Emperor. They lent money and delivered flour to friend and foe alike, while carrying on an illicit smuggling trade with England in violation of the French embargo.

When the Grand Duke Dalberg, in Frankfort, desired to go to Paris to do obeisance to Napoleon on the birth of his son, old Meyer Amschel, after the merchants of Frankfort had turned the Duke down, loaned him eighty thousand gulden at five percent so that he might make the journey. By thus placing the Duke under obligation Rothschild made him his man. There was no request that the Rothschilds might make thereafter that Dalberg would refuse.

Dalberg’s police commissioner, von Itzstein, in Frankfort, was a Jew. The commissioner, of course, was a particular patron of the Rothschilds, and rendered valuable services to them in their smuggling trade. Napoleon’s agents had caught old Meyer Amschel red-handed with contraband, and probably would have uncovered the vast extent of his operations had not Itzstein tipped him off in time. As it was he had to pay a fine of nearly twenty thousand francs for the merchandise uncovered.

Having placed Dalberg under obligation to him, Meyer Amschel proceeded to exploit him for the Frankfort Jews. Only five hundred Jewish families were tolerated by law in the city, and the Rothschilds were desirous of increasing their number. Dalberg, needing money, was susceptible to offers. He therefore permitted Meyer Amschel and his partner Gumprecht to persuade him to commute the annual sum of 22,000 gulden payable by the Jews into a lump sum, and grant them rights of citizenship in Frankfort, thereby making them the political equals of the Christians. As always, in such cases, the Jews demanded more than mere equality with the Christians; they wanted their own governing body. Of course Dalberg gave it to them. It became known as the Governing Body of the Israelite Religious Community. Police Director von Itzstein was the body’s first president. Dalberg, however, demanded that the commuted annual payment of 22,000 gulden be paid by a single payment of twenty times the amount. Meyer Amschel contribute 100,000 gulden himself and arranged that the Jews of Frankfort pay 150,000 of the 440,000 gulden immediately, and the balance in twenty-four bearer debentures.

“I should be most pleased,” Meyer Amschel wrote Dalberg, in
his peculiar German, "if I could be the first messenger of the good news, as soon as it has been signed by his Royal Highness, our most excellent Lord and great Duke, in our favor and that I can inform my nation of their great joy, will you graciously inform me of it through the post. I confess I abuse your goodness and grace, but I do not doubt that your Highness and your honored family have to await great heavenly rewards and will receive much happiness and blessing . . . because in truth our whole Jewry, if they have the happiness of obtain equal rights, will gladly pay with great pleasures all dues that the citizens have to pay."

The deal ultimately went through. The senate and the Christians of Frankfort were indignant. Rumors were soon circulated that the sum publicized did not take into account the money Dalberg received personally. It was well known that Meyer Amschel and his sons had been appointed official bankers to the grand duchy and that Meyer Amschel had been made a member of the Electoral College of Frankfort. A member of the Austrian Secret Police reported that Dalberg had personally received 32,000 karolins for his efforts on behalf of the Jews.

* * * * *

The citizens of Frankfort also greatly resented the transaction whereby the Jews of the city had been granted equal rights. Bribery for such rights was one thing; but bribery for special privileges was another, and feeling against Dalberg and the Jews ran high. Aside from these complaints, Jewish business methods were proving ruinous, not only to Christian bankers, but to Christian merchants as well. The fall of Napoleon restored Frankfort to the Hessians, and Baron von Hugel took over the civil administration of the city after the departure of the Grand Duke Dalberg. While the Jews had nothing to fear from Austria and Prussia, the Rothschilds were apprehensive that the rights and privileges purchased from Dalberg might not be included in the proposed new constitution for the city. The constitution itself was to be decided by the Vienna Congress, scheduled to meet on October 1, 1814. The Jews of Frankfort sent Bornes, Jacob Baruch and J. J. Gumprecht as their representatives to the Congress. These men were closely watched by the Viennese police, and finally ordered expelled. Metternich intervened, however, and the order was cancelled.

The Vienna Congress was the first of its kind to feel and experience Jewish pressure and influence on world affairs. Subsequent conferences were to be dominated by them and the course of history was to be altered by their efforts. The Rothschilds had contributed heavily to the funds furnished the Jewish representatives for their use at Vienna. The delegates made good use of
the treasure they carried. Where money and jewels were not
offered as ill-concealed bribes, they were disguised as “presents”.
Humboldt was presented with three magnificent emerald rings,
and four thousand ducats, which he refused. Frederick von Gentz,
Metternich’s secretary, however, had no such scruples and freely
permitted himself to be bribed. There were others.

News that Napoleon had landed on French soil March 1st gal­
vanzied the quibbling Vienna Congress into action. The German
Confederation was hastily formed. It consisted of thirty-nine inde­
pendent communities with a common government. Austria was to
preside over the Federal Diet of the confederation, whose seat was
to be Frankfort-on-the-Main. A constitution was sanctioned, and
all controversial matters, such as the Jewish question, were post­
poned until Napoleon was finally deposed.

Equal citizenship contemplates equal obligations as well as
equal rights. Men were needed in the final campaign against
Napoleon, who again was mobilizing the man-power of France for
a supreme effort. The two Rothschild brothers living in Frankfort
were called, with the other male citizens of that city, for military
service! They screamed “persecution” and appealed frantically
to brother Nathan in England. Nathan went to Herries. Herries
induced the Foreign Office to make representations to Herr von
Neumann, Austrian counselor of embassy in London. Neumann
immediately wrote to Baron von Hugel, Austrian plenipotentiary
at Frankfort:

“The English Government has requested me most particu­
larly to commend to your Excellency’s consideration the House
of Rothschild at Frankfort, which carries out the transfer of
our subsidies. This firm is represented by several brothers,
one of whom is established here, and is employed by the British
government in connection with all their principal financial
operations on the Continent. By reason of the confidence
which he enjoys, and the extensive nature of his operations,
both he and his brothers have incurred the envy of the Frank­
fort bankers to such an extent that an attempt has been made
to torment them by forcing them to do military service. As
the English government appears to be most anxious that this
firm should not be annoyed in any way, and as this appears
to be a matter that directly concerns our service. I felt that
I ought not to fail to transmit this request. I therefore ask
your Excellency to grant that firm every help and protection
that lies in your power.”

Baron von Hugel immediately sent the letter to Vienna, where
it was submitted to Metternich. The Rothschild brothers in Frank­
tort were not further “annoyed”, and did not see military service.

Count Buol-Schauenstein, Austria’s plenipotentiary and president
of the Federal Diet, took a dim view of Dalberg’s “deal” with the
Jews. “Trade,” he wrote, “is still the only means of livelihood
which the Jews adopt. This nation, which never amalgamates with any other, but always hangs together to pursue its own ends, will soon overshadow the Christian firms; and with their terribly rapid increase of population they will soon spread over the whole city, so that a Jewish trading city will gradually arise beside our venerable cathedral.”

James Rothschild was to make France his “Kingdom”. He was only twenty-two years old when he first arrived in Paris. He was extremely Jewish in appearance. His hair was red, his eyes deep-set; a wide mouth whose lips were eternally pursed beneath a prominent hooked nose—a combination that does not add up to attractiveness. He was almost servile in his mannerisms—a characteristic that disappeared in the coming years. He was to become the most powerful man in France—through monarchy, revolution and the republic!

Charles X learned little from the tragic history of the Bourbons. The ordinance dissolving the newly elected chamber of deputies before it had ever met, was published early in the morning of July 26, 1830. By its provisions new elections were ordered on an entirely different electoral basis, and, as usual, Paris went mad. The “portable” barricades were wheeled out and piled high in the principal streets, while crowds gathered everywhere. Shops and stores were plundered for weapons. Mobs marched through the streets. The windows of Polignac’s house were stoned and his carriage was smashed. By the 28th the revolution was well under way. Paris echoed with shouts and cries of “Down with the ministers! Down with the Bourbons!” Many sections of the Paris garrison of twelve thousand men, went over to the rebels. By the 29th the royal troops were forced back to Saint-Cloud, where Charles X awaited developments. He was prepared to revoke the ordinances, but it was too late. The Louvre and the Tuileries, which had been defended by Swiss troops, were stormed by the mob. The revolution was successful everywhere. On July 31 the king fled the country. Louis Philippe, of the House of Orleans, became his successor.

The revolution of July, 1830 was a revolution of the bourgeoisie—the well-to-do middle classes. While a few royal palaces and chateaux were sacked, there was very little damage to private property.

The Rothschilds, while having formed close and intimate connections with Charles X and his ministers, had not overlooked the House of Orleans. They had rendered financial aid on several occasions to the Duke, and thus had laid the ground-work for any eventuality. While Charles X and his ministers were hastily
racing for the closest frontier, the Rothschilds were already cheering for the revolution. Their allegiance to Charles X was shifted without effort to Louis Philippe. Feeling loyalty only to themselves and the Jewish nation, the Rothschilds were capable of appearing loyal to any Gentile government open to exploitation. James was immediately on hand to offer the new monarch the peculiar services of the House of Rothschild.

* * * * *

International Jewish finance, working through branches in foreign countries in the hands of close family relatives or associates, has always been handicapped by the nationalism of the several nations. Organized Jewry, scattered throughout the nations of the world, has been handicapped also by Gentile nationalism. Jewish organizations, whether they work in the field of finance, or in furthering the Zionist aspect of Neo-Messianism, are necessarily international in character, and strive incessantly for the destruction of national boundaries and Gentile nationalism. In its own circles, world Jewry works constantly for Jewishness, Jewish nationalism and domination of the Gentile world. Socialism, communism, and the revolutionary labor movement, Jewish led or dominated for the greater part, are also basically international. Analysis reveals that these Jewish movements are not so paradoxical as they appear at first glance. The uninformed merely see the surface characteristics, and, applying the results of experience and observation from a modern Gentile point of view, necessarily arrive at wrong conclusions. How can the Jews demand an international world order, and, at the same time, demand a separate and distinct nationalism for themselves? In the first place this is exactly the factual situation. They do demand an international world order for the Gentiles, and a separate, distinct and exclusive nationalism for themselves. The reasons are obvious. Jewish nationalism—as the sons of Abraham—is the basic principle of Judaism. The truth of this statement is one of the outstanding and uncontroversial facts of history. World domination by Israel is decreed by Jehovah. By bringing all the nations of the world under the authority of a world government, Israel may dominate by controlling the world parliament. As the Rothschilds and their Jewish brethren have controlled the several nations through the power of the purse, they intend to more rigidly control the world's Gentile population through a single World Government. Working through foreign, independent governments is tedious, time-consuming and expensive. The control of the power and force of a single governmental agency would channel Jewish will and finance expeditiously, instantaneously, and inexpensively.

Many forces, working from many sources, are necessary when
the thinking, customs, traditions, and freedoms of the world are to be completely changed. Religious faiths must be either utterly smashed or rendered completely ineffective as a resisting element. The ends of education must be altered to serve the new order rather than the individual, and brain-washing must replace mental enlightenment. Insofar as compulsory physical slavery has always ended in successful revolt, voluntary physical compliance should result in complacent contentment. Individuality despises regimentation, whereas collectivity glories in its fraternity and interdependence. Occasional rebels are best dealt with as "mentally ill" persons, rather than as intelligent "criminals". There is no resentment against authority when the political leader is taken away by kindly attendants in white coats. The mob will not consciously follow a "leader" who has been diagnosed as insane. Pride, dignity, family—these are dangerous ideas in a collective world order. Communism may be depended on to eliminate these potentials among the proletariat, while "progressive" education and integration of the races will eradicate them among the bourgeoisie. Pride in nationality, race and color will disappear after a generation of interbreeding, so that the universal brown-man will feel neither inferiority nor superiority. Such a world will be easy to control, particularly if its people can be made to believe that they willed it so.

Their fabulous command of unlimited supplies of money broke down all barriers for the Rothschilds. The dazzle of great wealth increased their social prestige everywhere. The powerful and the great, kings, princes and premiers sought their favor. They built palaces and entertained the "right people" with a royal magnificence that shamed the state affairs of monarchs. The world was at their feet, and the cause of Jewry in Europe was in its ascendancy.

James Rothschild’s palace in Paris was always open to the communist Heinrich Heine. The Jewish poet had broken all bonds with Germany and had established permanent residence in Paris in May of 1831. Heine's father had known the Rothschilds, having been constantly engaged in financial matters with them, so that Heine's intimate association with James was probably the renewal of an old acquaintanceship. The Jew, Ludwig Borne, also living in Paris, was in contact with Rothschild. Borne suggested that it might be well for humanity if all the kings were uncrowned and the Rothschilds placed on the thrones of the world. He (January 22, 1832) that Louis Philippe would be crowned in Paris, in Notre Dame de la Bourse, with Rothschild acting as archbishop. Thus Louis Philippe would not be crowned by the Pope, but by a Jew.

James Rothschild continually helped finance Heine, although
the latter apparently felt that he was not quite as generous as he should have been. Heine, the communist, looked upon Rothschild as a potential revolutionary and believed he (Heine) would one day come to see him as one of the “greatest”—a founder of modern “democracy”. “Herr von Rothschild,” he wrote, “was one of the first to perceive the worth of Cremieux . . . Similarly he at once appreciated Louis Philippe’s political capacity, and he was always on the most confidential terms with that great master of statescraft. Herr von Rothschild alone discovered Emile Pereire, the Pontifex Maximus of railways . . .”

In April of 1840 a Damascus priest, Father Thomas, and his servant disappeared. Foul play being suggested certain Jewish suspects were arrested who confessed to murdering the priest and his servant. World Jewry immediately protested venomously declaring that the Jews were innocent; that their confessions had been made under torture. James and Solomon Rothschild immediately brought their tremendous pressures to bear upon their various governments. James secured the cooperation of the French monarch, and Solomon induced Prince Metternich of Austria to take action. The Austrian Consul von Laurin protested to Mohammed Ali, reporting directly to James and Solomon of his actions. The French consul at Damascus, however, being on the scene, took an altogether different view of the murder and the defendants, and, the political situation being acute, Louis Philippe dared not risk unwarranted support of the Jews against the Christians. James’ letter to Solomon is of considerable importance. It clearly reveals the behind-the-scenes methods employed by the Jews in pressuring governments and molding public opinion. The letter follows:

“My efforts have unfortunately not yet produced the desired result. The Governments are acting very slowly in this matter; in spite of the praiseworthy action of the Austrian Consul they do not wish immediately to recall our Consul, because the matter is too remote, so that public interest has not been sufficiently aroused about it. All that I have so far succeeded in doing is, as is briefly stated in the Moniteur today, to arrange that the Vice-Consul at Alexandria should be instructed to investigate the conduct of the Consul at Damascus; this is, however, only a temporizing measure, since the Vice-Consul is under the Consul, so that he has no authority to call the latter to account for his actions.

“In such circumstances the only means left is the all-powerful method here of calling in the newspapers to our assistance, and we have accordingly today had a detailed account, based on the report of the Austrian Consul, sent in to the Debats and other papers, and have also arranged that this account shall appear in similar detail in the Allgemeine Zeitung of Augsburg. We should certainly have published Herr von Laurin’s letters to me on this matter, had we not felt that this should
only be done after previously obtaining the permission of his Highness Prince von Metternich.

“For this reason, my dear brother, convinced as I am that you will gladly do your utmost in defense of the just cause, I would beg you to request the Prince in his kindness to authorize the publication of these letters. The gracious sentiments of human feeling which the Prince has expressed with regard to this sad episode cause us confidently to entertain the hope that this request will not be refused. When you have received the desired permission, I beg you, my dear Solomon, not immediately to publish the letter in the Österreichischer Beobachter alone, but also to be so good as to send them immediately, with a short covering letter, to the Augsburger Zeitung, so that they may reach the public through that medium also.”

Prince Metternich, while bartering Austria away with Solomon Rothschild, nevertheless recognized the Frankenstein he was helping build in Europe. “By reason of natural causes which I cannot regard as good or as moral,” he declared in a moment of alarm, “the House of Rothschild is a much more important influence in French affairs than the foreign Office of any country, except perhaps England. The great motive force is their money. People who hope for philanthropy, and who have to suppress all criticism under the weight of gold, need a great deal of it. The fact of corruption is dealt with quite openly, that practical element, in the fullest sense of the word, in the modern representative system.”

What he said about the House of Rothschild in Paris, he could have said with equal accuracy about the House of Rothschild in Vienna.

* * * * *

Revolution swept over Sicily in January of 1848. Waves of excitement stirred the populations of the great cities of Europe. Disorders spread to Naples. In Paris the red flag was unfurled over the barricades. Jewish revolutionaries led the workmen and the students into the bloody revolt February 22, 1848. Guizot resigned. The troops attacked the revolutionaries on the barricades, stirring the populace into a frenzy of excitement. On the 24th the national guard and line regiments went over to the rebels. The seventy-four year old Louis Philippe fled the country. Marx and Engels were taken by surprise. Their theories had promised an early upheaval, but they were not quite prepared for the sudden and unannounced explosion. The Communist League in London, in probable anticipation of Marx's immediate assumption of dictatorial powers over the proletariat, hastened to transfer its powers to Brussels. Marx and Engels made ready to set out for Paris in order to take personal charge of the revolution. In anticipation of the necessity of quick and decisive action, the central committee was dissolved and Marx was entrusted with full revolutionary powers. The meeting was held in Marx's house.
The comrades had just passed the resolution bestowing dictatorial powers on Marx, when the Brussels police raided the place. Marx and his wife were arrested and they spent the night in jail. They were ordered out of Belgium the next day. They went to Paris.

Lamartine and Arago asked the Jewish banker, Michael Goudchaux, to accept the revolutionary portfolio for finance. The banker accepted. Caussidiere, the barricade prefect—a former journalist on *La Réforme*—asked James Rothschild for a loan for the purpose of paying his revolutionary aides. James happily complied.

The varied socialist sects of Paris were aroused to wild activity. Louis Blanc clamored for official adoption of the red flag as the national emblem, and for the immediate establishment of national workshops. Proudhon demanded “the organization of credit and speculation,” and loudly condemned all ideas of state-socialist experiments. Bakunin screamed for more blood-shed. Everybody sang the *Marseillaise*, shot off fire-crackers, and set up “trees of liberty” in the boulevards. The foreign revolutionaries formed themselves into “legions of liberty” to fight in their respective countries. A *German legion* was organized, Wilhelm Liebknecht being one of its youngest volunteers. Herwegh, who led the *German Legion*, invaded Germany and his “legionnaires” were cut to pieces in the course of the Baden fighting.

Marx arrived in Paris on March 4, 1848. He immediately organized a new “central committee” consisting of himself, Engels, Wolff, and the members of the London central committee who had also managed to get to Paris. Marx drafted a new manifesto entitled the “Demands of the Communist Party in Germany.” It contained seventeen points. Agitators were dispatched to Germany to stir up revolt—Wolff went to Breslau, Schapper to Nassau, and Stephan Born to Berlin.

In the beginning of April Engels and Marx left Paris for Germany, where the flames of the revolution had preceded them. The *Holy Alliance* had crumbled in the smoke and flame of Vienna, and Prince Metternich had fled the City on money borrowed from Solomon Rothschild. Baden, Wurttemberg, and Bavaria felt the terror of surging hatred as the revolutionaries carried fire and death through the streets of these cities.

And then the storm started to abate. Authorities began calling for tranquility, law and order. Foreigners in Paris became suspect. The excesses of the communists created a reaction against them. The atmosphere in Germany did not offer much hope for the revival of the “*Rheinische Zeitung*”—the project Marx and Engels contemplated when they left Paris—but it was finally launched on June 1, 1848 in Cologne as the “*Neue Rheinische*
Zeitung”—the first communist newspaper, although it called itself the organ of the “Democrats”. In addition to Marx and Engels the staff consisted of Wilhelm and Ferdinand Wolff, Ernst Dronke, Georg Weerth, Ferdinand Freiligrath, and Heinrich Burgers.

A great open-air meeting was held in Cologne at which Heinrich Burgers voiced the policy of the “Neue Rheinische Zeitung.” A second public meeting, with greater attendance, was held in a field near Worringen-on-the-Rhine. Here the Jew, Ferdinand Laselle, leader of a revolutionary group from Dusseldorf, met Engels for the first time. Marx, dodging the authorities in fear of deportation, was not present at the meeting.

Schapper, Moll and Herbert Becker were arrested. Publication of the “Neue Rheinische Zeitung” was officially prohibited. Wolff went to the Palatinate. Engels hurried to Barmen to destroy his seditious correspondence file, and, with Dronke, went on to Brussels, where they both were arrested. After being escorted over the French frontier, Engels stayed a short time in Paris, and then went to Switzerland.

On October 6, 1848, the blood-thirsty mob in Vienna murdered the war-minister Count Latour. His corpse was hung stark naked to a lamp post, where the mob entertained itself by continuing to insult and beat it. The first mob casualty was a Jewish revolutionary named Heinrich Spitzer. Jews led the revolt everywhere. The first revolutionary parliament in Vienna (and later in Kremsler) contained five Jewish deputies.

Marx, who had now met Lasselle, stayed in Cologne and continued to publish the “Neue Rheinische” in defiance of the order of suppression.

The counter-revolution moved slowly but confidently. In October Vienna fell and on November 9th Robert Blum was shot by a firing squad. Lassalle was arrested in Dusseldorf. Marx was tried before a Cologne jury on February 8, 1849. He was acquitted. Lassalle was acquitted in Dusseldorf. Marx continued with the “Neue Rheinische”. He now called for a revolutionary war against Russia.

The last edition of the “Neue Rheinische Zeitung” was dated May, 1849. The government, in the exercise of its police power, suppressed it and ordered Marx again deported.

Present at the Cologne congress of the “democratic” party was Karl Schurz and Gottfried Kinkel. Schurz has given posterity the following picture of the Jewish revolutionary leader:

“Marx was then a man of thirty, and was already the recognized chief of a socialist school. He was sturdily built, with a broad forehead, raven-black hair, a huge head, and dark, sparkling eyes, so that he attracted general attention. I had been told that he was a man of great erudition, and since I knew very little of his social and economic discoveries and
I was eager to hear the words of wisdom that would, I supposed, fall from the lips of so celebrated a man. I was greatly disappointed. What Marx said was (unquestionably) weighty, logical, and clear. But never have I seen any one whose manner was more insufferably arrogant. He would not give a moment's consideration to any opinion that differed from his own. He treated with open contempt every one who contradicted him. Arguments that were not to his taste were answered, either by mordant sarcasms upon the speaker's lamentable ignorance, or else by casting suspicion upon the motives of his adversary. I shall never forget the scornful tone in which he uttered the word 'bourgeois', as if he were spewing it out of his mouth; and he stigmatized as 'bourgeois', by which he meant to imply the embodiment of profound moral degradation, every one who ventured to contradict him. It is not surprising that Marx's proposals were rejected; that those whose feelings he had wounded by his offensive manner were inclined to vote in favor of everything which ran counter to his wishes; and that, far from winning new adherents, he repelled many who might have been inclined to support him.

James Rothschild gave Ledru-Rollin seven hundred and fifty thousand francs in support of the 1848 revolution. It is said that he was compelled to do so under Ledru-Rollin's threat to burn the Palais Rothschild in the Rue Lafitte.

In the three days street-fighting in June of 1848, Louis Eugene Cavaignac emerged victorious. He immediately assumed dictatorial powers and was nominated president of the council of ministers by the National Assembly. By the free use of large sums of money Rothschild ingratiated himself with the new power in France, and was as much at home with Cavaignac as he had been with Louis Philippe. It was soon said that he was as good a republican as he had been a monarchist.

The French Workers' Party claimed him as its own. The editor of the radical Tocsin des Travailleurs wrote:

"You are a wonder, sir! In spite of his legal majority Louis Philippe has fallen, Guizot has disappeared, the constitutional monarchy and parliamentary methods have gone by the board; you, however, are unmoved! . . . Where are Arago and Lamar-tine? They are finished but you have survived. The banking princes are going into liquidation and their offices are closed. The great captains of industry and the railway companies totter. Shareholders, merchants, manufacturers, and bankers are ruined en masse; big men and little men are alike overwhelmed; you alone among these ruins remain unaffected. Although your House felt the first violence of the shock in Paris, although the effects of Revolution pursue you from Naples to Vienna and Berlin, you remain unmoved in the face of a movement that has affected the whole of Europe. Wealth fades away, glory is humbled, and dominion is broken, but the Jew, the monarch of our time, has held his throne . . . "

Rothschild's old friend, General Theodule Changarnier, was
recalled from Algiers and made commander-in-chief of the National Guard of France.

Ferdinand Lassalle (1825-1864) was the son of Heymann Lassel, a prosperous Jewish silk merchant. Lassalle became a lawyer in Germany, practicing at Dusseldorf. He met Heine in Paris in 1845. As a result of his revolutionary activities in 1848 he served six months in prison. From his first meeting with Marx in 1848 he became an ardent and clever revolutionist. He was charged with moral complicity in the theft of a jewel case. He was convicted of the charge but the judgment was reversed on appeal.

Lassalle is regarded as the founder of the German Socialist Democratic Party—a political name that henceforth would mean the Communist Party to the initiated. In a very real sense Lassalle also may be said to be the father of the modern labor movement. He founded the Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein (General Labor Union of Germany), and became its first president. The Jewish Encyclopedia observes that "he was hated and denounced as 'the terrible Jew.'" His disciples were Bernard Becker, Vahlteich, Dammer, and Bebel.

Helene von Donnigesen (or Donniges) was Jewish on her mother's side. She was the wife successively of the Romanian boyar Racowita, the actor Siegwart Friedmann, and the writer Serge von Schewitsch. Lasalle met Helen in 1862 and planned to marry her. Her father strenuously objected, and Helen became engaged to Janko von Racowita. Lassalle promptly challenged both the father and Racowita to a duel, which the latter accepted. At first shot Lassalle fell mortally wounded and died three days later. He was buried in the Jewish cemetery at Breslau.

Lassalle had collected funds for Marx and his fellow exiles in London. He and Engels were the only two communists of importance who remained completely loyal to the disagreeable dictator Marx through the strife and poverty that overwhelmed him in 1849 and 1850. Freilegrath, however, did what he could. He was able to secure a commission for Marx to write articles for Horace Greeley's New York, Tribune every two weeks at one pound per article. Although Marx's name appeared on the articles and he collected the money for them, Engels did most of the writing. Lassalle, in 1855, secured another writing job for him as London correspondent for the Oder Gazette, a "progressive" periodical published in Breslau.

While Marx starved in London on the little money Engels was able to give him, Lassalle soared to popularity in Germany. His exploitation of the "working class" found growing support among
the laborers, and Lassalle made the most of the unrest and discontent of the day.

When William, brother of King Frederick William (who had just died) came to the throne, he issued a general pardon for the revolutionaries of 1848. While this general pardon restored most of the insurrectionists to full rights of citizenship, it did not help Marx because he had long since voluntarily abandoned his Prussian citizenship. Lassalle insisted that Marx come to Berlin so that he might petition the government for restoration of his citizenship or for re-naturalization. Engels supplied the money and Marx went to Germany. Lassalle met him at the railway station in Berlin and insisted that he stay at his home pending the legal proceedings. Meanwhile, he secured another job for him as London correspondent for the Presse, a Viennese newspaper. Lassalle’s efforts on behalf of Marx’s citizenship were unsuccessful and Marx was compelled to return to London.

The frustration that Marx suffered would be hard to describe. The political party he had created in Germany had slipped out of his hands. By an ironic fate he had no legal right to remain in the land of his birth—a right he had tossed away as worthless. Lassalle remained in supreme command of his revolutionary forces, while he again sullenly walked off into exile. As the years went by Marx’s frustration turned to bitter envy, which in turn grew into a brooding hatred for Lassalle. Thereafter, in characteristic bitterness, he referred to his Jewish disciple as “Izzy” and “Baron Izzy”.

* * * * *

Revolutionary socialism had originated in the Jewish mind and its effective leadership remained in Jewish hands. Marx, “the Moor”, although in exile, remained the recognized head of the movement and the oracle of theoretic determination. His Communist Manifesto was the handbook of communist theory and action throughout the socialist world. Ideas of “democracy”, in terms of majority rule as applied in ancient Greece, became restricted when coupled with “socialism” in the minds of its adherents after 1848. The “Socialist Democratic” parties of the several countries were neither “social” nor “democratic”. The underlying principle was the ultimate destruction of all opposition parties and the establishment of “the dictatorship of the proletariat”—a monolithic organization that made new theories, or the modification of Marxist theories, an unpardonable crime against the “proletariat”. A “centralized” sort of democracy—“democratic centralism”—rapidly developed. The rules were decided in congresses by the accredited delegates and thereafter became the unquestioned law of the parties. The dogma of Marxian theory superseded dissent or revision. The “deviationist”, or “revision-
ist”, the individual thinker—these “heretics”—suffered the ancient ban or excommunication of the synagogues with a vengeance. Until the communists had the power to sentence the culprit to death, his isolation from society was more complete than the old rabbinic bans. “Mass exposure” and the organization of mass hatred against the culprit became the approved method. Thus the communist or socialist parties developed under Jewish discipline in the atmosphere of secret societies.

Jewish workers, impressed with the Jewish origin and the Jewish leadership of the socialist movements made up the first important cells of communist political organizations in Europe. To this center came the Christian proletariat—drawn first by its envy, hate, greed and frustration, and attracted by the old promise of “a land flowing with milk and honey”. The pseudo-Christian laborer was not troubled with theories—he was to be moved only by plausible arguments that satisfied his baser emotions. Those he was to destroy and dispossess were the “exploiters”, the “bosses”, the “landlords”, the “authorities”, the governments—the combined bourgeoisie—the thieves of the profits of labor. The Church had to be destroyed because “religion is the opium of the people”; it lulled starving and oppressed people to sleep with promises of plenty in the hereafter, while the “bosses” and the “ruling class” grew fat in the present. These deluded Christian supporters of the Jewish onslaught on Christianity and civilization applauded such fiery harangues of stark, vicious hatred, and did not look ahead to tomorrow nor stop to inquire of the kind of world these Jewish agitators intended to build. And, indeed, here was the crux of the dilemma and the tragedy of the hoax! There was no plan for that brave new tomorrow!

In all of Marx’s insane theories of destruction there is no announced plan of reconstruction! What kind of a state did he contemplate? No one had an answer and few paused to inquire. Bismarck, demanding the suppression of the socialist organizations of Germany, raised the question in a speech on the floor of the Reichstag. “If only I could find out,” he said, “what the future state which Herr Bebel and his comrades envisage it like! We can only catch glimpses of it through the cracks. None of these gentlemen has been willing to enunciate a positive program. If every man has to have his share allotted to him from above, we arrive at a kind of prison existence where everyone is at the mercy of the warders. And in our modern prisons the warder is at any rate a recognized official, against whom one can lodge a complaint. But who will be the warders in the general socialist prison? There will be no question of lodging complaints against them. They will be the most merciless tyrants ever seen, and the rest will be slaves of these tyrants.”
No one replied. The revolutionary “scientific socialism” of the Jewish dictator exiled in London had no goal; no destination; described no objectives! In it are contained detailed blue-prints for sanguinary battles on the barricades; minute formulae for deceit, trickery and cunning; stirring battle-music for hate—but no place to rest when the butchery was done and the world destroyed. Marx’s apologists aver that his function was to analyze; not to prophesy; yet to analyze is to prophesy—at least to sketch the inferences and deduction necessarily indicated by the analysis. The statement is false, of course, because analysis alone does not contemplate a rigid course of action. As a “natural historian” of the course of capital one must of necessity be the prophet of its trend. And Marx was, in fact, the prophet of its trend. He said “capital” would be destroyed; that, indeed, it was its own grave-digger!” In its place would stand socialism! And socialism? Common ownership of the means of production and the objects of consumption! Just this and nothing more! Once he had a vision of the future as he paused to cleanse his tortured mind of the bloody path his proletarians would blaze through the world. “Let us imagine,” he wrote in his first chapter of Das Kapital, “an association of free men, working with common means of production, and putting forth, consciously, their individual powers into one social labor power. The product of this association of laborers is a social product. A portion of this product serves in turn as means of further production. It remains social property. The rest of this product is consumed by the members of the association as a means of living. It must consequently be distributed among them. The nature of this distribution will vary according to the particular nature of the organization of production and the corresponding grade of historical development of the producers” Only this, and nothing more! Reminiscent of “pilpulism” of the Talmud, it is a dim, faltering light—out of which came the Soviet Union.

What attracted Christian labor to Jewish Marxism? In the first place the overwhelming majority of its recruits did not know any more about its origins or its meaning than they do today. They were caught in the flamboyant slogans of the movement and carried along in the confraternity of Lassalle’s labor unions. They were caught by the overtones of “democracy”, “equality” and “freedom”. The tide was strong and it was moving out to sea.

All political movements are evolutionary. This evolution is both objective and subjective. No political movement adopts political doctrines by chance. Every political movement exists in terms of need, desire, or basic lack among its potential adherents before it takes form as a party organization. This does not mean, of course, that the political doctrines exist; but only that discon-
tent and dissatisfaction are extant to which proposed political doctrines may apply. The "party" comes into existence to give the movement expression, promising to enable it to achieve what it could not accomplish as an unorganized and undirected mass. The objective of all political parties is *power*. The political drive for power is only as strong and as constant as the interpretation of the *emotional* content of the mass by the political leader. Few political movements ever made much of an impression on history solely by cool, calculated reason, morals and ideals. Such a political party is necessarily unselfish and fair, and may only promise such intangibles as liberty and justice. Compared with the communist promise of the division of the world's wealth, the honest political party has very little to offer. The position of the political leader generally is that of an *interpreter*. The most successful political leader is not necessarily the most accurate interpreter. Unrest and discontent may be harnessed to several different types of chariots. The statesman, it is said, looks to the next generation, while the demagogue is only concerned with the next election. If men have abandoned God and morals they will not be moved by *God and morals*. While immediate demands and objectives may vary from time to time a living political movement varies little from its basic moral principles. The successful political leader, whether he be sincere, an opportunist or a demagogue, recognizes the desires, greeds, needs, bias and prejudices of the adherents of a movement, and gears his leadership to a vocal expression of those sentiments. He remains a leader of the movement so long as he is capable of expressing these sentiments.

Marx and Lenin recognized these obvious principles of political movements. They also recognized that an appeal to *base passions* is a stronger lever in such movements than appeal to lofty ideals. Those who have little or nothing of the world's goods may be moved to *justified collective thievery*, where they might never be stirred by lectures advocating self-improvement and virtuous conduct. "You have a world to gain, and nothing to lose but your chains" suggests that the "slaves" revolt and help themselves to the world's wealth. Individually a "slave" may not take what does not belong to him. If he does it means a jail sentence, if not a hanging. Collectively theft is suddenly justified; it becomes a mob-approved virtue!

Political movements are only possible where there exists *opposition movements*. If there was no opposition there would be no need for a political movement. And opposition movements mean *conflict*. The socialist movement is highly unique in that it is in opposition to *all* other existing political movements. Its objective is the destruction of *all of them*. Its objective is, in fact, more than that; it is determined to destroy the entire extant social and
economic system. It is a great deal more than political in the modern acceptance of the term. In essence it is Marx's theory of historical materialism—all history is merely the record of the deadly conflict between the workers and their masters. Thus Marx, the political leader, interprets the need and the greed of the revolutionary movement and chains it to his war-chariot of destruction. In the final analysis his system is more a declaration of war against all humanity than a "political" party. It is the only theoretic system ever conceived that is designed for the destruction of all opposition and the complete enslavement of its own members.

Men have rarely, if ever, made political parties. Great events, more often than not, create movements of one kind or another. Given an event, a class of men associated with the event, and a leader, and you have a political movement and a party. In Marx's time men were still talking of the Reign of Terror of the great French Revolution. During his own life the revolution of 1830 had shaken Europe, although it was a "bourgeois" revolution. The long and determined warfare against Christianity had taken its toll. Doubt and gross materialism stalked everywhere. The rabble of France had enthroned "Reason" and cast down the Cross of the Savior. The industrial revolution had created poverty, hunger and misery in the hovels and tenements of the poor. Hate, envy and distress filled the minds and bodies of great masses of men everywhere. It was said that the Utopians and Christian "socialists" had failed because they had remained steadfast in belief in God and the principles of the Church. The brooding, sullen mind of Marx, haunted by the ancient formulas of Talmudic logic and particularly aware of the fertile soil at his disposal, gradually conceived a new and sinister motor-power for political action. With the amoral abandonment of his Jewishness in relations to all Gentiles, he coupled his native cunning with Machiavellian deceit, and gave the "working classes" his "Communist Manifesto". The fact that his system offered no objective—no model state—is no mere oversight. It is an integral part of the plan.

Communism appeals to the failure, the lost, the unredeemable. Those who suffer from a sense of deep inferiority and frustration are solaced by the thought that they are the "victims" of some sort of system or exploitation. The failure is characterized by his unwillingness to confess his own shortcomings. When his hatred is directed against the supposed cause of his frustration, he becomes whole in his own self-esteem, and ruthless in his desire for vengeance. Communism produces an unconscious drive in its adherents to reduce mankind to a common denominator—the movement it produces becomes a leveling process, and its yardstick is mediocrity. It follows that Marxism had little difficulty in re-
It should be noted that while Marx's "scientific" socialism is designed for the so-called "proletariat"—the penniless laborer—Marx, his disciples and the movement's Jewish leaders all came from the hated bourgeoisie—the well-to-do middle class. This was true in the beginning, and, with amazingly few exceptions, has remained true throughout. The force for the destruction of Christendom—the unskilled rabble of the world—has, at all times, remained in the hands of the bourgeois Jewish intellectuals.

The Christian capitalist free-enterprise political parties of the world have been in retreat since the close of the First World War. They have fought a few rear-guard actions, and have surrendered fortress after fortress without having fired a shot. Their time-tried maneuvers and tactics have proved less and less effective with each passing year. They have been losing on every front for the very simple reason that they do not know, or refuse to acknowledge they know, where the front is located. By some strange spell of hypnotism they are afraid to name the enemy. Stupid shadow-boxing is about all the fighting these once gallant parties are now capable of staging. While posing as great supporters of "free enterprise", they scuttle their own ships with "drills" from the Communist Manifesto. While crying out against the "menace" of "Communism" they embrace its twin-brother, "Socialism". While lambasting the evil of the Jew Marx, they open their arms to two million of his Khazar brethren from the lands of the Jewish Socialist Bund. While denouncing Gentile aggression against Gentile nations they lend a hand and cheer Jewish aggression in Palestine. While orating about "independence" and patriotism on the 4th of July, they welcome an international parliament for World Government on the sacred soil of national independence. While mouthing the principles of Christ they forbid the singing of Christmas carols in public schools because the Jews are offended by such "Christological" manifestations! In a word, they have become Judaized!

Meanwhile the Jews control the means of communication, education, the press, entertainment, and the economic power to stifle and destroy all opposition to their plans for world domination through World Government. Marxism supplied the psychological formula that permits clever men to harness the socialist movement to their particular transmission-belt for their own purposes, and at the same time, to firmly entrap the movement in the iron meshes of its own net. Moreover, for the first time in history, the "clever men" are left free of the entangling web, so that in the end they will occupy positions of unassailable tyranny. For these reasons, among others, the socialist movement is admirably
adapted to corrupt control. The old political parties in opposition are equally corrupt, but the result of such corruption differs materially from the corrupt control of the socialist movement. Whereas Marxism is distinguished by its utter lack of morality, opposition parties are founded on morals. Corruption taints that which is moral, but leaves no impression where morals do not exist. A blob of black on a surface of white is plainly seen. A blob of black on black is hardly noticeable. Thus the black mark on the moral organization is a victory for the socialist.

If the Jewish socialist movement is to be countered, a new political movement must stir the hearts and minds of the non-socialist, Christian masses of the world. Anti-communists exist in great numbers, but this is not enough. Communism in all its Marxian socialist aspects must be rejected. Christians, of all sects and denominations, must forget old quarrels and join hands in a new Crusade for the preservation of Christian principles. As long as Christianity remains divided, its sects may be dealt with easily and at will. Perhaps it will take a world-shaking event to create a new Christian union. Perhaps its institutions must be broken and shattered before an unconquerable remnant arises to lead a new crusade for Christ, country and freedom.

One thing is certain. Unless Christian common sense prevails over the chaos that befuddles the world, the last of the Christians may again assemble in the catacombs of some abandoned ruin to await the coming of another Constantine.

Most of the anti-communist leaders of our time are failing in their struggles against Marxism because they lack either the courage or the knowledge necessary to the task. Those who know and understand the real problems involved are silenced by personal ambition and the devastating lash of the tongue of the opposition. The most capable are rendered ineffective by the subtle corruption of self-interest, or the paralyzing fear of being labeled a reactionary and an “anti-Semite”. Hence, the carefully chosen language of the modern politicians. The old cliches merely refurbish the empty platitudes, and the essence of their pompous harangues is compromise. The tired old parties, either running away, or adopting the platform of the socialists, plead only for the privilege of placing their candidates in public office. Their campaigns have become gigantic give-away programs, in which each party endeavors to out-bid the other in socialistic promises. Their economic, social and political doctrines, torn, soiled and bespattered with socialist offal, fail to rally the betrayed patriots of a forgotten day. Only the dejected veterans of ancient political wars listen with nostalgia and despair.

The greatest casualties in the socialist wars have been in the ranks of Christianity. The assaults against the citadel of God and Christ have been the most continuous and the most effective.
Christianity, of course, stood in the first line of battle. As long as it held firmly, godless socialism was powerless. But once the ranks of Christendom were penetrated, socialism rushed in to exterminate its institutions and its culture. Because of its international character and objective, the conflict of nations—particularly Christian nations—is the meat on which it feeds. Every war since 1848 has advanced the cause of Zionism and its brother, Communism. Marx established the principle and Lenin and Trotsky made it a party doctrine. World War I gave birth to the Soviet Union, established a “home” for the Jews in the Holy Land, dismembered Europe and launched the first attempt for World Government—the League of Nations. World War II established the Soviet Union as a world power, gave her a billion new subjects and a slice of Europe, created a nation for the Jews in Palestine at the expense of the Arabs, further dismembered Europe, and brought the United States into the orbit of the League of Nations under its new name—the United Nations. In addition, it destroyed the British Empire, launched the United States into world imperialism, and set the stage for World War in—possibly the last great war, Armageddon!

The divorce case of Countess Hatzfeldt was a cause celebre in Germany. Lassalle won it for her and made himself financially independent. For some unexplained reason the law suit became a symbol of the “struggle” between “liberalism” and “reaction”. Lassalle rigorously followed the Marxist “line” and remained steadfast party member. In 1856 he sent Marx thirty pounds and wrote “you have no friend in Germany but me”. Marx’s wrath was beyond control and he informed Engels that he was certain Lassalle was attempting to steal the fruit of his labors. Engels, always Marx’s champion, exploded: “The Jew! A typical Jew from the Slavic border, always ready to exploit everyone for his private ends. This mania for forcing his way into distinguished circles and making a successful career, at the same time concealing, with all kinds of hair oil and make-up, the fact that he is nothing but a greasy Jew from Breslau, has always been repulsive to me.” (March 7, 1856.)

Lassalle worked industriously in Germany attempting to have Marx’s “Critique of Political Economy” published. When the first part of the first volume appeared—and failed to be acclaimed—Marx blamed Lassalle.

In 1862 Lassalle visited Marx in London. Marx and his wife laughed at him and ridiculed his plans. Lassalle came to the conclusion that Marx did not like him. Nevertheless he gave him fifteen pounds in cash and sixty pounds in promissory notes. Marx showed his “gratitude” in his report to Engels. “That guy,” he wrote, “would rather throw his money in the gutter than lend it.
to a friend.” A little later (July 30, 1862) Marx decided that Lassalle was a “Jewish nigger”. “It is perfectly obvious from the shape of his head,” he wrote, “and the way his hair grows that he is descended from the negroes who joined Moses on the journey out of Egypt, unless perhaps his mother or his grandmother had relations with a nigger.”

* * * * *

In 1863 Lassalle announced the founding of the “General German Workers’ Association”. He called it a “party”. He was hailed everywhere as the king of the proletariat. He traveled throughout Germany preaching Marxism. He had organized the first socialist working-class party in the world.

Bismarck declared war on Denmark in 1864. Marx received rumors in London that the royalist Bismarck was in contact with Lassalle. William Liebknecht was requested to stay in Berlin and spy on Lassalle, which he did, reporting to Marx faithfully. Liebknecht has become “our governor-general in Germany” said Marx with satisfaction. In order to more carefully protect Marx’s rights in Lassalle’s communist activities, Liebknecht joined the Workers’ Association.

When news came of Lassalle’s death, Marx heaved a sigh of relief and relented. “Lassalle’s fate has given me pause,” he wrote Engels. “He was after all one of the old guard and an enemy of our enemies. It is hard to believe that such a noisy, restless, pushing fellow is as dead as a doornail, and from now on has to keep his mouth shut forever.” He wrote a warm tribute to Lassalle, and tried to succeed him as the head of the Workers’ Association. Being unsuccessful in this effort, he turned his attention to the First International as the surest means to world revolution.

In 1864 the International made its first public appearance. It dispatched a letter of congratulations to Abraham Lincoln on his reelection to the office of President of the United States. The message was acknowledged. “The difference between Lincoln’s answer to us,” Marx informed Engels, “and to the bourgeois had made such a stir here, that the clubs in the West End simply do not know what to make of it.”

Odgers, leader of the shoemaker’s union in London was the president of the First International from its inception.

* * * * *

William Liebknecht was Marx’s life-long friend and disciple. Of the eight people who stood at Marx’s grave in the cemetery at Highgate, one was Liebknecht, who had traveled from Germany to pay the man of hate this last honor. Like the majority of communist leaders Liebknecht did not belong to the proletariat. He had a university education. He became a revolutionary in Paris in 1848. He was a fugitive from Germany until 1862, spending the intervening years in Switzerland and England. His long
intercourse with Marx hardened his communist orthodoxy. He became one of communisms most effective polemists. He converted August Bebel, the Saxon woodturner, to Marxism. When Schweitzer fell heir to Lassalle’s Workers’ Association, Liebknecht and Bebel, heading up Marx’s wing of the International, led the fight against it. It was Liebknecht and Bebel who organized the Democratic Workingmen’s Party at Eisenach in 1869. In spite of all that Marx and his faithful disciples might do, Lassalle’s party gained ground. In 1875 the two parties merged at Gotha. Liebknecht’s party had nine thousand members, and Lassalle’s had fifteen thousand. Communism had grown in Germany. The meeting at Gotha adopted the first program of the United German Social Democracy. Although Marx and Engels were ignored, the economics of the program were thoroughly Marxian in theory, and only slightly influenced by the teachings of Lassalle and Schultz-Delitsch in practice. The political part of the program included the demands of the Democratic Workingmen’s Party adopted at Eisenach in 1869.

* * * * *

Paul Singer, a German Jewish clothing manufacturer, became a member of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. He was elected a member of the Reichstag in 1884 and became associated with Liebknecht and Bebel.

The deep fatalism of Marxism is clearly manifest in Liebknecht’s speech on the floor of the Reichstag, April 2, 1886. “I will tell you this,” he cried. “We do not appeal to you for sympathy. The result is all the same to us, for we shall win in one way or another. Do your worst, for it will be only to our advantage, and the more madly you carry on the sooner you will come to an end. The pitcher goes to the well until it breaks.”

In July, 1886, nine socialist leaders, including Bebel, Dietz, Von Vollmar, Auer, Frome and Viereck, went on trial at Freiburg, charged with participation in an illegal organization. They were found guilty and sentenced to imprisonment for terms varying from six to nine months.

* * * * *

Marx’s ponderous and almost unreadable Das Kapital at last made its appearance in 1859, the year in which Darwin’s Origin and his followers, the English Chartists, Proudhon in France, and of Species was published. Adam Smith, Ricardo, Robert Owens Rodbertus in Germany, had all previously developed the theory of “surplus value”. Marx, having stolen the basic ideas of the Utopians, “turned Hegel on his head,” purloined his “dialectics”, usurped the “materialistic” ideas of Feuerbech, filched the extant “surplus value” theories, stirred the mess vigorously while cursing the assorted authors of the brew, and served up the unsavory result as “Marxian scientific socialism”.

What he tried to say may be roughly summed up as follows:

(1) Labor gives value to all economic goods. The laboring class is the producing class, but it is deprived of its just share of the products of its labor by the capitalist class, which appropriates "surplus value".

(2) This is possible because of the capitalist method of production; private capital controlling both the processes of production and distribution.

(3) Private capitalism is the result of a long and laborious process of evolution, precipitated suddenly by the industrial revolution.

(4) The industrial age is characterized by anarchy in distribution, private production, gradual disappearance of the middle-class, development of a two-class system, and the rich growing richer and the poor growing poorer.

(5) The industrial age cannot long continue, because monopoly capital merging production, will narrow the opportunities of employment. It will then soon become so powerful as to be unendurable. Then society—the other class, the starving proletariat—will appropriate private capital and the means of production, and thereafter all production and distribution will be socialized.

Karl Menger, the Austrian economist, was probably the first to demolish Marx's theory of "surplus value". It is now considered thoroughly discredited. His "materialistic" conception of history may be easily refuted by any bright school boy who missed indoctrination through "progressive" education. It must be remembered that this "materialistic" concept of history is the very heart of Marxism. Shorn of the validity of the "surplus value" theory, the economic side of Marxism collapses completely. The answer is within reach of any reasonably intelligent person. If observation does not report an ever decreasing number of capitalists and an ever increasing number of poverty-stricken workers, then "surplus value" disintegrates in a puff of smoke. Since the publication of "Das Kapital", the number of capitalists and middle-class well-to-do have increased at an incredible rate, while the poorest paid proletarian in the United States lives better than Marx ever lived on Engel's money.

Marx left more than the "Communist Manifesto" and "Das Kapital" to his followers. He left a bitter invectiveness, flaming hatred, and a will to violence that never before was transmitted so successfully to posterity. He infused his philosophy with the driving vitality of fatalism. The faceless proletarian he created was in his own image; a composite of two thousand years of Marxian rabbis. The fiery life he breathed into his tortured creation permeated its every fiber with a burning desire to die on the barricades.
Capitalism will be its own grave-digger, and there will be no need for shovels in the socialist future! Just this and nothing more! The “materialistic” interpretation of history—perhaps history itself—must end when capitalism has finished digging its own grave. And even Marx’s fine system of dialectics must fall to the ground in his brave new socialist world. Never again will it be necessary to search for an antithesis because communism will be the last and final synthesis. One might as logically reason that the law of gravity ceases when the apple hits the ground.

Marx left no program except war and revolution. The “brotherhood” he founded was mothered by Envy and fathered by Hate. Because he believed he had destroyed God, he would play God himself, and Lassalle would be his prophet. Because he failed to leave directions for the road to the Worker’s Paradise, his followers in a hundred sects were free to chart their own course. Between the wars with the “capitalists” the “comrades” might cut each other’s throats just to keep in practice, but they would ultimately fight shoulder to shoulder on the barricades against the common enemy.

Meanwhile socialism spread throughout the world. In June of 1881 Henry Mayers Hyndman (1842-1921) published England for All. Although he did not mention his name, Hyndman’s book was predicated on Marx’s main ideas on the relationships of capital and labor. Marx’s reputation in England was not very good and Hyndman was fearful that the mention of his name might prejudice Englishmen against the theories his book expounded. He did, however, state in the preface that “much of the matter contained in chapters two and three” was the work “of a great thinker and original writer” whose works, he hoped, would soon be accessible to the majority of Englishmen. Thus, for the first time, Marxism was introduced into the minds of men by means of the psychological Trojan Horse.

Simultaneously with the publication of his book, Hyndman founded the parent organization of the Social Democratic Federation, which, in 1911, became the British Socialist Party, with Hyndman as chairman. The Federation, in its early days, included, besides Hyndman, William Morris, the poet; Ernest Belfort Bax; Eleanor Marx, daughter of Karl; Walter Crane, the artist; Henry H. Champion; Harry Quelch, editor of the Federation’s paper, Justice; and Helen Taylor, step-daughter of John Stuart Mill.

At the time of World War I, the British Socialist Party was badly disrupted, and many of its member became open communists. Hyndman reorganized its remnants under the party’s original name, the Social Democratic Federation, in 1920. Hyndman is very important in the development of socialism in England. His later works brought the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lassalle,
and other revolutionary writers to the attention of the English speaking world. (His organization made a Marxist out of Bernard Shaw, who went into Fabianism and became a creator of the Labour Party.)

Karl Johann Rodbertus (1805-1875) and Charles Brook Dupont-White (1807-1878) (the last named a Frenchman), are recognized as the precursors of what was to become known as “Socialism of the Chair”. Adolph Wagner, of Berlin, became the “scientific” leader of this school of socialism. Gustave Schmoller, Brentano, Adolph Held, Schaeffle, and other scholars from German Universities were members. In 1871 Herr Offenheim, in the National Zeitung referred to some of these professors as “Katheder Sozialisten” (“socialists of the chair”). This name was accepted by Professor Schmoller in his opening address at a gathering in Eisenach in 1872. A considerable movement was thus launched in Germany which led to the formation of the Union for Social Politics.

“Socialism of the Chair” is unquestionably the school that Franklin Roosevelt’s “Brain Trust” attempted to emulate, both in philosophy and method. The professors of the “chair”—like the “Brain-Trusters”—saw the state, in spite of itself, moving toward socialism. As government seeks to regulate private business, it necessarily gradually absorbs it, so that, in the end, there is only state business. As a matter of practical politics the members of the school of “Socialism of the Chair”—like Roosevelt’s “Brain-Trust”—opposed violent or sudden change, and looked forward to a slow, but certain, evolution toward improved conditions. “We preach,” said Schmoller, “neither the upsetting of science nor the overthrow of the existing social order and we protest against all socialistic experiments . . .”

Schmoller, Wagner, and the others exerted great influence on Bismarck, who adopted much of their program. In putting many of their proposals into law Bismarck believed that he was undermining the social democratic movement, and thereby strengthening the state—the first great fallacy in combatting Marxism. The social legislation of the seventies and eighties in Germany was the result of the influence of the “Chair” on the Iron Chancellor. From this development came the idea of “state socialism”. Like the Christians, who sought to strengthen Christianity by adopting socialism, Bismarck sought to strengthen Germany by adopting Marxism. Both the Christians and Bismarck hoped to weaken the Jewish revolutionary movement and both ended by weakening Christianity and free governments.

Marx died in London in March of 1883. A few months later a
small group of people met in a bare room somewhere in Chelsea.
London, to listen to an American, Thomas Davidson, expound his
ideas of "Fellowship of a New Life". Out of this meeting came
the English Fabian Society, organized on January 4, 1884—just
thirty-six years after the publication of the "Communist Mani-
festo". Although the immediately expected revolution predicted
by Engels in 1844 had not materialized, and British industry had
expanded into a world monopoly, the Fabians were not to be dis-
couraged. They adapted themselves to the bettered conditions
when immediate hope of revolution had dimmed, but consoled
themselves with the pious belief that it must come eventually. In
time they came to believe that the transition from capitalism to
socialism was a gradual process, accelerated at times by wars and
insurrections. Pursuant to this reasoning, they adopted the fol-
lowing: “For the right moment you must wait, as Fabius did, most
patiently, when warring against Hannibal, though many censured
his delays; but when the times comes you must strike hard, as
Fabius did, or your waiting will be in vain and fruitless.” The
Fabians thus embarked on a "waiting policy", prepared to strike
hard when the enemy—the government—was weak. They were a
little confused on their history, as one of their members, H. G.
Wells, pointed out. The Roman General, Fabius, never did strike
hard. Wells might have added—and probably did—that Fabius
just wore Hannibal out, by never engaging him in a pitched battle
that he knew he could not possibly win.

In 1887 the Fabian Society adopted a set of principles, which,
with but few modifications, are in effect today. They declared
that the Society consists of socialists; works for the abolition of
private property in land, and aims at the reorganization of society.

Bernard Shaw became a Fabian in September of 1884. With
characteristic pompous vanity, he later wrote in the minutes of the
first meeting he attended in May of that year: “This meeting was
made memorable by the first appearance of Bernard Shaw.” Sidney
Webb and Sidney Oliver joined the Fabians in 1885. Other mem-
bers were Graham Wallas, Annie Besant, Hubert Bland, H. W.
Massingham, Edward R. Pease, H. H. Champion, Percival Chubb,
William Clarke, H. G. Wells, Beatrice Potter Webb, Ramsey Mac-
Donald, Pethick-Lawrence, Sir Leo Chiozzo-Money, Keir Hardie,
G. D. H. Cole, and many others.

The Fabian Society allegedly never had a president and no person
or group of persons have ever admitted that he or they acted
as its official spokesman. Some seven essays or lectures by Ber-
nard Shaw, Sidney Webb, William Clarke, Sidney Oliver, Graham
Wallas and Annie Besant are believed to express the Society’s
philosophy.
On February 26, 1871, the preliminary Peace of Versailles was signed. Thiers, Jules Favre, and Alfonse Rothschild had concluded the financial negotiations, and had accepted Bismarck's conditions for the surrender of Alsace-Lorraine and the payment of five billion francs. Alfonse Rothschild guaranteed, jointly with the other bankers, the financial operations.

On March 11, the Emperor William and the German general staff left Versailles. As soon as the German troops had evacuated the southern forts, the National Assembly moved from Bordeaux to Versailles, where it first convened on March 20, 1871.

The Social-Democrats—the Parisian communists—had allied themselves with Marx's International Workingmen's Association, founded in 1864. The revolutionary organization was generally referred to as the International, and, after the creation of subsequent Internationals, it became known as the "First". Its first congress was held in 1866 in Geneva, Switzerland. Its basic purpose was the unification of the workers of all lands for the purposes set forth in the "Communist Manifesto". The most effective result of the work of the First International was the spreading of communist doctrines among the workingmen of the world. The last congress of the First International was held at Philadelphia in 1874.

The International, of course, was dominated by the Jews. In addition to Marx, who also acted as secretary for Germany and Russia, there was James Cohen, the secretary for Denmark. Neu­mayer was the secretary of the office of correspondence for Austria. Fribourg was one of the directors of the Paris Federation of the International, of which Loeb, Lazare and Armand Levi were members. Leon Frankel headed the German division at Paris. Many of the Jews affiliated with the International were to play leading roles in the bloody Commune.

The National Guard of Paris, was composed of left-wing ele­ments and under the domination of the communists. Under guise of rescuing them from the German troops, the National Guard carried off twenty-seven cannon. After the departure of the Germans they took many more cannon—417 in all—and planted them on Montmartre. Louis Adolphe Thiers, the new premier, ordered General Vinoy to seize the cannon and crush the Guard. Vinoy's soldiers revolted and went over to the communists.

A "Central Committee" of the National Guard was set up, and an election of a commune was called on March 26th. A heavy "red republican" and socialist majority was the result. On April 2nd Thiers bombarded Paris. A communard counter-attack the next day was repulsed. The civil war continued until Thier's troops took Fort Issy and Fort Vanves, and finally breached the wall at Porte Maillot and Auteuil on April 22nd. Some of the
members of the Commune fled. Another group massacred sixty seven hostages in its hands, and held out against Thiers until the capture of Fort Vincennes on May 29th.

The Paris Commune was the first communist government in Europe. All Church property was confiscated; the Churches were plundered. Advances of several millions of francs were secured from the banks and wealthy individuals still in Paris. The Archbishop of Darboy and a number of priests, together with other prominent persons, were arrested by the Commune and sent to Mazas, as security for the safety of the National Guards captured by Thiers’ Versailles troops. The Archbishop and the other prisoners were ultimately shot. On May 20th the Commune resolved to drench all public buildings and whole districts of the city with petroleum and set them on fire. The Tuileries, Palais-Royal, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Justice, police headquarters, the City Hall, theatres and whole districts were burned.

Alfonse Rothschild, of course, withdrew with the government to Versailles, and took a room in the Hotel des Reservoirs, where he lived through the terrors of the revolution. Throughout the fighting, looting and burning, the Rothschild house and its priceless possessions remained untouched. As always before, the House of Rothschild emerged from the hazards of the war of 1870-1871 and the Paris Commune, financially unshaken and still the undisputed masters of Europe. Again they were capable of switching their allegiance from the monarchy and bestowing it with equal devotion on the Third Republic.

Alfonse Rothschild, who was James’ eldest son, died on May 26 1905. His son, Eduard, succeeded him as the head of the French bank. Alfonse’s brother, Edmund, was to be distinguished by his zealous Zionism, and his support of the Jewish colony in Palestine.

Marx was enthusiastic over the bloodshed in Paris. The Communards were “our heroic Parisian party comrades”, and the Paris Commune was “intellectually a child of the International”. He accepted the moral responsibility for the Commune, to the disgust and indignation of the world. “If only the Commune had listened to my warnings!” Marx lamented to Professor Beesly, insinuating that he was a military expert as well as the infallible “dictator of the proletariat”.

The final days of fighting, when the hostages, including the Archbishop of Paris, had been shot down in cold blood by the Communards, shocked decent people everywhere. Archbishop Affre had been killed between the lines in the June fighting and Paris had been set on fire. Marx was exultant, and though his “fame” spread everywhere as the “monster” who had let loose the murderous cut-throats of Paris, he strutted like a peacock before the
members of the *International* in London. He launched into an
eulogy of the “immortal heroes” of the Paris barricades. “When
the *Paris Commune* took the management of the revolution into
its own hands,” he declared, “when plain workingmen for the first
time dared to infringe upon the governmental privilege of their
‘natural superiors’ . . . the old world writhed in convulsions of
rage at the sight of the red flag, the symbol of the republic of
labor, floating over the Hotel de Ville.”

Georges Clemenceau, leader of the “bourgeois leftists”, came into
prominence at the close of the Franco-German War. He was joined
by the socialist “leftists”—including sections of Marx’s *International*
in opposition to the “Capitulards” (the Versaille government under Thiers). He was to dominate the Peace Conference
at Versailles at the end of World War I in 1919.
DEBATNOW, the Jewish historian, declares that the doctrine of socialism grew with the nationalistic ideology of Zionism—"on a parallel line"—thus expressing what every careful student of the subject must necessarily conclude. Moses Hess, the "communist rabbi", and the Zionism of the Jewish Socialist Bund, is ample proof of this fact. Both philosophies are Jewish in origin and development. The Jewish intellectual leadership of the world's revolutionary movements has always been particularly characterized by its emphasis on Jewish nationalism and its exclusiveness, as distinguished from its attitude toward the internationalism of the Gentile "comrades". Internationalism, of course, is the ultimate goal of Marxism, and while this world objective is preached and practiced by its Jewish leadership, it is quite clear that the contemplated destruction of Christian and Gentile nations must leave the Jewish nation intact and separate. While this Jewish policy has split the communist movement ideologically on a number of occasions—particularly in Russia—both the supporters and the opponents of Zionism are united on basic Marxian doctrines and the necessity for international agitation and revolt.

At first glance, it would appear that this dual Jewish objective—an international leveling process for the ultimate consolidation of all non-Jewish nations into a single communist World Government, and the preservation of the Jewish nation as the dominant world power—might create a powerful trap from which the Jews, in a final struggle, would be unable to extricate themselves. Jewish tacticians, however, have no fear of this possibility. The "indestructibility" of the Jewish nation, its amazing elasticity in adapting itself to new conditions, and the ingenious "know how" in dominating governments, removes any fear of being entrapped in its contemplated World Communist Government. Two thousand years under emperors, monarchies, republics, tyranny and benevolence, have steeled the Jews in their will to survive as Jews, and to fulfill their exalted destiny. To their age-old techniques of bribery, revolt and flattery, they have added the modern devices of propaganda, brain-washing, and mass hypnotism. With their ancient seat of power restored in Palestine and an incipient World Government in the making, they believe that the star of their destiny is rising. The power of their purse is, indeed, terrible, and the forces of their revolutionary proletarians most formidable. If the free people of the world do not willingly submit to their world empire, then it may be necessary to unleash a third world war
with its atomic and hydrogen arguments. The very dual character of their drive for world conquest is the basic secret of their escape from the world trap they are building. From the outset they have declared "this is not for us. We are a separate nation. We will remain so. We have given you communism; destroy yourself! The law will go out of Zion."

Hess' "Borne and Jerusalem", not only laid down the "historic and economic" basis of what would be known as "Zionism", but outlined a complete Trojan Horse plan for the Jewish invasion of Palestine. In "diplomatic" language the plan is called "colonization". In practical warfare it is a "time bomb". It contemplated a gradual Jewish occupation of the land of the Arabs; migration of Jews from the lands of their birth to the Holy Land for the ultimate purpose of driving the Arabs out of their homes. These proposals found enthusiastic response among the Khazar Jews of Russia.

The Cabalistic activities of the small Jewish settlements at Safed and Tiberias attracted the Cabalistic Jews of Russia and Galacia. Some few migrated to Jerusalem, but most of them were attracted to the two cities of Galilee. Their numbers in Palestine were negligible at the beginning of the "colonization" period. Sir Moses Montefiore, Adolph Cremieux and Soloman Munk, who had journeyed to see Mohammed Ali on behalf of the Jews who had confessed to murdering Father Thomas, became interested in the plight of the Jews in Syria. After the massacre of the Maronite Christians in 1860, Adolph Cremieux, together with other prominent Jews, founded the Alliance Israelite Universelle (Alliance of International Jews), which had as its chief objective the defense of Jews in any part of the world. "All other important faiths are represented in the world by nations," declared the founders, "that is to say, they are incarnated in governments especially interested in them and officially authorized to represent them and speak for them alone. Our faith alone lacks this important advantage; it is represented neither by a state nor by a society, nor does it occupy a clearly defined territory." Hence, the Alliance's proposed drive for world power was disguised as protection of Jewish "faith".

The purpose of the international Jews to surreptitiously capture Palestine and dispossess the Arabs is ill-disguised in a letter written by Charles Netter to the Central Committee of the Alliance at Paris: "You are preparing an asylum for whole populations," he advised, "who perhaps tomorrow will be forced to flee en masse because of the fanaticism of the Greek victorious over the crescent... You will accomplish the pacific conquest of this sacred land—neither Orthodox nor Reformed has forgotten it—the Supreme Being was invoked by our fathers, while the rest of the world was plunged in paganism... In this wise you will gain
the Holy Land. The magnitude of the task need not frighten you. That which appears to be a revery today may tomorrow become a reality."

Neo-Messianism was aborning. What had heretofore been expected by way of the powers of a miraculous Messiah was now to be accomplished by Israel itself! In "Emunah Yesharath" (1860), Rabbi Hirsch Kalischer declared that new interpretations must be given the old ideas, and that the Messianic idea can become a fact only in the slow processes of historic events. His work marked a complete break with the past, and called for positive action. Hess, emphasizing the social and economic, and Kalischer emphasizing the religious, created the zeal that galvanized Russian Jewry into action.

With the birth of Neo-Messianism came an enthusiastic interest in the Hebrew language, now dead these many years. Behind the sudden interest was the fine hand of the Jewish psychologist. Language is a prime requisite to national development. Outside of the synagogue Hebrew was practically unknown. The Khazars of Russia and Poland spoke the strange admixture of languages called "Yiddish", the Jews elsewhere spoke the languages of their adopted countries. If one is to have a nation, one must have a language. So it was that the study of Hebrew, particularly among the young, became an important adjunct to Zionism. Societies were established everywhere, text-books were written, and Jewry turned to the study of the ancient language with vigor and enthusiasm. In Palestine, where the "colonizing" Jews spoke the languages of their birth, Hebrew lived again as a common language.

The cruel, cold-blooded murder of Czar Alexander II on March 1, 1881, created an intense Russian resentment against the Jews. Goldenberg's confession had verified—if verification had been necessary—the wide-spread Jewish determination to destroy all constituted authority. It was estimated that not less than twenty percent of the terrorists were Jews. The government's attempts to cope with the assassinations and bombings were further aggravated by Jewish riots in Kiev and elsewhere. The exodus from Russia and Poland to the United States had actually started in 1880, but a number of Russian Jews also migrated to Palestine. World Jewry condemned Russia's efforts against the subversive Jews as "anti-Semitism", and distorted the government's measures against them into "atrocity", propaganda to step up the "colonization" plan in Palestine.

Alexander III never fully recovered from the horror of his father's assassination, and the impression of that terrible day in 1881 haunted him for the remainder of his life. He was inclined
to follow his father's liberal policy and to carry out many of the reforms he had contemplated. Russia's long and unsuccessful efforts to deal with its unassimilable Jews were uppermost in the new Emperor's mind. Every idea of conciliation was necessarily associated with the subversive movements that brought terror into the life of Russian officials. The overwhelming number of Jews involved in murders and other crimes was appalling. The Jewish problem was inseparable from the revolutionary problem. Desperate times called for desperate measures, and the so-called "May laws" were adopted. The Jews were forbidden to settle outside the towns and villages, even within the territories which they were permitted to inhabit. In 1887 the city of Rostov-on-Don was excluded from the *Pale of Settlement*. In 1891 seventeen thousand Jews were deported from Moscow: Jewish quotas were established in governmental institutions and, with a few exceptions, Jews were excluded from governmental service. Russia was determined to "Russianize" its Jews or drive them from the country.

The history of the Jews discloses a singular fact that repeats itself with amazing regularity throughout the centuries. We read time and time again of thousands of Jews being deported from Alexandria and other places, only to read a little later that the place is teeming with Jews. Hence, without explanation, when we return to Moscow the town will be populated with more Jews than before.

Leo Pinsker came to the conclusion that the destruction of Jerusalem had deprived the Jews of a seat of government, and that they needed its restoration so that they might deal with the Gentiles as an established nation. He therefore called for *self-emancipation*. His book, "*Autoemancipation*", (he believed), was the answer to "anti-Semitism". Pinsker's ideas found expression in the *Zionist Congress*, the *Jewish Colonial Trust*, and the *National Fund*.

Moses Lob Lilienblum, born in 1843 at Kovno, had been active in the *Haskalah* movement, and he had been deeply engrossed in the materialistic philosophies that had swept across Europe into Russia. The vigorous counter-attack of Alexander III against the Jewish revolutionaries convinced him that a firmly established base of operations was essential if the Jews were to survive their attacks on Christianity. He supported the proposal of Haym Gedaliah to buy Palestine from the Sultan, and threw himself wholeheartedly into the "*Hibbat Zion*" ("Love of Zion") movement. He became the secretary of Pinsker's new society, inspired by "*Autoemancipation*". He wrote "*Return of the Exiles*". He was not much impressed with the exodus *en masse* of the Jews for America. He came to the conclusion that such immigration would merely create a Jewish question in the United States. From this
train of thought came his book "Rebirth of the Jewish People in the Holy Land of Their Ancestors" (1883).

Dr. Isaac Rulf, of Memel, followed in the footsteps of Pinsker. His book, "Arukat Bat Ammi" ("The Healing of My People"), carried the Khazar Jewish philosophy of Zionism to European Jewry. Yishub Erez Yisrael (the Resettlement of the Land of Israel) gripped the Orthodox Jews of Frankfort-on-the-Main and Berlin, rearousing the ancient dream of the Messiah and the promises of the Covenant.

Asher Ginzberg (who wrote under the name of Ahad ha-Am), brought vitality to Chovevi Zion. In "Derek ha-Hayyim" ("The Way of Life") he emphasized Israel's "mission" and the preparation that was necessary to its attainment. He proposed a sort of "central committee" or society, that was to be "untrammeled in its activities" and selected for its "quality" rather than its numbers. He was calling for "leaders"; a sort of general staff—to lead the Israelites back to the promised land. "Lishkot", or lodges were organized in many Russian cities, and the society took the significant name of "Bene Mosheh" ("Sons of Moses"). Out of these efforts came the Rehobot colony in Palestine, the Carmel Wine Company, the publication society Ahiasof, and the Hebrew magazine, Ha-Shiloah. In 1874 a first attempt was made to establish a Jewish agricultural colony in Palestine. In 1882 Jewish immigrants from Russia and Romania settled at Rishon Le-Ziyyon and Wadi el-Hanin in Judea, Rosh Pinnah in Galilee, and Zikron Yaakob in Samaria.

It is said that Baron Edmund de Rothschild spent between sixty and seventy million francs in financing early colonization of the Jews in Palestine. In 1889 he made a gift to the Palestinian Jews of whatever interest he still retained in the Jewish Colonization Association. In 1907 the "colonies" were surrendered to the colonists together with the burdens of self-government.

Theodor Herzl wrote the "Judenstaat" ("Jewish State") in Paris in 1895. Although this work was to give Zionism its real impetus, the doctrines set forth were not new. It incorporates the basic ideas of Jewish writers from Hess to Asher Ginsberg. The society Kadimah in Vienna, founded by Nathan Birnbaum in the eighties had long been imbued with Jewish nationalism and Neo-Messianism. This society immediately supported Herzl's views and proposed a "Society of Jews" to carry on the plan set forth in "Judenstaat". The English Jew, Israel Zangwill, became interested in Herzl's ideas, and arranged for Herzl to address the Maccabaeans in London. Herzl accepted and made the address July 6, 1896. The first edition of "Judenstaat" appeared in Vienna the same year.

In May of 1896, a secret emissary of the Turkish Sultan, the Chevalier de Newlinsky, was sent to Herzl with the offer of a
charter for Palestine in return for the ending of the European press campaign against the Sultan because of the Armenian difficulties.

* * * * * *

The *Jewish Encyclopedia* states that socialism in Russia “became a movement of the Jewish masses.” The Jewish labor movement developed in stride with both Zionism and communism. The first Jewish labor organizations came into existence in the eighties in Lithuania—in Vilna, and other cities, and, as there were no labor association in Russia or Poland, the Lithuanian movement appears to be the first. Its recruits came from Jewish working-men engaged in handicrafts. In the nineties the movement spread to the manufacturing centers of Lithuania and Poland—Bialystok, Smorgen, Warsaw and Lodz. The first strikes for fewer hours, wage increases, and working conditions followed. Jewish intellectuals, many of whom had received university educations abroad, and had been attracted to revolutionary doctrines, guided the labor movement along the lines of European social “democracy” as established by Marx and Lassalle, thus creating the ideological background for the Russian revolutionary movement.

* * * * * *

Two important Jewish organizations were created in 1897. One was the *Jewish Socialist Bund* or *Jewish Labor Federation of Lithuania and Poland* (Judischer Arbeiter-Bund von Littauen und Polen), and the other was the *World Zionist Organization*. The first organized for the destruction of all Christian governments, and the second organized for the conquest of Palestine and the world!

The *First Zionist Congress* was held in August, 1897, in Basel, Switzerland. The Congress declared: “The object of Zionism is to establish for the Jewish people a publicly and legally assured home in Palestine”. This terse statement asked no favors; offered no petition to the Palestinian Arabs; begged leave of no one! It made the demand as a matter of right! Moreover, it demanded that the world recognize and legalize that right. At the outset the movement was political, but its claim to Palestine was rooted in Jewry’s Neo-Messianism, which is the essence of Judaism. The underlying purpose of the Zionists became more and more apparent as alternative offers from sympathetic Christian governments for a “home” in other parts of the world were spurned. *Nowhere but Palestine! Nothing less than Zion!*

A Jewish settlement in El-Arish, a strip of territory south of Palestine under Anglo-Egyptian administration, was certainly available, but it was refused. The Portuguese Republican government offered a tract of land in Angola in 1912. The British government offered land in East Africa, but the Zionists were not interested. *Only Palestine was Zionism!*
Behind the ideas of Moses Hess, Leo Pinsker and Theodore Herzl was the Covenant, a deep, ingrained sense of race superiority, and the ultimate destiny of the Sons of Abraham. The propaganda, for Gentile consumption, did not deceive the Zionists. Had they been sincere in a desire for a “home”, anyone of the proposed lands would have sufficed. The refusal of these offers reveals the Neo-Messianism behind the movement.

* * * * *

On the partition of the Roman Empire in A. D. 395, Palestine fell to the Empire of the East. For more than 200 years thereafter the country enjoyed a pastoral peace. The restless, intriguing Jew was gone, and a quiet serenity lay over the ancient land. Christians from all over Europe made difficult pilgrimages to worship at the sacred places where the Savior had walked, healed the sick, and taught the way to salvation for all mankind. Palestine was then part of Syria.

In A. D. 611 the peace of the Holy Land was broken by the thunder of war, as the armies of Chosroes II, King of Persia joined by the Jews, invaded Syria. They swept over the country like devouring locusts, plundering and destroying everything in their path. Jerusalem was taken. The Church of the Holy Sepulcher was razed to the ground, and its treasures carried off in triumph. Not a church or a cross was left standing in the land.

The Emperor Heraclius reconquered the lost territory in 628, returning it to the Byzantine Empire.

Abu Bekr, who succeeded Mohammed, gathering the tribes of Arabia, carried the crescent into the fertile province of Syria. Heraclius was defeated in his very first engagement with Abu Bekr. Bostra fell and the Moslems marched on Damascus. Abu Bekr died before the siege of the city, but it fell to his successor, Omar, seventy days later (A. D. 634). Caesarea, Sebusteh (Samaria), Nablus (Schechem), Lydda and Jaffa fell under the onslaught of the Mohammedans. Meanwhile Heraclius gathered a new army and again marched against the Arabs (636). At the Yarmuk River, battle was joined and Heraclius' army was utterly defeated. Omar marched on Jerusalem, which capitulated after a feeble resistance.

The Crusades! Then the Mongolians of Central Asia! The Christians and the Moslems of Syria united to hold back the common enemy—overwhelmed and defeated! Palestine under the Mameluke sultans of Egypt. The invasion of the Tatar tribes—and finally the Turks! Sultan Selim the Grim wrested the land from Egypt...

This is the land the Jews claim as their own! Four thousand years ago Jehovah said: “Unto thy seed will I give this land . . .” And Jewry contends that Jehovah promised that the Jews would return to Palestine, and that this promise will be fulfilled because of its divine origin. The Jews well know that this prophecy was
fulfilled over two thousand years ago! Only the Christians seem to have forgotten it.

Alfred Guillaume, Professor of Old Testament Studies at the University of London, writing in his treatise, “Zionists and the Bible”, demolished the Jewish claim to a second return to Palestine. Writes the Professor:

“... such views are a distortion of Old Testament prophesies which predicted a return from Babylon and from all the lands whither the Jews had been exiled. The Jews did return to Judea, they did rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, and they did rebuild the temple; and after fluctuating they did secure a brief period of political independence and expansion under the Maccabees. Thus the prophecies of the Return have been fulfilled, and they cannot be fulfilled again. Within the canonical literature of the Old Testament there is no Prophecy of a second return from the Babylonian Exile.”

No Christian may possibly accept the Jewish claim to the Holy Land without repudiating the basic theme of Christianity. St. Paul in Galatians, 3:24-29 makes this point crystal clear:

“Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ, there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.”

The Jewish Socialist Bund soon became the strongest and best organized body of the socialist movement in Russia. From its first congress in Vilna, in September, 1897 (just one month after the First Zionist Congress), it spread into the heavily Jewish populated centers. The Bund, of course, was strictly Jewish. As its members extended their socialist activities into the revolutionary political movements they passed as Russians. The Jewish Socialist Bund differed greatly from similar organizations in France and Germany in one important aspect. Whereas Lassalle and the others had played down the nationality aspect of their movements in the emphasis on the international character of communism, the Jewish Socialist Bund echoed the Zionists and proclaimed that the Jews were a distinct nationality. This difference was to play an important role in the development of the radical revolutionary movement in Russia and elsewhere.

The Russian units of the Bund were actually secret societies, appealing to the members of the Nihilist and other terroristic groups. In 1898 the Bund organized the Russian Socialist Democratic Party, which recruited left-wing Russians, and thus introduced Marxism to them. This first socialist party is now the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and the parent body of
the communist parties throughout the world. By means of the 
Russian Socialist Democratic Party, scattered Russian labor groups
became fraternally united with the Jewish socialist movement, and
in this manner became acquainted with the doctrines of Marx and
Lassalle. While Jewish socialist leaders occupied conspicuous
posts in the Russian socialist movement at large, the affiliation
of the Bund with the Russian Socialist Democratic Party was
strictly as a separate, autonomous body. Thus, at the very outset
of the Russian communist movement the Neo-Messianism of the
Jews was apparent. The Marxism they carried to the Russian
masses was essentially international in intent and purpose, yet,
as the initiators and leaders of the movement they insisted on
their own autonomy, their peculiar exclusiveness, their separate
nation!

The Bund published its own paper abroad, "Die Arbeiter Stim-
mie". It was printed in Yiddish, the language that had developed
through the centuries from their Khazar ancestors.

* * * * *

The first congress of the Communist Party of Russia was held
at Minsk, March 1, 1898, under the general title of Union for
Struggle for Liberation of the Working Class. Delegates from
"unions" at St. Petersburg, Moscow, Ivanov-Vosnesensk, Kiev and
the Jewish Socialist Bund made up the "congress" delegation.
Gregory Zinoviev, whose real name was Hirsch Apfelbaum, in his
"History of the Russian Communist Party", says that there were
eight delegates present, and then proceeds to name nine: Edelman,
Vigdorchek, Radchenko, Tuchapsky, Vanovsky, Petrusjevitch,
Kramer, Kosovsky and Mutnik. The last three named represented
the Jewish Socialist Bund. The Union, says Zinoviev, had been
originally organized in St. Petersburg. Its members included
Lenin, Radchenko, Krshishanovsky, Vaneev, Starkov, Martov, Sli-
vin, Zinoviev, Shelgunov, and Babuskin. Other important founders
and members of the party were Krassin, Fedosiev, Melnitsky, Alas-
bishev, Goldenach (Riazonov), Steklov, Tziperovitch, Kramer,
Eisenstadt, Kosovsky, and Khinchuk. Kramer, Eisenstadt and Kos-
ovsky were also the founders of the Jewish Socialist Bund.

Zinoviev, himself a Jew, lauds the Bund and gives it its place
in the organization of the communist party, stating that it 'ante-
dated by several years the workers' movement in St. Petersburg
and Moscow'.

"The Jewish Workers and artisans," Zinoviev declares, "became
revolutionary earlier than the workers of the other cities, and
were enabled earlier than the others to create a mass workers'
organization, uniting them into a union which received the name
of the 'bund.'" (Bund means "union" in Yiddish.) "From the
womb of this organization of Jewish workers," Zinoviev continues,
"came forth not a few great heroic workers. Suffice to name the
Jewish worker Leckert, murdered by von Bahl, the Chief of Police of Vilna, and to call to mind a whole series of active workers in the Jewish workers’ movement, who are still in the ranks of our party, and who shared in its organization.

At the time of its formation, and for several years thereafter, the Jewish Socialist Bund was the largest and most powerful unit in the Russian Communist movement. Its leaders worked incessantly in spreading Marxism among the workingmen of the industrial sections of the empire, creating secret cells wherever they found three or more sympathizers. The Jewish leadership of the revolutionary movement was recognized everywhere. “And,” says Zinoviev, “it was not at all by chance that this congress was held in Minsk, in a city of the Jewish Pale, on the territory of the Bund’s activities.” It was only fitting that the site of the first congress should be in a city of the Jews who had brought communism to Russia and founded its first party. “At the present time” Zinoviev said, “reviewing the history of our party, now grown into a great organization, we ought, it seems to me, to remember the courageous Jewish workers and artisans who, arising the first to the struggle, helped us lay the first stone in the foundation of our party.”

The first congress elected a central committee, appointed an editorial board for the proposed party paper, and sent out the typical communist call to the proletariat.

The controversy over Jewish nationalism arose within the Russian Communist Party at the beginning. Party congresses were made up of delegates selected from various “workers” units and cells, of which the Jewish Socialist Bund was one. At first the membership of the various units or cells, ostensibly Russian, was, in fact, Jewish. But as time went by more and more Russians were drawn into the movement. Lenin, as his leadership developed, made “the hegemony of the proletariat” a fundamental doctrine. The Jewish demand for “autonomy” strongly suggests an ideological “escape valve” from the trap being prepared for the Christian world, and the historical events of the last fifty years makes the “suggestion” a fact.

In 1899 the Third Convention of the Jewish Socialist Bund convened in Kovno. A proposal to demand national equality for the Jews was voted down. A similar proposal at the Fourth Convention (1901) was also voted down. The Fifth Convention held in 1905, basing its stand on the Brussels-London convention of the Russian Social Democratic Party (communist), adopted a resolution demanding “national-cultural autonomy” in the domain of
Poale Zion grew out of the Jewish Socialist Bund and had as its principle objective the establishment of cooperatives in Palestine. The organization was represented at the All-Russian Zionist Congress held at Minsk in 1902. It was organized in 1901 in Russia, from whence it spread to Austria, Palestine and the United States. The organization was recognized by the Ninth Congress of the World Zionist Organization and thus further coupled Marxism with the movement.

Jewish revolutionary activities convulsed Russia with increasing frequency. The cruel assassination of Czar Alexander II in 1881 and the public execution of the murderers did not dampen the zeal of the terrorists. A Jew named Mloditzki had made an unsuccessful attempt on the life of Loris-Melikov. Before Mloditzki was executed he defiantly declared that terrorism would continue and that Melikov would be murdered. “If it is not I,” he shouted, “it will be another; and if it is not the other, it will be a third. Count Melikov will be murdered by us.” The Russian government continued to wrestle clumsily with the problem, torn by conflicting emotions that demanded stern measures on the one hand and conciliatory and lenient measures on the other. Jewish uprisings put down by the police, and, because of their seriousness, sometimes by Russian troops, were advertised abroad by Jewish propagandists as “pogroms”. So consistent were these Jewish inspired stories, and so well suppressed were the Russian government’s reports, that uninformed American and European Gentiles believed that the Jews were poor innocent victims of a blood-thirsty, anti-Semitic government.

Agitation went on with increasing activity among students and workingmen. Disorders and riots were carefully planned and executed at the universities. Sudden strikes were called at the factories. An underground press at home, and a blatant press abroad, spewed forth inflammatory revolutionary propaganda for the Russian proletariat, and anti-Russian propaganda for foreign consumption. While much of this revolutionary activity had gone on for a number of years, it was gradually coordinated by the rise of the Jewish Socialist Bund and the Russian Communist Party after 1897.

Russian Jewish youth flocked to the revolutionary parties and many of them were attracted to terrorist activities. “The Jews,” declares Dubnow, “supplied the revolutionary army and a larger number of fighters than was warranted by their numerical proportion to the rest of the Russian population.” Revolutionary terrorists such as Balmashiev, Karpovitch, Szaznov,
Savinkov, Gershuni and Hirsh Leckert became “party” heroes. Hirsh Leckert fired at the Governor of Vilna in 1902. The Jewish terrorist paid for his bad marksmanship with his life. Gregory Gershuni directed the assassination of the Minister of the Interior, Sypiagin, murdered Bogdanovich, the Governor of Ufa, and directed the plot against Prince Obozensky, Governor of Kharkov. Stephan Balmashov actually pulled the trigger that killed Sypiagin as he entered the Minister. In 1897 Karpovich shot and killed the Minister of Education, Bogolepov. In July of 1904 Sazonov assassinated Sypiagin’s successor, Von Plehve.

Gregory Gershuni was probably the most blood-thirsty cut-throat of the Jewish terrorists. He was born in Shavli. He changed his name, left Shavli, and joined the revolutionaries. He was sentenced to death by the St. Peterburg court-martial in February, 1904. The death sentence was commuted to life at hard labor in Siberia on March 5, 1904. After being confined in the fortress of Schlusseburg for a time, he was transferred to Akatuysky prison from whence he escaped. Traveling to Japan he made his way to the United States where he was received like a conquering hero. During his six weeks’ stay he collected over thirty thousand dollars for the Russian revolutionaries. He died in France in 1907.

The Russian people recognized the revolutionary movement as Jewish instigated and Jewish led. Von Plehve said that it was an “alien movement, the work of Jewish hands.” It therefore is not surprising that Russian newspapers should also report the fact. One Krusheven, the publisher of the newspaper Bessarabitz (The Bessarabian) in Kishinev, capital of Moldavian Bessarabia, undertook to editorialize on the Jewish nature of the terror and revolution that was sweeping the country. He commented on the tendencies of the Jews to exploit the Gentiles, and pointed out their deep, ingrained hatred of Christianity and Christians. He truthfully accused them of importing socialism into Russia and agitating a “Godless revolution”. He stated very little that the Russians did not know through long experience and observation. Whether or not Krusheven’s newspaper article was responsible for what followed may be an open question, but rioting broke out on Sunday, April 6, 1903. It is difficult to learn what exactly happened because the facts available come from completely unreliable Jewish sources, and the Russian sources have been silenced forever. Jewish houses and stores were demolished and many Jews were killed and wounded. Dubnow places the Russian casualties at two and ignores the wounded. Von Plehve immediately dispatched troops into the streets and put a stop to the rioting.

The Russian newspapers did not attach much importance to the affair and dismissed it as a “brawl”. The Jews, however, fed the foreign press with sensational stories of horror and brutality,
painting the incident as government conceived and executed. “Secret” letters between the Governor of Bessarabia and Von Plehve “suddenly” found their way into the columns of the London Times, dated two weeks before the Kishinev riots. Von Plehve is alleged to have written the Governor that if anti-Jewish “disorders” should occur, the government would not interfere with armed forces. Even Dubnow, the Jewish historian, can hardly swallow this trick, and confesses that the “authenticity” of the letter is “not entirely above suspicion”. He is willing to assume, however, that there is “no doubt” that some such instruction was given.

Americans and Europeans were continually agitated and inflamed against Russia by the barrage of “atrocities” committed against the Khazar Jews. Jewish organizations everywhere collected huge sums of money from Gentiles and Jews alike to succor their unhappy “brethren” under the lash of the Czar. Meanwhile Jewish revolutionary agitation and terrorist activities in Russia continued unabated.

Von Plehve appears to have acted promptly and properly in the Kishinev riots. By the end of April he had issued a circular instructing the various governors to adopt measures for the “prevention of violence” and admonishing them to make every effort for the “suppression of lawlessness”.

* * * * * *

A Jew by the name of Pincus Dashevski attacked the publisher Krusheven with a knife on the Nevski Prospect in St. Petersburg, June 4, 1903. Dashevski’s knife, intended for the publisher’s heart, wounded him in the neck. Dashevski was arrested and brought to trial. At the preliminary hearing he frankly confessed that he intended to kill Krusheven. At the trial, Gruzenberg, Dash­evski’s attorney, contended that his client had merely meant to voice his protest against the “unbridled criminal activity of Krush­even.” On August 26, 1903 Dashevski was sentenced to five years penal military service. His appeal from the judgment and sentence was denied.

* * * * * *

On May 10, 1903, the Russian government, in one of its placating moods, announced the opening to the Jews for free domicile of one hundred and one localities in various governments of the Pale of Settlement. These localities had hitherto been barred to the Jews under the “Temporary Rules” of 1882. The Jews received the announcement with indifference, and continued with their revolutionary activities.

Meanwhile the flood of Khazar Jews into the United States continued with increased vigor. American Jews and their organizations worked feverishly in financing the exodus from Russia. Special organizations and committees were set up for the purpose of receiving the immigrants at Ellis Island and caring for them
in New York. Gentile employees of Jewish firms were soon re­placed by the immigrants, and American employment was seriously effected in New York City. Jewish leaders admonished the American Jews that “a considerable portion of the historic national center in Russia and Poland was, under the pressure of external events, in the process of removing to North America,” and that “practical Jewish politics had the direct duty of organizing this great rising center of Jewry.”

The *Jewish Encyclopedia* states: “The Jewish exodus from Russia drafted to the United States large numbers of Socialists, mostly college and university students, who must be reckoned among the pioneers of the Socialist parties in America. Their main field of activity was the ghetto. But the masses of Jewish workmen and tradesmen who were educated by this propaganda, scattered throughout the country in pursuit of employment or business opportunities and became ‘the peddlers of socialism’ among their shopmates and neighbors.”

American Jewry was influential enough to persuade ex-President Grant to call a mass meeting in *Chickering Hall*, New York City, February 1, 1882 for the purpose of drumming up funds for the Jewish revolutionaries fleeing Russia. Mayor William R. Grace was the chairman of the meeting. A fund of $25,000.00 was collected through the efforts of one Drexal, a banker.

The *Hebrew Immigrants Aid Society of the United States* raised $300,000.00, of which sum the *Alliance Israelite Universelle* at Paris contributed $40,000.00; the *General Committee of Paris*, $20,000.00; the *Berlin Committee*, $35,000.00; the *Mansion House Committee of London*, $40,000.00, and the *New York Russian Relief Fund* (of which Jacob H. Schiff was treasurer), $57,000.00. In 1883 about $90,000.00 more was collected.

Temporary quarters were built on Ward’s Island and at Green­point, Long Island. About 3,000 immigrants were housed and maintained in these quarters until they were supplied with other quarters and employment by the Jewish organizations.

Many of these Jewish revolutionaries had criminal records and were otherwise undesirable. The *Hebrew Immigrants Aid Society* immediately set itself up as the legal defense arm of the Khazar Jewish hordes, hired lawyers to defend deportation cases, and effectually stopped the attempts of United States officials to stem the unprecedented human tide of revolutionaries into this country.

* * * * *

The Jews of Russia, assured of escape to the United States, became bolder in their attacks on the Russian government. Homel, a town in the Government of Moghilev (in White Russia), contained about 20,000 Jews, which was about one-half of the town’s inhabitants. The Jewish population seethed with Zionist and social-
ist revolutionary secret societies. On August 29, 1903, a fight broke out in the market place between a crowd of Jews and Christians. A quarrel over the price of a barrel of herring offered by a Jewish store-keeper is said to have been the cause of the tumult. A Christian peasant was killed. A week or so later, on September 1st, the Jewish and Christian workers from the railroad shops were embroiled in a riot. The Jews were armed. Twelve Jews were either killed or wounded, and eight Christians were either killed or wounded. The troops put a stop to the sanguinary battle, accounting for three of the casualties. Both Christians and Jews were arrested.

Two days later the Governor of Maghilev came to Homel and addressed the people of the city at the Town Council. “I am sorry for the unhappy victims,” he said, “but how could such bitterness have arisen? Religious toleration in Russia is complete. The causes of the latest events lie deeper. The Jews have now become the leaders and instigators in all movements directed against the Government. This entire ‘Bund’ and the Social-Democrats—they are all Jews.”

According to the official reports of the Government, the armed Jews attacked the Christians. When the troops arrived, the Jews attacked them, and the soldiers had to fire in self-defense. “The cause of the disturbance,” the report concludes, “lies in the extremely hostile and defiant attitude of the local Jews against the Christians.” Of the sixty defendants, thirty-six were Jews. The trial lasted three months. About half of the Christians and half of the Jews were acquitted. Those convicted were given light sentences.

The story told abroad by world Jewry, of course, was quite different. It had been a government “pogrom”. The Jews of Russia, however, looked upon the affair as some sort of a Jewish victory, and the publicity it received stirred the revolutionary enthusiasm of the younger Jews to greater acts of violence.

Meanwhile a number of Christians who had participated in the Kishinev riots were brought to trial. The Jewish lawyers connected with the trials attempted to try the Government rather than the accused. The defendants were convicted and sentenced to hard labor or penal service. Governor von Raaben was replaced. The civil actions for damages brought by the Jews were dismissed.

Zinoviev paints a sinister back-drop for the Second Congress of the Communist Party of Russia. “In various localities,” he says, “the lightning of revolutionary struggle began to flash.” A series of so-called “peasant” movements flamed into revolt in Saratov, to be suppressed by Governor Stolypin. Revolution stemming from the Pale of Settlement was inundating Holy Russia. The descendants of the ancient Khazar hordes were on the march!
Nikolai Lenin (Vladimir Ilich Ulianov—1870-1924), and Leon Trotsky (Lev Davydovich Bronstein—1870-1940), were about to enter upon the great rehearsal that was to prepare them for the most tragic drama of history. Lenin was a Russian lawyer, born in Simbirsk (now Ulyanovsk), while Trotsky was a Jew from Elisavetgrad.

The Second Congress opened in Brussels. It was to be a secret meeting, but the delegates were so loud and boisterous that the Belgian police soon knew that something unusual was going on. The **Coq d'Or** became revolutionary headquarters. Gusev is said to have sung in such loud voice that crowds gathered beneath the windows out of curiosity. Lenin’s favorite song was “We Were Wedded Out of Church”, which Gusev sang for him on festive occasions.

Lenin reported that there were forty-three delegates with fifty-one votes present. Some of them, including Lenin and Martov, were entitled to two votes each. In addition to the delegates, there were fourteen “consultative votes”—fraternal delegates with voice but no vote. These “fraternal” delegates included Axelrod, Zasulich and Potresov of the *Iskra* (the Communist publication) Board; Arkadi Kramer of the *Jewish Socialist Bund*; Noah Zhorodania, of the *Georgian Social Democracy*; and Hanecki and Warski of the *Polish Social Democracy*.

The Congress convened July 30, 1903 in an old flour warehouse decorated with red cloth. The place was infested with rats and fleas. Russian and Belgian police swarmed through the alleys and streets. Georgi Valentinovich Plekhanov delivered the opening address. The delegates sang the “International”. Out of respect to the Minsk Congress of 1897 they officially designated this, the Brussels meeting, the “Second Congress”. They declared that the purpose of the convention was to fuse all factors into a single, unified *All-Russian Social Democratic Labor Party*.

Present were Schatman, Lydia Makhnovetz, N. Baumann, Lydia Knipovitch (“Djadenka”), Stopani, Maklin, Lenov, Krasikov, Dmitry Ulianov (Lenin’s brother), Zemlyatchka, Panin, Maschinsky, Gusev, Ackerman, Galkin, Lyadov, Levin, Nikolaev, Dr. Maldenberg, Trotsky, Zurabov, Bogan Knuniantz and Topuridze. From the *Jewish Socialist Bund*: Kramer, Eisenstart, Portnoy, Liber, Medem and Kossovsky. And, of course, Lenin, Martov, Plekhanov, Axelrod and Deutsch of the *Iskra* organization.

The absence of the “proletariat” from this “Second Congress” is so glaring that Zinoviev feels called upon to apologize. “The *Iskra* organisation,” he explains, “and our committee was, for the most part, made up of students and of professional revolutionists; there were not many workers in it. The workers were still individual figures such as Babushkin and Schatman, who were begin-
ning to make their way out of the worker masses. Due to this
fact, the second party congress which laid the foundations of the
party, was also in the main not made up of workers. But, despite
this fact, the Iskra organization was, in reality, the first Bolshevik
organization, playing a great and active role in the revolution—
the role of the Communist vanguard. Made up of professional
revolutionists led by Comrade Lenin, although not purely working-
class in composition, it bore along with it, nevertheless, the worker-
masses, and gave expression to that which was ripening deep
within the proletarian masses. And this group, later the creators
of our party, was borne on the crest of the waves of the toiling
masses."

All of which, of course, is a play on words and a rather pitiful
attempt to disguise the agitational basis of the entire movement.
First and foremost the Russian term “Bolshevik” signifies the
“majority”. The editorial board of the party organ “Iskra”
(Spark) never contained more than a hand-full of members and its
readers could hardly be numbered as members—certainly an in-
significant “minority”. They were all so-called intellectuals; in a
very real sense of the slang term, they were “bums”. They were
not workers and therefore did not belong to the
proletariat. The
members of the revolutionary conspiracy desired to lead a workers’
movement, and it was necessary to deceive the workers and make
them believe that it was their movement. Hence, the embarrass-
ment of Zinoviev and the others in having to admit that the organi-
zers and leaders of the Communist Party did not belong to the
working-class!

When the speech-making, the shouting and tumult of the open-
ing ceremonies diminished, the congress opened with a wrangle
over credentials. Lenin and Martov clashed in the first of the
Iskra caucuses. Martov demanded a representative presidium,
while Lenin held out for a three man presidium, all from the
Iskra group. Lenin finally won the argument and the presidium
was composed of himself, Plekhanov, and Krasikov.

The first open break occurred on the question of the relationship
of the Jewish Socialist Bund to the Party. While all of the mem-
ers of the Bund were Jews, the Congress as a whole, was also
largely composed of Jews. The debate that followed was between
one group of organized communist Jews and another unorganized
group of communist Jews and Gentiles. As has been pointed
out heretofore, the Jewish Socialist Bund was as thoroughly
Zionist as it was communistic. While it was determined to destroy
the nationalist characteristics of all other peoples, it insisted on
preserving its own Jewishness and its own nation. It had brought
Marxism to Russia. It had organized the first communist Congress
at Minsk and had taken the initiative in organizing the Second. 
Its members had been the chief assassins and bomb-throwers. It 
was the leader of organized revolution. But first and foremost 
its members were Jews, and they had resolved that, as far as the 
*Bund* was concerned, “class-consciousness” and “national conscious­
ness” went hand in hand. The delegates had come to Brussels 
with a firm determination to secure continued autonomy in all 
Jewish problems, and to have the communist revolutionary move­
ment, at the outset, recognize the claim of the *Bund* to represent 
all Jewish socialists wherever they might be found. Lenin, on 
the contrary, stood for a rigidly centralized party in which national 
subdivisions were to be mere agencies for transmitting through 
their several languages the slogans, programs, decisions, and orders 
of an all-powerful central committee. Martov, Trotsky, Axelrod 
and the other *non-Bund* Jews supported Lenin against the *Bund* 
members. When the vote was taken the Lenin faction was vic­
torious. It was this vote that ultimately brought about the split 
that gave rise to the Bolshevik (majority) and Menshevik (min­
ority) factions.

Much of the history that followed, as well as otherwise incom­
prehensible current events, are explained and made clear by an 
understanding of the issue involved in this remote and obscure 
debate in the rat-and-flea infested warehouse in Brussels in 1903. 
The phrase, “Bolshevik Revolution”, conveyed little to foreign 
readers. As the years passed the term “Menshevik” was heard, 
and it, too, conveyed nothing of importance to the average Euro­
pean and American. Those who understood the meanings of the 
terms misinterpreted their significance. For a long time most 
people were under the impression that the “Bolsheviks” were the 
blood-thirsty, bomb-throwing type, whereas the “Mensheviks” were 
opposed to sanguinary revolution and advocated gentler means of 
attaining a sort of democratic form of government. The difference, 
as has been indicated, was simply a matter of the Jewish *nation*. 
Underneath, of course, was something else—the safety-valve of 
escape for the Jews from the gigantic trap Jewry was setting for 
Gentile nations. History, if it taught the Jews anything at all, 
taught them that they cannot peacefully exist under any form 
of government or economy that they are unable to dominate and 
exploit. A socialist government shared with Gentiles would prob­
ably be more disastrous to them than any other system, unless 
they completely dominated it. Under any other conditions they 
must perish, because socialism is, theoretically at least, the nega­
tion of exploitation. Hence Jewish Marxism had two faces: one 
for the Gentile and one for the Jew. All Gentile nations were to be 
merged into one great socialist family under a world government. 
The Jews, by maintaining their status as a nation, would control 
the world through its representatives in a world parliament.
Both wings of the Communist Party of Russia were largely Jewish whether Bolshevik or Menshevik. Lenin, a Gentile, was the stumbling block for the Jews, and it was solely because of his strong personality that the split came. Zinoviev's account of the debate, aside from the usual communist cliches, is quite accurate. “The first point of divergence,” he explains, “was the attitude toward the national question, in other words, to the Bund. Although once again paying tribute to the heroism of the Jewish worker and artisan, who in the darkest night of reaction arose the first to fight, at the same time it must be said that the role played by the Bund in history was opportunist and Menshevist. At the Second Congress, its precise approach to the national question was very definitely brought out. The Bund demanded that it be regarded as the sole representative of the whole Jewish proletariat of Russia, refusing to take cognizance of the fact that the Jewish people in general were scattered throughout the whole country, and that therefore the correct course was for them to join the organization of the place in which they lived, just as the Finnish, Estonian, and other workers.”

* * * * *

The next controversy grew out of Martov's draft resolution defining members and their obligations to the party. Lenin also had a resolution on the same subject. The resolutions appeared to be so much alike that even the delegates must have been bewildered at the furious debate that followed their introduction. There was, however, a substantial difference. Martov defined a party member as one who subjects himself to the control of the party, and gives support of any sort to the party organization. Lenin defined a party member as one who participates in some party organization and its tasks. Martov, Axelrod and other Jewish delegates argued that the Lenin formula was needlessly dangerous in view of the fact that the party was illegal. The Lenin resolution, they declared, would discourage students, professors, and other intellectuals from working with the party because by actually being identified with the party they ran the risk of exposure. Lenin retorted that the party needed workers, not students and professors. Says Zinoviev: “The course which Martov and Axelrod proposed to us threaten us with the same fate as that which overtook the Social Revolutionaries, who took in everyone that they fell in with, and had by 1917 become so diluted that individual revolutionaries floundered around in it among a mess of bourgeois democrats like flies in milk.”

Martov won a short-lived victory. The delegates decided that anyone might enter the party who aided it and worked under its control. It is said that Lenin nearly went mad. Martov, writing about the event long after, said: “I gained the victory, but Lenin managed in a short time, with the aid of several other points.
Lenin had won the fight against the Bund, and lost the debate with Martov. Trotsky had sided with Martov—a fact that Stalin would remember in his struggle with "Trotskyism." During the debate Trotsky declared: "I do not believe that you can put a statutory exorcism on opportunism. I do not give the statutes any sort of mystical interpretation." Axelrod, remembering that communism was a Jewish philosophy, asked the Congress: "Is not Lenin dreaming of the administrative subordination of an entire party to a few guardians of doctrine?"

This momentous debate required two full sessions, innumerable votes on procedure, and two roll calls. The final vote was 28 for Martov and 22 for Lenin. Simple arithmetic discloses that the Martov faction was in the majority.

Lenin, in a white rage, went to work. He split the Iskra caucus by barring Martov, Axelrod, Zasulich, and Potresov from its sessions. When not in meetings he incessantly lobbied the delegates. Krupskaya, his Jewish wife, writes that he did not sleep and was unable to eat. His great opportunity came when the Bund delegates, smarting under the bitterness of their defeat on the Jewish question, walked out of the Congress—five votes that had supported Martov! Lenin then moved to dissolve the Rabochee Delo (revolutionary publication) under pretense of giving exclusive recognition to Iskra. Martov, a loyal Iskrist, fell into the trap and voted for the motion. As a result, the two Rabochee Delo delegates also withdrew from the Congress. Lenin's minority of six was thus turned into a majority—and the Bolsheviki was born! Lenin, by this device, turned his defeat into victory, and his unusual talents for propaganda soon made the world believe that he led the majority of the revolutionaries—or, at least, the "majority" of something. ("Bolshestvo" means "majority"; "Bolshevik" means "majorityites").

Although the Communist Party of Russia actually split on the Jewish question, it remained united on communist doctrines generally, and on the necessity for the destruction of all capitalistic governments particularly. Regardless of the differences in their ultimate objectives, the "comrades" of both factions always fought shoulder to shoulder on the barricades.

Zinoviev holds that the vote on the composition of the editorial board of Iskra marked the conscious determination (on Lenin's part solely, of course) of the "majorityites" (Bolsheviks) and the "minorityites" (Mensheviks). Before the Second Congress, the Board was composed of Lenin, Plekhanov, Martov, Potresov, Axelrod, and Zasulich. Lenin now proposed a three man board to be composed of himself, Plekhanov and Martov. The vote was
close—25 to 23—but Lenin won. “From this juncture,” declares Zinoviev, “derive the terms ‘Bolshevik’ (majorityites) and ‘Menshevik’ (minorityites). As is known, during the revolution often an altogether different interpretation was placed on them. Many thought simply that the Bolsheviks were those who desired the most possible, while the Mensheviks were prepared to be satisfied with less. In actual fact, however, this winged-word arose in connection with the fact that the majority (Bolshestvo) voted for the Plekhanov-Lenin editorial board, the minority (Menshestvo), against it.” While this is the juncture that Lenin selected, it is certainly not the real cause of the split. The vote on the editorial board (after the five Bund delegates and the two Rabochee Delo representatives walked out) was merely an extension of the disagreement on the Jewish question.

* * * * *

The split in the Communist Party of Russia over the question of Jewish nationalism must necessarily have strange overtones in years to come. The Jewish origin of the movement and the work of the Jewish Socialist Bund in establishing the Communist Party of Russia are historical facts. The reason for the division of the party into two segments would become vague and indistinct in the years to come, but the reason would remain. As has been seen, the Jews predominated in both the Bolshevik and the Menshevik groups, and the members of both wings joined hands throughout the world in their revolutionary activities. But the internal conflict for control of the movement never ceased. Where Communism came to power the Jewish communists maneuvered and conspired for domination. Until the ascendency of Stalin the Jews controlled both the Soviet government and the Communist Party of Russia. Stalin’s controversy with the Jew Trotsky involved the question of Jewish nationalism and accounts for Stalin’s ruthless liquidation of the old Bolsheviks, nearly all of whom were Jews. Ideologically Stalin had the best of the argument—something that Marx would have been unable to have foreseen. The Jews who opposed Stalin did not oppose communism. The Trotskyites were, and are, the same kind of communists as the Stalinites. Many Jewish communists in recent years have won wide acclaim by having written and spoken against Stalin. A careful examination of these writings and statements reveal the rather amazing fact that there is no condemnation of the doctrines of communism—only Stalinism. In most cases the student will learn that these alleged “anti-communists” attempt to distinguish between communism and socialism without ever using the terms.

Jewish communism must some day come to grips with its creation—Gentile communism! The Jews will no more merge their nationalism into international communism than they will merge into any other group. Communism is merely a Jewish device, in
the same category as capitalism—and both have been used, and will continue to be used, for the same Jewish purposes. When it suits Jewry's objectives the Soviets will be pictured as "anti-Semitic", but the name-calling will be no more an indictment of communism than it is of capitalism. While some Jews were unable to stomach the Hitler-Stalin pact, they nevertheless persisted in their revolutionary activities. The fact is, however, that most communist Jews followed the twisting party line of the Hitler-Stalin pact with sickening accuracy.

The ruthless invasion and conquest of Palestine with the immoral approval of the United Nations would bring puzzling developments in Jewish-Soviet relations. Only an understanding of the Jewish-Communist nationalism controversy, as it was fought out in the old flour barn in Brussels between Lenin and the delegates of the Jewish Socialist Bund, clarifies Jewish maneuvering in later years.

The Central Committee was elected (quite naturally) by the Bolsheviks (a majority). Martov refused to serve on the editorial board of Iskra. Krupskaya says "P. B. Axelrod was particularly pained by the fact that Iskra was not published in Switzerland, and that the stream of communication with Russia did not pass through him. . . . To her, Vera Zasulich—leaving Iskra would mean once more becoming isolated from Russia. . . . For her it was not a question of self-love, but a question of life and death . . ." Lenin and Plekhanov became the "editorial board". When Plekhanov suggested to Lenin that they should bring the others back, Lenin left the "board". Plekhanov then reinstated them.

The Russian and Belgian police finally grew tired of the wrangling and shouting in the old flour warehouse, and arrested Rosa Zemlyachka, Iskra agent, and deported her. The remainder of the delegates were given twenty-four hours to get out of Brussels and Belgium. So the Congress packed up and went to London. Their money was running low, and London was very hot. They reconvened on August 11th and finally closed their sinister business August 23rd.

Gregory Zinoviev (Hirsh Apfelbaum) did not attend the Second Congress. Neither did Stalin nor Kamenev. These three were destined to become the rulers of Russia after Lenin's death—two Jews and the Mongolian Georgian, Stalin. Lev Borisovich Kamenev (whose real name was Rosenfeld, 1883-1936) joined the Social Democratic Party in 1901. He was arrested and banished to Siberia (1915-1917) for anti-ally war propaganda. He took a leading part in establishing the communist government of the Soviets after
the revolution, and became the vice-president of the U. S. S. R. in 1923. He married Trotsky's sister.

The Russo-Japanese War commenced January 27, 1904. Russia was apparently no match for the military superiority of Japan from the very start. The communists were jubilant and prepared to turn the "imperialist war" into civil war in accord with Marxian principles. Noeoye Vremya, and other Russian newspapers, charged that the Socialist and Zionist Jews were secretly helping Japan. It was said that the Jews were exporting gold abroad, and provoking England and the United States against embattled Russia. Most of the charges were true.

During February of 1904 a Jewish poem "To Haman" appeared. Its central theme was the prediction of the death of the "new Haman", who was easily identified as von Plehve, the Minister of the Interior. On the morning of July 15, 1904 the terrorist Sazonov threw a bomb at von Plehve in the square before the Warsaw depot in St. Petersburg as the Minister was preparing to leave for Peterhof to report to the Czar. Von Plehve died in the explosion, his blood staining the pavement where he stood.

Svyatopolk-Mirski succeeded von Plehve as Minister of the Interior on August 26, 1904. The post had never been an easy one, but it had never been quite so difficult as in the fall of 1904. On the 22nd of August, new Jewish riots broke out in Southern Russia—in Smylla, Kiev, Rovno, and Volhynia—and continued through October. The Gentiles abroad were told that these Jewish disturbances were "pogroms" instituted by the Government. This Jewish propaganda has become fixed in the minds of the people of Western Europe and the United States by Jewish historians and writers. It has found its way into encyclopedias, articles, histories and even novels, written by Gentiles for Gentile readers. Never before in the history of the world has the effort of a government against a criminal revolutionary movement been so thoroughly smeared and discredited.

The Jewish communists carried their propaganda into bourgeois circles, establishing what was to become so well-known in later years as "liberal" and "progressive" groups. The members of these organizations are generally referred to by official legislative investigating committees as "communist fellow-travelers". These "bourgeois intellectuals" of Russia, in 1904 and 1905, were composed largely of Jewish lawyers and professionals who had not been closely associated publicly with the terrorists and secret revolutionary societies. Setting the pattern for later day Jewish-communist agitation in other countries, a group of lawyers and literary "progressives" met at a public banquet to "call" for "the repeal
of all national and denominational restrictions." The Zemstov workers assembled at St. Petersburg and adopted a resolution pointing up the "anomaly of the political order."

* * * * *

January 22, 1905 has since become known as St. Petersburg's "Bloody Sunday". Although there were Jews and revolutionaries in the mob led by the priest Gapon that marched on the Winter Palace, it appears quite certain that the intentions of both the priest and the overwhelming majority of the people were peaceful, and not prompted in any sense by revolutionary motives. Many of the marchers carried banners and icons. There is no clear account of what touched off the Cossack attack but its units suddenly rode into the square and into the advancing crowds, shooting down many of the marchers as they drove them back. Whether the commander of the Cossacks had become overly nervous, or whether the Jewish revolutionaries stage-managed the affair by leaking out "information" to the secret police that the marchers carried concealed arms and approached the Palace with revolutionary intent, cannot now be ascertained. The latter probability is strongly supported by what is now known of communist tactics. Father Georgi Gapon has been lambasted by the Socialists as a "double-dealing" priest, inferring that he led the St. Petersburg workers into a death-trap. There certainly does not appear to be any substantial evidence in support of these charges. Father Gapon had spent most of his priesthood among the factory population of St. Petersburg, and there is no evidence that indicates that he was not in full sympathy with the plight of these people, or that he was not doing what lay in his power to alleviate their distress. The fact that he first secured permission from the secret police to organize the workers into labor unions indicates that he was working within the law and attempting to rescue the workers from the atheistic clutches of the communists. It was Father Gapon who led the strike of these unions, and he was in the forefront of the workers as they marched to the Winter Palace in January. He carried the union's petition to present on its behalf to the Czar. Common sense revolts at the probability that he was engaged in a conspiracy that contemplated a useless and meaningless massacre of unarmed people. And it would appear that even the most stupid would anticipate the reaction of the public at large to such unwarranted brutality. Inept and clumsy as they were, Czar Nicholas and the men surrounding him were certainly not stupid. It therefore can only be concluded that the commandant of the Cossacks acted on nervous impulse, or that the authorities had received "planted" information of a gigantic plot to murder the royal family.

In any event the news of the horrible event spread with electric
intensity across Russia, mobilizing anger and rage against the Czar. The Jewish Socialist Bund and its revolutionary affiliates were exuberant. The incident had accomplished more in a few minutes than all the propaganda and terrorist activities had been able to accomplish in two decades. The Jewish revolutionaries could now look to support from the masses of the Russian Gentiles.

Demonstrations, strikes and acts of terror swept Russia with the force of a tidal wave. In Poland and the western governments of Russia, Jewish revolutionaries arose in open revolt, posing as striking workers and labor unionists. A Jew named Stillman fired at the Chief of Police of Odessa and wounded him. In Moghilev another Jew made an unsuccessful attack on the Chief of Police. Revolutionary fervor spread. Communist organizers worked feverishly among the proletariat. Leagues and unions of railroad employees, engineers, laborers, and even lawyers, sprang into existence over night. Strikes were called everywhere. University and college students struck. Industry and commerce began to grind to an uncertain stop throughout the empire. As the police moved in to disperse rioters and demonstrators, new acts of terrorism rocked the country. Grand Duke Sergius, a member of the House of Romanov and governor-general of Moscow, was killed by a bomb thrown by Kalayev of February 4, 1905.

The League for the Attainment of Equal Rights for the Jewish People of Russia came into being at the end of March, 1905, as the result of a conference of Jews held in Vilna. The new organization demanded civil, political and national rights. The "national" rights here demanded had nothing to do with national Russian rights. The demand was the same ancient cry that had bewildered the authorities of Europe for two thousand years—the demand to be an autonomous nation within a nation. The shocking part of the resolution was that it called for full Russian rights and, at the same time, rights and powers of a separate and distinct nation!

The League's most defiant act was the adoption of a resolution sending "enthusiastic greetings" to the assassin Dashevski who was doing time in a penal military company.

A central bureau of the new organization was established at St. Petersburg, composed of twenty-two members. Among these were M. Vinaver, G. Sliosberg, L. Bramson, Dr. Shmaryahu Levin, S. M. Dubnow (the Jewish historian), and M. Ratner.

The Jewish youth were armed and bands of them roamed over the country, raiding and terrorizing the Gentile settlements. As a result the Russians in a spontaneous uprising organized into groups and attacked the Jews. These groups became known as
the Black Hundreds. Riots broke out in Bialystok, Dusyaty, and Simferopol in early April.

Many Russians were converted to socialism, by members of the Jewish Socialist Bund, particularly after the massacre of the workers on “Bloody Sunday” at St. Petersburg. While the Jews maintained their own communist organization, the Bund, they worked incessantly to build the Communist Party. In the beginning, and for many years thereafter, the Bund furnished the leadership for the Russian cells.

In Zhitomer the members of the Jewish Socialist Bund used a portrait of the Czar as a target for pistol practice in a field behind the city. Rumors of this insult to the Czar led to an open clash between the Russians and the Jews in the latter part of April. Dubnow reports that fifteen Jews were killed and nearly a hundred were wounded, but fails to give the Gentile casualties. The battle lasted four days. On April 25, fourteen members of the Bund, armed with postols, marched from the town of Chudnov to reinforce their comrades in Zhitomer. As they attempted to pass through the town of Troyanov, the outraged Russian peasants killed ten of them.

The Jewish Socialist Bund carefully organized an uprising in Odessa, financed by the Jewish merchants. Quantities of arms were purchased and secretly distributed among several thousand younger Jews. At a prearranged signal the Jews swarmed into the streets carrying a red flag, firing fusillades from their revolvers at anything or anybody. The national flags of Russia were torn from their standards, and the Czar’s portrait was mutilated wherever it was found. The Municipal Council of Odessa was resolved into a “Commune” modeled on the bloody French Commune, and renamed the “Committee of Public Safety”. The revolutionaries immediately issued a proclamation announcing the establishment of the “South Russian Republic”. The Commune, at the Jews’ coercion demanded the withdrawal of the Czar’s troops, the disarmament of the police, and the establishment of a ‘citizens’ militia. The armed Jews, in full possession of the city, were insolent and violent, and the unarmed Russians were powerless to stop them.

When at last the troops of the Czar marched in and put down the revolt, world Jewry screamed “pogrom” and Russian “anti-Semitism”.

Under the communist theory of transforming the “imperialist” war into civil war, Lenin’s faction called for the defeat of Russia. At the Amsterdam (1904) Congress of the Party, Plekhanov embraced the Japanese delegate, Katayama, amidst the enthusiastic
shouts and applause of the entire Congress. Martov writes: "The leader of the Finnish ‘Activists’ who later headed the Finnish government in 1905—Konni Zilliakus—openly proposed to Plekhanov as well as to the foreign representatives of the Bund, that they enter into negotiation with the agents of the Japanese government in regard to aid for the Russian revolution in the form of money and arms."

The war was going badly. "Bloody Sunday" was the greatest propaganda weapon the communist Jews had ever had, and they made the most of it. The Japanese victories helped destroy the waning faith in the fumbling leadership of Czar Nicholas II. The communists publicized the slogan: "Organization of armed insurrection and the creation of a provisional revolutionary government!"

The Third Communist Party Congress was completely under the control of the Mensheviks, in spite of Lenin’s attempt to pass off his faction as the "majority". Moreover, the Mensheviks were in complete control of the Central Committee, the editorial board of Iskra, and the Party Council. It was a rather ludicrous position for Lenin’s "majority"—which did not control anything. Zinoviev, again the loyal apologist, admits: "The situation of the Bolsheviks was, I repeat, exceedingly difficult, and was rendered even harder, owing to the fact that there was no possibility of an appeal to the Party, which was condemned to an underground existence and subject to savage persecution on the part of Czarism."

The labor strikes arranged by the Jewish Socialist Bund assumed the character of anarchy. The revolution may be said to have actually started on October 18, 1905. The peasant movement broke with violent intensity accompanied by the burning of manors and the ruthless destruction of estates. Poland and the Baltic region trembled in the throes of terrorism. In December the revolutionaries threw up the usual barricades in the streets of Moscow and held off the police until the troops arrived and put them to flight. In Nyezhin, in the government of Chernigov, the Gentiles compelled the rioting Jews, headed by a rabbi, to publicly take the oath of allegiance to the Czar. The League of the Russian People was organized to counter the Jewish revolution.

The Chief of Police of the city of Bialystok was assassinated. On June 1, 1906, a revolver was discharged during a Church procession, which set off a riot against the Jews who had started the trouble. A bomb exploded in the summer home of Prime Minister Stolypin. A thousand suspects, mostly Jews, were rounded up and arrested. A sentry was fired upon in the city of Syedletz on August 27, 1906 which resulted in a riot. The League of the Russian People gained strength.
Zionism grew. The Social Democratic Party advanced its revolutionary activities on the premise that “the blood of the Jew must serve as lubricating oil upon the wheels of the Russian Revolution.” (Dubnow.)

The Russian Zionists met at Helsingfors in November, 1906, and adopted the following resolution:

“The Zionist organization of Russia sanctions the affiliation of the Zionists with the movement for liberty among the territorial nationalities of Russia, and advocates the necessity of uniting Russian Jewry with the principles of the recognition of the Jewish nationality and its self government in all the affairs affecting Jewish national life.”

The Jewish Socialist Labor Party was born in 1905. Its members called themselves “Saymists”, from “Saym” (“Diet”).

The League for the Attainment of Equal Rights disintegrated in 1907, its members reforming in the Jewish Peoples’ Group, and the Volkspartei (Jewish National Party). The latter group promoted emigration to the United States and Palestine—two programs defined as “great national factors destined to create two new centers of Judaism, one quantitatively powerful center in North America, and a smaller national center, but qualitatively, from the point of view of cultural purity, more valuable, in Palestine.”

In September of 1911, Premier Stolypin was assassinated by a Jew named Bogrov in a Kiev theatre in the presence of the Czar and other officials of state.

The Russian fleet was destroyed by the Japanese in Tushima Straits May 27-29, 1905. The Treaty of Peace was signed at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, September 5th of the same year. By the terms of this Treaty, Japan acquired Korea.

President Theodore Roosevelt, who acted as intermediary, was very happy over Russia’s defeat. “Between ourselves,” he wrote to Theodore, Jr., “for you must not breathe it to anybody—I was thoroughly well pleased with the Japanese victory, for Japan is playing our game.”

“Teddy” was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1906 for ending the war.

In recent years the Jews and their Gentile tools have made intensive efforts to play down the Jewish origin of communism and the part played by the Jews in the Russian Revolutions of 1905 and 1917. It is not uncommon to read today that the role played by the Jews has been “highly exaggerated”; that the Czarist elements have sought to “blame” the Jews rather than
the Russian people, and that the charges against the Jews generally are the results of the “anti-Semitic” propaganda of the Nazis. Relying on the average person’s lack of information on the subject, these apologists dishonestly point out that it was the Bolsheviks who made the revolution; that the Mensheviks—the Jewish element—were opposed to the Bolsheviks. The argument is quite effective to those who do not even understand the terms, and have no idea of how they came into existence. The fact is that Lenin and Trotsky came back to Russia after the Czar had abdicated. The Mensheviks had carried on the initial stages of the Revolution. It was Lenin and his faction who snatched the victory and the power of government in 1917, and it was Lenin’s talents for propaganda that established the myth of the Bolshevik victory.

The fact that Jews, such as Martov and Axelrod, offered ideological opposition to Lenin’s program for party organization, did not make them less violent or less blood-thirsty than the Jews who supported Lenin in these mental exercises. It did not make any difference whether these Jews called themselves the ideological “minority” or the tactical “majority”, they were revolutionary Marxists united for the destruction of Christendom.

There was not a single radical or revolutionary movement in Russia, other than the Decembrists, that did not count Jewish intellectuals among its leaders. Of the group that assassinated Czar Alexander II, five were Jews. Deutsch and Axelrod were among the founders of Russian communism with Plekhanov and Zasulich. Martov (Tsederbaum), first a member of the Jewish Socialist Bund, came over with Lenin into the St. Petersburg League, and later became a Menshevik. The so-called “peasant” Social Revolutionary Party was almost totally Jewish in leadership. Among them were Gershuni, terrorist; Azev, chief of the terrorist section and police agent; Minor; Zhitlovsky, and the two international revolutionaries, Steinberg and Natanson.

The Russian Revolution was as Jewish as its founder, Karl Marx. It was revolution of the Jews, by the Jews, and for the Jews!

The beast with two horns—communism and Zionism—had done great wonders in the earth. It had brought the fire of revolution from the heavens in the sight of men, and the world trembled!
THE POPULATION of the United States is made up of the people of many nations. For the greater part, the immigrants who came here from foreign lands came with full intention of availing themselves of the freedoms, opportunities and the obligations of citizenship. In turning their backs on their native lands and facing the promises of the Constitution of the United States and its flag, they resolutely determined to leave old allegiances behind. They would become Americans in the fullest sense of the term. True, memories and love of the old land would linger throughout their lives. Old friends, loved ones left behind, and the customs, cultures and traditions of their ancient countries and peoples, would understandably reoccur with bitter-sweet nostalgia. But these newcomers would become part of this new land of freedom; help build its vast reaches into a magnificent new civilization, lending the best of their culture, tradition and morality to the cement that would make the new edifice endure. Their children would become native Americans, and, under freedom and justice, they would help create a new culture, a new tradition—a distinctly unique homogeneity that would be called American. These immigrants were to be the molders and builders of the United States.

It was only the Jewish immigrants who were different. In shaking the dust of the lands of their birth from their shoes, they had no allegiance to abandon. The only sense of loyalty that stirred their minds was loyalty to the Jewish nation—and its members scattered everywhere. The Ashkenazic Jew had never owed allegiance to the monarchs of middle Europe, any more than the Sephardic Jews had owed loyalty to the governments of Spain and Portugal. The Khazar Jews, the sworn scourges of Russia, merely carried their embittered hatred of the Russian government with them as they passed through the ports of entry into the United States. Having no allegiance to abandon, they nursed their hatreds and clutched them to their breasts. Of course, there was Palestine, a country they had never seen! There was their loyalty! In taking the oath of allegiance to the United States, they mentally reserved their over-all allegiance to the Jewish nation. During their two thousand mile journey to the Messianic Age, there had been many temporary stop-overs. This strange land of naive freedom-loving people would be just another way-station; a place to rest; to gather strength—and then to journey on to their destiny.

Armed with centuries of experience in bending governments to
their will, the Jewish immigrants looked upon the political system of the United States as particularly made to their order. Presents, bribes, flattery, pressures—these ancient levers to power might, indeed, move the world, when applied to the democratic processes of the United States. The greed and ambitions of Gentile politicians who must depend on money and votes for the attainment of their goals, are malleable alloys for the unique hammers of World Jewry. The vaunted “two-party” political system of this strange land of inexperience, offered the world-wise Jews a competitive market-place where they might openly sell their money and support for specific Jewish objectives to the highest political bidder. With increasing numbers and accumulative experience they soon learned that they might remake this remarkably naive land in their own image. The American people had become so thoroughly saturated with ideas of their freedoms that they had become incapable of judging between their own best interests in maintaining them, and granting license for their destruction. Under the heading of “religious freedom” a large determined minority might successfully destroy the basic religion that gave rise to the very concept of freedom. The transformation of the United States into a base for world-wide Jewish operations began with the arrival of the first ship load of Khazar Jews from Russia.

The socialist movement in the United States may be said to have started with the arrival of the first Jewish revolutionaries fleeing the European police following the revolution of 1848. Most of these Marxists were Ashkanazic Jews from Germany. Among them were such men as William Weitling, Marx’s disciple, who had been exiled from Germany for subversive and revolutionary activities. The United States threw open its hospitable arms, and, not only welcomed him, but provided him with a job as a clerk in the Bureau of Immigration in New York City!

“The effects of the events of European history upon American development,” states the Jewish Encyclopedia, “might be written almost entirely from the annals of Jewish immigration.”

Many of the Khazar immigrants found employment in New York’s clothing industries, which were controlled by the Jews. Besides dominating the cotton trade, Jews were manufacturing shirts, clocks, cigars and jewelry. Many of the Russian and Polish Jewish immigrants became glaziers and cigar-makers. Others became peddlers, small shop-keepers, and proprietors of supply stores for peddlers.

In 1889 Morris Hillquit and Joseph Barondess organized the United Hebrew Trades in New York City. At this time there were 75,000 skilled Jewish laborers in the city, of whom two-thirds were
Russian Jews. By the beginning of January, 1905, 20,970 Jews were members of unions, of which 15,582 were Russian Jews (figures by Abraham Lippman, secretary of the Russian Hebrew Trades). A thousand Jews were enrolled in the Theatrical Musical Union. Many of the Jewish immigrants found employment in the silk factories of New Jersey, the machine shops of Connecticut, and the jewelry factories of Rhode Island.

By 1905 Russian Jews were counted among the biggest real estate operators in New York. These Jewish realtors were largely responsible for Brownsville, the suburb of Brooklyn, and for a considerable portion of the Bronx on the Harlem River.

At the turn of the century the Khazars had penetrated the professions. In 1905, in New York City alone, there were about 400 physicians, 1,000 druggists, 300 dentists, 400 lawyers and 25 architects, not to mention musicians and writers of popular songs. Many of them had found jobs in the city government, and teaching positions in the public schools.

Beginning in 1885 Yiddish periodicals made their appearance. By 1905 six daily Yiddish newspapers printed in New York had a circulation of over 100,000.

The first Jew settled in Chicago in 1837. By 1845 there were exactly ten male Jews in the city, just enough for the minyan. By 1885 the estimated Jewish population of Chicago was three hundred and twenty-five thousand.

A few English Jews settled in Cincinnati prior to 1829. Many of the Ashkenazim flooding into the country from Germany after the 1848 revolutions also settled in Cincinnati. Memphis, St. Paul, Indianapolis, St. Louis, San Francisco, Portland, Oregon, and many other cities received a quota of the revolutionary “forty-eighthers”.

Oscar S. Straus, Henry Morgenthau, Irving Lehman, Simon Wolf and Adolf Kraus, are some of the more prominent descendants of the German Jews who found haven in the United States after 1848.

Simon Wolf (1836-1923) was born at Hinzweiler, Bavaria. He was twelve years of age when he came to the United States in 1848. He attended the Ohio Law School and practiced law in Ohio and in Washington, D. C. President Hayes appointed him to the office of civil judge at Washington, from which he resigned to accept the post of consul-general of the United States to Egypt in 1881.

Simon Wolf was extremely active in the Independent Order B’nai B’rith, holding the office of president from 1903 to 1905. He became an official spokesman-lobbyist for the Jews of the United
States, and ultimately for the Jews of the world. As chairman of the Board of Delegates of Civil and Religious Rights, an exclusively Jewish organization, Wolf was responsible for much of United States policy on the Jewish question, not only within the borders of the United States, but throughout the world as well.

The United States did not escape the early ideas of the Utopians and the milder sort of socialism that was associated with Christianity. Similarly, the incipient idea of labor organization, later to be supplemented with the revolutionary doctrines of Marx and Lassalle, made an early appearance.

The Working Men’s Party was organized in 1829. Its members were called “Workies”, and the party was referred to as the “Infidel Party”, and the “Dirty Shirt Party”. It had a few initial successes in industrial centers, such as Albany and Philadelphia. The president of the Carpenters’ Union was elected to the New York State Assembly. One spokesman for the organization declared that “great wealth ought to be taken away from its possessors on the same principle that a sword or pistol may be wrested from a robber.”

The “Party” did not last long. Its members were attracted to Andrew Jackson’s “democracy”.

Albert Brisbane, father of the journalist Arthur Brisbane, was the son of a well-to-do landowner in New York State. He received a thorough education and traveled and studied extensively in Europe. While there he became acquainted with the works of Saint-Simon, and afterwards devoted much of his time and money to the propagation of Saint-Simon’s views. He met Fourier in Paris in 1832, and studied the details of his system under Fourier’s personal direction. Returning to the United States Brisbane worked incessantly on behalf of Fourierism. In 1840, he published "Social Destiny of Man”. The book was a reprint of passages from Fourier’s works, accompanied by Brisbane’s comments and illustrations. Horace Greeley became a Fourierian as soon as he finished reading Brisbane’s book. In order to further publicize its theories Brisbane agreed to write a column a day on the subject for Greeley’s New York Tribune.

Greeley’s “Associationists” was used as a vehicle for his socialist ideas, and he soon involved some of the prominent people of the day in Fourierism through its medium. Parke Godwin, associate editor of the New York Post, was brought into the “inner circle”, together with William Ellery Channing, Unitarian minister; Charles A. Dana, afterwards to become the editor of the New York Sun; George Ripley, later literary editor of the Tribune, and editor of the American Encyclopedia; John S. Dwight, and others.
During the early forties Fourierism made considerable progress among the intellectuals in the United States. Numerous publications appeared, devoted to the "new social philosophy". The anti-slavery movement gave impetus to it, and Fourier and his theories became subjects of public discussion everywhere.

A convention of Fourier societies was held at Clinton Hall in New York City, April 4, 1844. George Ripley was elected president of the group. Horace Greeley, Albert Brisbane, Parke Godwin and Charles A. Dana were among the vice-presidents. A National Confederation of Associations was the agreed objective of the meeting, and a publication—Phalanx—was to be its official organ. Albert Brisbane was commissioned to keep in closer touch with the international movement.

In the thirties a group, called the "Transcendental Club" by its critics, met at irregular intervals in Boston for the purpose of discussing social and philosophical questions. William Ellery Channing, George Ripley, Waldo Emerson, John S. Dwight, Margaret Fuller, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Henry Thoreau, and Elizabeth P. Peabody were among the members. Everything was discussed from religion to politics. Many of the members supported the claims and theories of the Utopian socialists, and advocated the establishment of colonies in order to prove or disprove them.

Ripley, the Unitarian minister, anxious to submit these Utopian views to a test, resigned his post as a minister in 1840. He selected a 200-acre milk farm at West Roxbury, near Boston, for his experiment. A group of about twenty—including Ripley and his wife—Dwight, Hawthorne, and William Allen, were selected for the human element, and they all moved to the project. They called it "The Brook Farm Institute for Agriculture and Education". In 1844, following the organization of the National Confederation of Associations, Brook Farm was launched as a full-fledged Fourieristic experiment. It was renamed "Brook Farm Phalanx". The official publication of the Fourierists, The Harbinger, was transferred to the Farm and placed in the editorial charge of Ripley, Dana and Dwight.

By 1846 the Farm was beginning to prosper. The "experimenters" were nearing the completion of their "unitary phalanx" building, when fire broke out and the building burned to the ground.

The most important of the Fourieristic experiments was the "North American Phalanx" developed at Red Bank, New Jersey, in 1843. Ninety members with an investment of eight thousand dollars created a value of eighty thousand dollars by 1852. The project lasted for twelve years. Dissensions from within caused a sort of internal decay, and the members voted to dissolve after suffering a fire loss of twelve thousand dollars.

All of the other projects failed almost from the start. The proponents of the theories were discouraged. Morris Hillquit, however,
was of the opinion that the amateur socialists had accomplished something. "On the whole," he wrote, "the communistic mode of life proved to be more conducive to the physical, moral, and intellectual welfare of man than the 'individualistic regime'."

Meanwhile the Jews from Germany carried the revolutionary doctrines of Marx to the far sections of the United States. Americans for the first time heard the "scientific" jargon of Marxism, and became gropingly familiar with such vague terms as the "proletariat", the "bourgeoisie", "dialectics", "materialism", and the "class-struggle". For the first time, from Jewish lips, they heard that "religion was the opium of the people". As is usual in such cases, it was the intellectual "bourgeoisie" that found these doctrines fascinating. The "workingman", for whom they were intended, showed amazingly little interest. The irreligious doctrines found more sympathetic ears, strange as it may seem, in the "modern" circles of religion than among the masses of the people.

To those clergymen who had toyed with Utopian experiments and who had advocated the marriage of socialism and Christianity, these strange new philosophies of "dialectic materialism" and "class consciousness" had a strange appeal. In time, William Montgomery Brown, member of the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church and Fifth Bishop of Arkansas, would write a book entitled "Communism and Christianity", and would become a self-styled "Episcopus in Partibus Bolshevikium et Infidelium". The cover of the book would bear the hammer and sickle and the slogan: "Banish God from Skies and Capitalists from Earth."

The Jewish peddlers from Germany carried Marxism in their knapsacks. It was the one commodity they were willing to give away to the unsuspecting Americans who were willing to accept the "gift".

Horace Greeley's New York Tribune promoted the communistic European trend by hiring Karl Marx as a foreign correspondent. Greeley supported most of the "radical" movements of his time. He belonged to the Printers' Union; as a matter of fact, he was the union's first president.

The right to strike in the United States was first established in 1842, by a decision of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, written by Chief Justice Lemuel Shaw.

The United States was the first country in the history of the world that granted the wandering Jew every right and privilege accorded its own citizens. Under the Constitution the naturalized Jew shared in the government, and became eligible to nearly every office within the gift of the people. The professions were open to him, and he might express his opinions in all the forums...
of the land without fear of reprisals. He could organize his fellow Jews for political, religious, educational or nearly any other purpose, or he might join with his Gentile neighbors in their organizations—if they would permit him to do so. Indeed, he might join with them in their political parties and in many other such public groups whether they liked it or not, but—so extreme were these Americans in their strange concepts of freedom—they had a right to accept or reject any one for any or no reason in their private societies and fraternities. This type of freedom, in Jewish thinking was quite reprehensible, and, in time it must be condemned and shattered as “discrimination” and “anti-Semitism”. These new-comers from their self-segregated communities of Europe, elated at standing straight and equal before the law of the United States, were infuriated when they found many private doors closed to them. The heady wine of freedom became so overwhelmingly intoxicating to the Jews that the two-way street of liberty became intolerable. It was not enough for the “Chosen People” to be merely equal; they must be supreme!

Most galling of all was the inescapable fact that this new America was a Christian country! Here, as elsewhere in their wanderings, the Jews found great cathedrals and rural churches. Public ceremonies and legislative assemblies opened and closed their sessions with prayers that invoked, not only the blessings of God, but the compassion and intercession of His Son, Jesus Christ! Public schools emphasized the morality and doctrines of Christianity. Children sang carols at Christmas time, and scenes of the Nativity were important episodes in public Christmas celebrations. On every hand, in political campaigns, in newspapers and other periodicals—the people were continually reminded that the founding fathers were Christians, and that that great Charter of Freedom, the Constitution of the United States, was a Christian document.

Within a few decades the Jews would change these native “Americanisms” and destroy these “Christological manifestations”. They would Judaize this purported “Christian” nation. Oscar S. Straus would ultimately “prove” that the republican form of government of the United States was actually founded on Judaism, and should more properly be considered “Jewish” in origin rather than Christian. (“The Origin of the Republican Form of Government.”)

With wealth, influence and freedom, the immigrant Jews became arrogant. To those who raised their voices in protest against the unrestricted flood of Jews into the country, the Jews retorted that all were immigrants or descendants of immigrants, and that the only real Americans were the Indians. Based on this untenable premise, American Jews contended that immigration of Jews into
the United States was a right and not a privilege, and, amazing as it may seem, many protesting American voices were hushed.

The Jewish people are probably the most intensely organized of all the nations of the world. The immigrants from Germany were particularly obsessed with ideas of organization, and they turned their hands to herding their fellow Jews into innumerable clubs, lodges, synagogues, societies and charities. All of these groups were, of course, strictly Jewish, and no Gentile was eligible to membership or participation. Jewish charity—which must be carefully distinguished from Christian charities—is exclusively for Jews. The basic idea of Jewish charity—again distinguishing it from the Christian philosophy—is the brotherhood of Israel in relation to the Covenant, the promise of world domination. Christian principles of compassion, regardless of race or creed, have no application to Jewish charity—which would permit a human being to drown if he were uncircumcised. The German Jews in America, away from their former ghettos, contrived a mental ghetto for their brethren in the Land of Freedom.

On March 7, 1860, eight hundred women shoe-makers of Lynn, Massachusetts, went on strike for an increase in pay. To publicize their grievance they paraded through a snow-storm carrying parasols and wearing their best hoop-skirts. Striking mill girls captured their mill superintendent and ducked him under a pump.

The sinister revolutionary virus of Marx and his Jewish disciples crept over the United States, slowly and almost imperceptibly infecting great masses of Americans. The irreligious fallacies spread out over the land destroying the roots and seeds of faith; shriveling with the corroding breath of doubt the strong vines of two thousand years. Like an invisible vaporous poison it silently invaded the class-rooms of American schools to over-power the reason of those who taught the young; penetrated the ivory towers of universities and colleges to befuddle the learned; curled quietly and unseen about the pulpit to cloud the mind of the minister so that he suddenly lashed out at the pillars of his faith. One by one the great champions and defenders of the faith dropped from sight and their voices were finally hushed. In the legislative halls of the nation, where the paralyzing vapors found their way, strange and fearful proposals made their appearance. Politicians stopped talking about “our Christian nation” and Christian ministers were suddenly self-conscious if they mentioned “Christ” in their public prayers. The body-politic of the United States gradually succumbed to the paralyzing Jewish virus sweeping into the country from the unchecked gates on Ellis Island.
History records that the great majority invariably absorbs the minority. This has been true of every Gentile migration among Gentile nations, but its great exception has been the failure of great Gentile populations to absorb its Jewish minority. This fact with its notable exception is universally recognized. The Jewish migration to the United States, however, from 1848 on, was to reveal an amazing deviation from the general rule. The Jewish minority appears to be absorbing the overwhelming majority. Within a hundred years America would be Judaized beyond Karl Marx’s wildest dream.

Carl Schurz (1829-1906), German revolutionist, was born in Liblar, near Cologne. He attended Bonn University where he was exposed to the socialist theories of Marx. He assisted Gottfried Kinkel in editing the Bonner Zeitung. He took up arms in the revolution of 1848. He escaped to Zurich when Rastatt surrendered. In 1850 he secretly returned to Germany and rescued Kinkel from prison and helped him escape to Scotland. Schurz went to Paris. The police compelled him to leave France and he found refuge in London. In 1852 he migrated to the United States, and lived for a while in Philadelphia.

In Watertown, Wisconsin, he became a prominent leader in the Republican Party. He began the practice of law in Milwaukee. In the Republican national convetion of 1860 this disciple of Marx was the chairman of the Wisconsin delegation. Lincoln appointed him minister to Spain in 1861. Returning to the United States in January, 1862, he was commissioned a brigadier-general. In 1869-1875 he was United States Senator from Missouri. He broke with the administration in 1870, and started the Liberal Republican Party movement in Missouri.

Isaac Mayer Wise was born in Bohemia in March, 1819. He came to the United States in 1846, an ordained rabbi. He became the rabbi at the Jewish community in Albany, New York, where he lived for eight years.

Through Isaac Leeser, publisher of the Occident, Wise reached a wide audience of American Jews. He urged the “need for progress in ideas,” the need for rabbis trained in the United States, and for a union of America Jews to provide a college for rabbinical training.

In 1854 Wise took over the Congregation Bene Yeshurun at Cincinnati. Here he founded the Israelite, published in English, and a German language paper, Deborah. In 1871 the foundations for the Union of American Hebrew Congregations was laid, largely through the efforts of Isaac Wise. Four years later the Hebrew Union College was opened.
Before he died in 1900, Wise had completed an over-all molding device for American Jewry, thus insuring the perseverance of the “Jewish nation” myth and the fiction of the “mission of Israel”, irrespective of the various shades and degrees of orthodox and reformed Judaism. He had established a union of congregations, a college for rabbi training, and a rabbinical conference. Jewry would not lose its Jewishness in America.

* * * * * *

Corruption swept the Congress of the United States. Credit Mobilier of America, a railroad construction company building the Union Pacific railroad, invaded Washington. Big business lobbies became more powerful than Congress itself. It is reported that Collis P. Huntington of the Central Pacific Railroad spent from two hundred thousand to a half million dollars during every session of Congress, “barely out-bribing his rivals”. Congressman Oakes Ames was said to be the chief lobbyist and pay-off man for Credit Mobilier. By virtue of Credit Mobilier’s efforts the United States Treasury was some twenty-three million dollars short. Oakes Ames is alleged to have bribed his fellow congressmen with free stock, which paid as high as 625 percent dividends in a year. Among those who are said to have received Credit Mobilier stock was Congressman James Brooks, the Democratic leader. White House Secretary Orville Babcock was accused of participating in the two and one-half million dollar whiskey tax fraud, and War Secretary William Belknap was charged with having received $25,000.00 in bribes from Indian store-keepers. Even the Vice-President of the United States, Schuyler Colfax, is reported to have received a bribe for blocking the investigation of Credit Mobilier and its operations.

Uriah S. Stevens is said to be the founder of the Noble Order of the Knights of Labor (1871). In the beginning its membership was limited to tailors. Members of other crafts were eligible to membership later. By 1876 there were more than a hundred affiliated “assemblies”. The membership is said to have been over 80,000 in 1878, and 700,000 in 1886.

The Knights of Labor was a secret society. Even its name was not made public, being designated by five asterisks, which caused it to be spoken of as the “society of the Five Stars”. Many people became alarmed at some of its activities. Certain Jewish cabalistic signs appearing in a public place would summon hundreds of workingmen. Both Catholic and Protestant clergymen were aroused over the mystery that surrounded the organization, and spoke in public against it.

The Society had an unwritten ritual. When public antipathy and hostility became general, a partial removal of the injunction to secrecy was lifted, which appealed the public to some extent.
Women were admitted thereafter. In 1883 Negroes became eligible. In 1886 the organization boasted of over a million members. It disappeared as suddenly and mysteriously as it had come into existence.

* * * * * *

Daniel De Leon (1852-1914) was born on the Island of Curacao. He was educated in Germany and the Netherlands. He came to the United States in 1872 and edited a Spanish newspaper in New York City. He studied law at Columbia University, and practiced for a time after receiving his degree in 1876. He lectured at Columbia University (1883-1889) on Latin-American diplomacy. He joined the Knights of Labor in 1888. He became active in Edward Bellamy's "Nationalist" movement in 1889, and the Socialist Labor Party in 1890. He was a Socialist Labor candidate for governor of New York in 1891. He was the editor of the Socialist Labor weekly, "The People"

De Leon was an inflexible Marxian doctrinaire and revolutionary. He was one of the founders of the Industrial Workers of the World (1905), but he was later expelled with his particular followers (1908). He then organized a rival group, the Workers' International Industrial Union, which was dissolved in 1925.

* * * * * *

The Independent Order B'Nai B'rith (Sons of the Covenant) indicated its international character after the close of the Civil War. Aside from its foreign lodges, its central theme was clearly revealed as Jewish nationalism, and its activities on behalf of international Jews completely divorced it from Americana. The American citizenship of its members simultaneously supplied a shield and a sword for its activities. The "sword" was its political power as a voting bloc in the great centers of population, and its "shield" was the First Amendment to the Constitution. Under the guise of "religious freedom" the organization launched political attacks upon foreign governments fighting off their own Jewish revolutionaries, and urged venal congressmen and public officials to intervene in the name of "religious" tolerance. Its influence and power grew with the passing years. Its contact with its foreign lodges extended its influence into foreign governments where the Jewish members played the age-old "back-stair" diplomacy and exercised their terrible power of the purse.

The B'nai B'rith was destined to operate the most powerful terrorist gestapo the United States has ever known—the Anti-Defamation League

In New York City corruption ruled the Democratic Party under the rapacious direction of "Boss" William Marcy Tweed and Tammany Hall. It is estimated that Tweed and a few Tammany insiders stole seventy-five million dollars from the city in two years. Between 1865 and 1871 the total theft is estimated to be as high
as two hundred million. Tweed is said to have bribed everybody, including the Governor, the legislature, the Mayor of New York City, and countless lesser officials. In 1869 he was able to force all contractors doing business with the city to add one hundred percent to their bills, and hand back the overcharge in cash to Tweed and his associates. The percentage was raised as Tweed became more greedy.

* * * * * *

The Liberal Republicans nominated Horace Greeley for President in 1872, and the Democrats endorsed him. Greeley's campaign slogan was "Turn the Rascals Out". The radical press, of which he had long been the leader, turned on him. Suddenly he was an "accomplice of Jeff Davis, the Ku Klux Klan, and 'Boss' Tweed". Greeley's career had been one of varied promotions. He had given his support to prohibition, spiritualism, socialism, free soil, Republicanism, labor unions, the Civil War, reconciliation with the South, and innumerable lesser causes.

The Wall Street panic came in 1873.

The men who ran the United States of America, established its policies, made its laws, and enforced them, through panics and prosperity, made more money between 1865 and 1900 than any similar number of men so placed had ever made before.

On July 16, 1877 the railroad workers went on strike against the Baltimore and Ohio. The strike started at Martinsburg, West Virginia, and spread to Baltimore. Twelve people were killed by the Maryland militia. The strike spread to Pittsburgh. Fifty-seven strikers, soldiers and rioters were killed in a pitched battle, and three million dollars worth of railroad property, including 126 locomotives, was destroyed. The nation's railroad traffic stopped. President Hayes sent United States troops into Maryland, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Illinois and Missouri, and the strike came to an end. It was the bloodiest labor disturbance the United States had ever experienced.

* * * * * *

Victor L. Berger (1860-1929), Austrian born Jew, came to the United States in 1878. He was a follower of Eduard Bernstein (Engels' old associate), and Karl Johann Kautsky (champion of Marxism and Engels' private secretary). He became editor of the Milwaukee Daily Vorwaerts (1892-1898), the Social-Democratic Herald (1900), and the Milwaukee Leader (Socialist daily newspaper—after 1911). In 1924 Berger, with Morris Hillquit, supported Robert M. La Follette for president. He was a delegate to the International Socialist Congress at Marseilles, France, in 1925, representing the American Socialist Party. After 1927 he became the chairman of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party.
He died August 7, 1929 from injuries received in a street-car accident.

Morris Hillquit (1869-1933), was a Jewish immigrant from Latvia. He became a lawyer and practiced in New York City from 1893. He joined the Socialist Party in 1888 and soon became one of the most prominent leaders in the movement in the United States. He was an unsuccessful candidate for Mayor of the City of New York in 1917.

Joseph Barondess, a Russian Jew, was a radical labor leader, and worked closely with Hillquit and the Russian Jew Abraham Cahan. All of these radical leaders spoke and wrote Yiddish and English, and exercised considerable influence on the immigrant Jew and the left-wing Gentile. Cahan was the editor of Forward, a socialist labor Yiddish publication that enjoyed a circulation of 150,000 copies a day. Hillquit is the author of a History of Socialism in the United States.

The Socialist Labor Party was organized in 1877. Its first presidential campaign polled 21,512 votes in six states. In 1898 it totaled 82,204.

The Socialist Labor Party split in the late nineties, when Daniel De Leon, who headed the party, insisted on organizing industrial unions to compete with the American Federation of Labor. His syndicalist ideas were ultimately realized by the C. I. O. (Congress of Industrial Organizations.) Morris Hillquit, Job Harriman, and others, held out for the primary Marxian principle of boring from within existing organizations, thus anticipating William, Z. Foster's T. U. U. L. (Trade Union Unity League) by quite a few years. Both tactics are communistic; the “one big union” theory being the ultimate objective after the conquest of the trade unions.

The first Jewish labor union was organized in 1877. The clothing industry attracted the Jewish immigrants, primarily because it was almost exclusively in the hands of Jews, and Jewish manufacturers naturally gave the Jewish worker preference over the Gentile.

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America is almost exclusively Jewish, as is the International Ladies’ Garment Workers. Neither organization is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor or the Congress of Industrial Organizations. The Jewishness of these two groups is indicated by their schemes of internal organization. They maintain schools, health centers, banks, welfare and social plans, and provide recreational programs, so that the ghetto life of its members is almost complete.

Sidney Hillman a socialistic left-wing Russian Jew, led the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America from the beginning. His record of communistic fellow-traveling is too long to set forth
here, but may be found in the reports of the congressional and
other legislative investigating committees on un-American activi-
ties. The extent of his sinister influence in American politics and
the United States government is summed up in the pass-word that
came out of the Democratic Convention that nominated Franklin
D. Roosevelt for his last term, and Harry S. Truman as his run-
ning mate: “Clear it with Sidney!”

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America is an outgrowth
of the United Garment Workers of America, the original organiza-
tion, and an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor. At the
Nashville convention of the United Garment Workers in October
of 1914, a number of Socialist delegates were excluded. They im-
immediately constituted themselves a separate convention, elected
a general executive board with Sidney Hillman as general secre-
tary. The locals of the United in Chicago, Rochester, Baltimore
and New York City, most of which were adherents of Jewish
Socialism and members of the Socialist Party of America, ratified
the action of the rebel group under Hillman and left the United
Garment Workers. The Hillman group attempted to retain the
original name of the organization, and petition the American Fed-
eration of Labor in convention at Philadelphia for affiliation. The
petition was denied. The new name, Amalgamated Clothing
Workers of America, was adopted in a special convention held
at New York City in December, 1914.

The Khazar Jews of Russia had not changed their inborn hatred
of all things non-Jewish by merely moving to the Land of the
Free and the Home of the Brave. Meeting in convention in New
York City the Jewish delegates of the new Amalgamated did not
hesitate to declare their intentions against the government that
had so readily succored them. “Every oppressed class in history,”
they said, echoing the Communist Manifesto, “achieved its eman-
cipation only upon its attaining economic supremacy. The same
law operates also in the struggle between capital and labor. The
industrial and inter-industrial organization built upon the solid
rock of clear knowledge and class-consciousness will put the organ-
ized working class in actual control of the system of production,
and the working class will then be ready to take possession of it.”

Hillman’s pro-Communist leanings are clearly expressed in his
proclamation calling on the Jews of the Amalgamated to parti-
cipate in the May Day demonstration held in New York City in
1917. “And just at this time,” he exalts, “freedom has scored her
greatest triumph in the successful Russian revolution. Czardom
lies buried in its own filth. Democracy and freedom are now en-
throned in the great Russian Empire . . . it is . . . for the purpose
of giving full expression to our joy over the birth of freedom
in Russia, that the May Day celebration of this year must be such
The American Federation of Labor came into existence in 1881, confederating a quarter of a million craft union members.

Samuel Gompers, an English Jew, became its president, a position he held for forty years until his death. He was born in England in 1850 and died in 1924. He was a cigar-maker by trade. He first organized the cigar-makers, and then turned his attention to the creation of a national central labor body, which ultimately became the American Federation of Labor.

While Gompers was ethnically a Jew, his work and thinking separates him from the rest of his people. He was deeply interested in the problems of the workers, and there is not much evidence to indicate that he looked with preference on the Jewish workers. For forty years he appears to have worked honestly and sincerely on behalf of the American workingman without regard or concern for his religious or ethnic origin. He stands out singularly free of the dual loyalties of the Jewish immigrant.

His Americanism, in spite of the Marxian and Lassallian origin and background of the labor movement, is etched with bold strokes against the revolutionary internationalism of his fellow Jews. His conception of labor organizations was refreshingly American. Much of his great energy throughout his forty years of leadership was expended in repelling the Jewish-socialist onslaughts that would have captured the Federation for revolutionary purposes. Every effort of the radicals within the organization to convert the movement into a political party for socialist purposes was promptly and ultimately defeated by the little Jewish labor leader from England. His patriotism for the land of his adoption, his meticulous policy in avoiding involvement of the Federation in the bitter controversies of partisan politics; and his abhorrence of communism won great respect for the organization he headed. Unquestionably the policies he adopted and successfully followed advanced the legitimate cause of the workers.

After all, Gompers had escaped the mental chains of the Talmud.

On May 1, 1886, three hundred and forty thousand union members responded to an eight hour work stoppage. On the 3rd of May a man was killed and several wounded at the Chicago McCormick Harvester plant. On May 4th a mass meeting of union men was held in Haymarket Square in Chicago. Of the three thousand assembled many were socialists and anarchists who controlled some of the unions. Many of these revolutionists had supported and helped elect Mayor Carter Harrison, who was
present at the meeting. The Mayor stayed through part of the affair, and then left for his home.

One Samuel Fielden climbed on the speaker's wagon and addressed the throng. "You have nothing more to do with the law," he cried. "Throttle it, kill it, stab it; do everything you can to wound it . . ." A round, cast-iron, dynamite-filled bomb with a long sputtering fuse hurtled through the air to explode in the midst of a group of policemen. Eight people were killed and sixty-seven injured.

The assassin's bomb had accompanied the Khazar revolutionists from Russia, and made its first horrible appearance in Chicago.

August Spies, Adolph Fischer, George Engels, and Albert Richard Parsons were tried and convicted for the crime. They were hanged on November 11, 1887. The socialists contended that the men were innocent, and that they had been "railroaded" by Melville E. Stone of the Chicago Daily News.

Three of the convicted men were foreign-born (Germany) and were confessed anarchists. The fourth, Albert Richard Parsons, was American-born. He had moved to Chicago from Galveston in 1873 where he had become interested in socialism and had joined the printers' union. Ultimately he became an anarchist. In a little paper he published, he echoed the program of Johann Most and Lev Hartman as set forth in the "principles" of their International Revolutionary Congress: "Workingmen of America," he wrote, "learn the manufacture and use of dynamite. It will be your most powerful weapon . . ."

The Haymarket bombing did not find a chord of response in the thinking of the vast majority of the American people, and the reaction against labor unions became pronounced. Marx, Lassalle, dynamite, anarchy and Russian nihilism came sharply into focus in the public mind. Yet, every ship from Europe carried capacity loads of revolutionary Khazars into the Port of New York, and units of the Jewish Socialist Bund came into existence wherever American industry had established its factories.

The Noble Order of the Knights of Labor, which had boasted of seven hundred thousand members, began to disintegrate.

Henry George, the "single taxer", ran for Mayor of New York City, and polled 68,110 votes.

The Second or Socialist International was organized at Paris in 1889. Its headquarters was established at Brussels, Belgium in 1890. The Socialist parties of the world were affiliated with it. The German and Russian Social Democratic parties, which were the most important by virtue of ideological leadership, gave impetus to the world-wide revolutionary character of the movement.
Friederich Engels, August Bebel, Karl Kautsky, and G. V. Plekhov were the recognized leaders.

This second attempt to coordinate world-wide revolt was to last until the beginning of World War I. It would ultimately be replaced by the Third or Communist International, which would be known as the Comintern.

The years intervening between the dissolution of the First International and the formation of the Second in 1889, were years of intense educational work on the part of the Marxists for the cause of communism. During this period a new generation of socialist leaders were recruited and trained. Communist theorists had ultimately concluded that successful revolution was impossible without powerful links with the working masses.

In the final analysis it is the working class that must fight and die on the barricades if communism is to be victorious. The resulting revolutionary program, therefore, called for a proletarian army that would be willing to sacrifice itself in the cause of destruction. Fortunately—for the communist leaders—the program did not call for the education of the masses. On the contrary, it called for Marxism education of the communist leaders in psychological formulas and their application to historical events for the purpose of moving the masses of the workers to sustained acts of revolutionary violence. The leaders of the revolution were to make up the "general staff" of the movement—the Marxian "vanguard" of the proletarian "army". Only the general staff was to concern itself with the tactics and strategy of the war. The problem was how to move the blind masses of faceless men toward the pre-determined objectives of communism?

Bebel and Leibknecht in Germany and Jaures and Guesde in France, worked incessantly in the labor organizations of the two countries establishing the necessary connecting rods between the "vanguard" and the proletariat.

Marx had been dead for six years when the Second International was born, yet it more completely expressed his diabolical doctrines than did the First International.

In the middlewest the Brotherhood of the Cooperative Commonwealth was organized by J. A. Wayland, editor of The Coming Nation, (afterwards the Appeal to Reason). The Commonwealth vigorously espoused a "colonization" plan. Its members eventually joined with the remnants of the American Railway Union, under the leadership of Eugene V. Debs, and formed the Social Democracy of America. At its first convention in 1888, the majority of the delegates favored concentration on a plan for "colonization". The minority withdrew and organized the Social Democratic Party of America. Eugene V. Debs, Victor L. Berger and Seymour Stedman,
among others, were elected to the Executive Committee of the latter organization.

Between 1860 and 1890 ten million immigrants had entered the United States to share, as Jefferson had predicted, “the legislation with us.”

Quietly and unobtrusively, in the beginning, schools for the systematic dissemination of authentic revolutionary propaganda came secretly into existence. The first objective of the instructors of these informal classes was the utter destruction of the moral fiber of the students. Immature boys and girls were the most “eligible” scholars, and the first lessons were designed to eliminate respect for moral tradition, law and order. This was usually accomplished by example in the field of sex. Boys and girls up to the age of eleven were made to dress and bathe in common, and great stress was laid upon the explanation of the sex functions in classrooms where the girls and boys were herded together.

Such a school, the Ferrer or Modern School, was uncovered by the Joint Legislative Committee of the State of New York Investigating Seditious Activities in 1919. J. Isaacson, Harry Kelly and Leonard D. Abbott were the men who directed the institution. The school had been established by the Jewess Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman in 1910, and was named after Francisco Ferrer who was executed in Spain.

Sex teaching in the high schools of the United States has become a “must”, high on the “progressive educational” lists of American educators. When sex discipline is completely destroyed the United States will be ready for world government.

* * * * * * *

The Zionist Organization of America was formed in 1897. Richard Gottheil of Columbia University was its first president, and Rabbi Stephen S. Wise was the first secretary. Branches, or affiliates for women (Hadassah), and children (Young Judea) were soon organized to supplement the work of the parent group. Louis D. Brandeis served as president of the Z. O. A. before his elevation to the Supreme Court of the United States. Judge Julian Mack and Louis Lipsky were important members of the organization. Lipsky also served as a member of the world Executive Committee.

The Labor Zionist Organization of America (Poale Zion) was organized in 1907 by the members of the Jewish Socialist Bund. Its “American” objectives were the support of labor and “progressive” forces in Palestine. Its publications are the Jewish Frontier, Labor Zionist, and Yiddisher Kemfer.

Mizrachi Organization of America (1911), seeks to rebuild Israel as a Jewish commonwealth in the spirit of Judaism. The organization publishes the Jewish Outlook and Mizrachi Weg.

The United Labor Zionist Party (Achdut Ha'avodah Poale Zion)
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was created in 1920. Its members work to establish a "demo­
cratic" socialist order in Israel, and to strengthen the Jewish
labor movement in the United States. Its organ is Unzer-Veg.

Thus it was, long before their cruel aggression, that the Jews
of America planned the future government of the state they would
build in Palestine once they had forcibly wrenched the land from
its rightful owners. These organizations were just a beginning.
They would multiply in numbers and members as the Jews took
over America and grew wealthy. The hordes of Khazars whose
forefathers never trod the Holy Land, were the most zealous of
the Zionists. The Sephardic and Ashkenazic Jews, having found
the United States agreeable, had been on the verge of accepting
it as the “promised land” and contenting themselves with a
spiritual Zionism. Their good intentions, however, were literally
smothered by the aggressive fugitives from Russia’s secret police.
They were torn from their lethargic “Americanism” and rudely
launched into a new crusade for Palestine and the conquest of
the world. The Khazar Jews of the Jewish Socialist Bund became
the leaders of American Jewry.

The panic-depression of 1893 swept the country. Henry Clay
Frick, chairman of the Carnegie Steel Company, was shot by an
anarchist at Pittsburgh.

*C * * * *

Coxey’s “Army” marched in 1894. Carl Browne, “General” Jacob
S. Coxey and his son, “Legal Tender” Coxey, led the motley mob
in its trek to Washington. Senator William Alfred Peffer, Populist
of Kansas, introduced the Coxey “bills” in Congress. The “Army”
reached Washington April 26th. President Cleveland and the
members of Congress refused to see the “General”.

The Jewish leaders of the revolutionary movement were quick
to recognize in the Negroes of America a powerful potential
weapon. Applying the principles of "minority appeal", so success­
fully used in their own behalf, they embarked on a program of
provoking “class consciousness” among the black populations of
the United States. It was an easy transition from the false cry
of “religious” persecution to discrimination because of color. Where
the Jewish propagandists had formerly employed the charge of
“anti-Semitism” they now screamed “anti-Negro”. In the larger
cities where both Negroes and Jews rubbed shoulders the Propa­
ganda of Marx and Lassalle crossed the color-line. The Jew, the
chosen of Jehovah, had less respect for the Negro than he did
for the white Gentile, whom he despised, and his earliest efforts at
recruiting this product of American slavery was hesitant and re­
luctant. The rise of the Communist Party of America would bring
a flood of activity in this field of agitation, but the earliest efforts were not quite wasted.

A statement written by W. A. Domingo, editor of the "Emancipator", contains the following excerpts:

"American radicals "must have specially prepared propaganda showing negroes how they as a group are likely to benefit and improve their social and economic status by any radical change in the present economic system . . . Induce intelligent negroes to attend radical meetings and to become members of radical organizations . . ."

It was some time later that the Marxian propagandist started writing the word "Negro" with a capital "N".

* * * * *

During the Civil War the Republicans had passed a federal income tax law, and the Supreme Court had promptly ruled that it was unconstitutional. In June of 1894, the Democrats in Congress enacted a two percent tax on four thousand dollars or more. Congressman David A. De Armond of Missouri declared that "the passage of the bill will mark the dawn of a brighter day." Senator Sherman denounced the bill as "socialism, communism, and devilism". He might have found its text in Marx's Communist Manifesto. Joseph H. Choate, the dean of the New York Bar, told the United States Supreme Court that the tax was "a communist march on private property." The Court held the bill unconstitutional on May 20, 1895. Justice Stephen J. Field from California (appointed by Lincoln) wrote the majority opinion. Justice John M. Harlan denounced the opinion as a "monstrous, wicked injustice to the many for the benefit of the favored few," and the New York World called it "another victory of greed over need."

Marx laid down his principal postulate in the Communist Manifesto. "The history of all past society," he declares, "has consisted in the development of class antagonisms, antagonisms that assumed different forms at different epochs . . . The Communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property-relations; no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas." Having created his basic premise, he proceeds to the heart of the problem. "The first step in the revolution by the working class," he says, "is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy." And how is this to be accomplished? "The proletariat," he answers, "will use its political supremacy, to wrest by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i. e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible."

In the beginning, Marx points out, "despotic inroads on the rights of property are absolutely necessary." Such "inroads" will
“outstrip themselves”, necessitating “further inroads upon the old social order.” He then sets up a ten point program for the destruction of the “most advanced countries.” The second point of this program calls for “a heavy progressive or graduated income tax”.

The politicians of the United States ultimately wrote this communist plank into the Constitution of the United States! It is officially the Sixteenth Amendment.

* * * * *

In 1900 the Socialist Democratic Party and the Socialist Labor Party came to a temporary agreement and nominated Debs for president and Job Harriman for vice-president. They polled 97,730 votes.

On July 29, 1901, at a convention held in Indianapolis, delegates representing the various Socialist organizations (except the New York faction of the Socialist Labor Party) formed the Socialist Party of America. It was not a “party” in any real American sense. It was an international membership organization, admitting children and aliens into its group. The affairs of the “party” were under the iron direction of a Central Committee. Patriotism for the United States, or any other country, was condemned. “The only struggle which would justify the workers in taking up arms,” the Party declared, “is the great struggle of the working class of the world to free itself from economic exploitation and political oppression.”

Victor L. Berger, the Jewish Socialist leader, writing in the “Social Democratic Herald” of Milwaukee (July 31, 1909) undoubtedly expressed the sentiments of the members of the Jewish Socialist Bund who had found refuge in free America. Said the “grateful” Berger:

“No one will claim that I am given to the reciting of ‘revolutionary’ phrases. On the contrary, I am known to be a ‘constructive’ Socialist.

“However, in view of the plutocratic lawmaking of the present day, it is easy to predict that the safety and hope of this country will finally lie in one direction only—that of a violent and bloody revolution.

“Therefore, I say, each of the 500,000 Socialist voters and of the 2,000,000 workingmen who instinctively incline our way, should, beside doing much reading and still more thinking, also have a good rifle and the necessary rounds of ammunition in his home and be prepared to back up his ballot with his bullets if necessary.”

Morris Hillquit became the acknowledged leader of the Socialist movement in the United States. While he recognized the communist leadership of such Jewish “intellectuals” as Rosa Luxemburg, Fritz Ader, and Trotsky, he advocated socialism as the “political and spiritual guide of the working class”.
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A “unity convention” of the socialists was held in Indianapolis in 1901, out of which came the Socialist Party. It polled 402,000 votes for its presidential nominee in 1904; 424,000 votes in 1908; 897,011 in 1912; 585,113 in 1916, and 919,799 in 1920. Allen L. Benson was its 1916 candidate.

The socialist movement in the United States, because of the immigration from Poland and Russia, is more closely affiliated with the Leninist brand of Marxism than with the socialist movement in England. While the United States received many of the revolutionaries of 1848, their particular socialism was lost in the flood of violent Marxism that swept into the United States with the Khazar Jews of Russia. This does not mean that socialism has not been radical in this country from the very beginning. Aside from “Utopian” and milder “Christian” forms, it has been distinctly revolutionary. There have been (and still are, for that matter) innumerable “social reformers”, and this group is susceptible of several logical divisions. Some of these “reformers” are of the Fabian type; real socialists who are in no hurry for what they consider the “inevitableness” of socialism. They advance “reforms” on the theory that the capitalist system is weakened by the acceptance of such compromises. The Bismarck type “reformer” is not a socialist in any sense. He advances “reforms” on the theory that he weakens the revolutionary fervor by accepting some of its lesser demands. A third category includes neither the demagogue nor the revolutionary. He is akin to the Utopians and the Christian Socialist. A fourth type is the political opportunist. He accepts and supports whatever he believes will advance his own ambitions.

The revolutionary socialist was opposed to “reformism”, until after 1900, and the “reformists”, in their movements, were usually heavily out-voted in socialist Congresses. The most out-spoken revolutionists had usually been their nominees for public offices—such as Eugene V. Debs, who carried the Red Flag in every presidential campaign, except one, until his death.

The Milwaukee Socialists set the “reformist” course before 1900. Victor Berger was their “leader”, in the full sense of the “leader” concept. “If Socialism is to become positive,” he said, “it must conduct the everyday fight for the practical revolution of every day.”

In explaining the Bernstein doctrine Berger said: “Others condemn every reform which is to precede the ‘Great Revolution’ . . . Nothing can be more absurd . . . Progress is not attained by simply waiting for a majority of people, for the general reconstruction, for the promised hour of deliverance. . . . We want to reconstruct society, and we must go to work without delay, and work ceaselessly for the cooperative Commonwealth, the ideal of the
future. But we want to change conditions now. We stand for scientific socialism."

After 1900 there was a change in socialist sentiment toward reformism. When Senator La Follette entered the political arena (1904) he was perhaps the most effective demagogue yet to appear on the American scene. Berger classed him with William Jennings Bryan as a “visionary”—personally honest and politically dishonest. "An insurgent," said Berger, "is sixty percent of old disgruntled politician, thirty percent clear hypocrisy, nine percent nothing, and one percent Socialism. Put in a bottle and shake well before using and you will have a so-called ‘progressive.’"


On January 1, 1919, Hillquit hailed the new year as "the turning point in human history." He sent "New Year" greetings to revolutionaries everywhere: "To the 150,000,000 proletarians of factory and field in all Russian territories, the pioneer-warriors for human rights and human dignity, for liberty, and bread. May the new year bring them unity and power, victory and peace, and deliverance from all reactionary onslaughts, domestic and foreign."

In 1902 Jack London declared that there were a million socialists in the United States who began their letters "Dear Comrade," and ended them "Yours for the Revolution." "Far be it from me," he wrote, "to deny that socialism is a menace. It is its purpose to wipe out, root and branch, all capitalistic institutions of present day society."

Hillman's Jewish Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, composed largely of members of Russia's old Jewish Socialist Bund, launched into foreign language publications in order to capture the Gentile aliens from other lands. "Advance" was the chief publication of the organization, largely subsidized by the Jewish union. Joseph Schlossberg was one of its earlier editors. In addition to "Advance", Amalgamated published "Fortschritt", a Jewish weekly; "Il Lavoro", in Italian; "Darbas", a bi-weekly, printed in Lithuanian; "Industrial Democracy" in Polish, and a publication of the same name, printed in Bohemian. The Russian Revolution of 1917 prompted the publication of "Rabochy Golos", printed in the Russian language.

During the years leading up to World War I all of these publications of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America were unpatriotic, and followed the declaration and principles set forth in the War Program and Proclamation of the Socialist Party of
America adopted at the St. Louis Convention April 6, 1917, which reads, in part, as follows:

“The Socialist Party of the United States in the present grave crisis, solemnly reaffirms its allegiance to the principle of internationalism and working-class solidarity the world over, and proclaims its unalterable opposition to the war just declared by the Government of the United States. . . . We, therefore, call upon the workers of all countries to refuse support to their governments in their wars. The wars of the contending national groups of capitalists are not the concern of the workers. . . . The danger of recurrence of war will exist as long as the capitalistic system of industry remains in existence. . . .”

William R. Hearst, in his ambition to become president of the United States, used his powerful newspaper chain to support various demagogic issues, at times calling for socialistic reforms. In 1902, by virtue of a deal with Tammany Boss Charles E. Murphy, he was elected to Congress from mid-city New York. By 1904 he had made himself a “friend” of organized labor, and received 208 votes for the Democratic presidential nomination. In 1905 he was elected Mayor of the City of New York on an anti-Tammany and anti-utility platform, but the Tammany crowd destroyed enough Hearst ballots to put their man in the City Hall. Charles Evans Hughes narrowly defeated him for Governor of the State in 1906. In 1908 Hearst set up a third party. His ticket polled 83,962 votes out of fifteen million.

Dr. Judah L. Magnes, president of the New York City Jewish Kehillah in 1909, was a graduate of the Hebrew Union College. He also became Chairman of the Conference Committee of the Fur Industry. His Jewishness is revealed in an article entitled “Americanism: True and False,” appearing in the “Fur Workers” for March, 1920:

“Soviet Russia stands as a beacon on the hill-tops, cheering on the agonizing peoples with a light in the darkness, with new hopes and philosophies, with wondrous longings ...”

But now, when the peoples of Europe are freeing themselves of their tyrannous masters and of the old systems that wore them down, what a disillusionment in the answer that comes to them across the seas from America! Deportations of political prisoners, the torture of conscientious objectors in dark, damp prisons, suppression of political parties, the invasion of private homes without warrant, the clubbing of innocent men and women, the prostitution of newspapers and other publications, the breaking up of economic organizations, and all the while the land flows with milk and honey and our population is bidden to rest easy under the official declaration that America has had her revolution and has achieved finality in political, economic and spiritual ideas.

“Let us use intelligence and help organize the great force of labor, and let us throw our lot with the lot of free and
liberty-loving men everywhere. Let us uphold the ideal of internationalism in the name of the old America that was free and is now dead, and in the name of that new America which is now in the process of being born."

The rabbi's brethren had talked the same way about old Russia when the Russian people were fighting off the revolutionary attacks of the Jews.

Probably no form of propaganda is more effective and powerful than the caricature and the cartoon. From Vienna came Joseph Keppler (1838-1894) to give Americans the lanky rube in the flag-striped overalls as a symbol for the United States—"Uncle Sam". As a cartoonist for Leslie's Weekly, Keppler caricatured most everything on the American scene, specializing in lampooning "big business", politics and religion. His "Bosses of the Senate", depicting money bags at the rear of the United States Senate Chambers with the "People's Entrance" in the gallery padlocked, follows the biting socialist and communist type of garish propaganda. "Sour Grapes", a cartoon depicting Pope Leo XIII as a winking fox who "couldn't control the public schools of the United States" is an example of his biting religious jibes. Thomas Nast (1840-1902), an immigrant from Germany, the black and white cartoonist, was as vicious as Keppler in his cartooned attacks on Catholic officials.

Frederick Burr Opper (1857-1937), the political cartoonist and creator of the comic strip "Happy Hooligan", was an American born Jew.

Lassallism may be said to be an extension of Marxism into political action through trade unionism. So-called Marxist revisionists, such as Eduard Bernstein, are not so much "reversionists" as they are "extensionalists". Basically they are Marxists. Bakunin, and others, adding anarchy now, instead of waiting for the "withering" away of the proletarian dictatorship, led the way for the syndicalist phase of communist thought. The emphasis was on industrial unionism, whose ultimate objective is the "one big union." Syndicalist thinking emphasizes the "general strike" and "direct action" as the best means to attain social change. This theory lessens the emphasis on the necessity for overthrowing the capitalist system and therefore plays down "political action" as a means to socialism.

All strikes, the syndicalists claim, have some revolutionary value. The extent of the "value" depends on how the strike is conducted. Strikers should win by strife and violence. Conciliation and arbitration are to be avoided.

Sabotage is particularly a syndicalist weapon. It consists "in obstructing in all possible ways the regular production to the
dismay and disadvantage of the employer”. Loafing on the job, damage to machinery, delays—a thousand frustrating errors while obeying all rules and regulations, is the accepted syndicalist sabotage method.

The “class struggle” and “class consciousness” doctrines of Marx are strongly emphasized by the syndicalist. In attacking the state the syndicalist attacks patriotism. The workingman’s country is where he works. International solidarity and anti-patriotism are held to be necessary corollaries of the class struggle.

Socialism continued to make steady progress into the colleges, universities and the churches. A former Secretary of the Treasury, in a 1909 address to a college alumni, said:

“I am alarmed at the trend toward Socialism in this country today. If there is any power in this country to stem it, it ought to be trained minds of college men. Four out of five commencement day orations are purely Socialistic. I have met many of the teachers of sociology in our schools and universities. With few exceptions these teachers are Socialists, though they hesitate to admit it and most of them will deny it. Unconsciously there is a great deal of Socialism being taught in these days from the pulpit. The Chautauqua is also full of it. I do not recall a Chautauqua speaker who is not talking and teaching Socialist doctrine. The trend of the newspapers is toward Socialism, and, I repeat, the trend is dangerous to this country.”

Under the title “The Christian Socialists”, an article signed by Rev. A. L. Byron-Curtiss (Rand School’s American Labor Year Book, Vol. II, pp. 358-60), the spread of Marxism into American churches is revealed. The report, in part, reads as follows:

“The Christian Socialist movement in the United States in the late seventies and during the eighties was sporadic in character but was led by very sincere and earnest men... During the last decade of the nineteenth century the word Socialism began to be used by them and the Socialist program presented as a theory or plan, and considerable cohesion or unanimity appeared among the devotees. Among the leaders may be mentioned Rev. W. D. P. Bliss and Professors George D. Herron and R. T. Ely.

“Probably the Episcopal Church was the only one within which there arose a society bearing any resemblance to a working class movement... To a very few radical Episcopalians is also to be credited the importation of a distinctively Socialist organization from the Mother Church of England, the Christian Social Union, which sprang from the Christian Socialist movement of Kingsley and Maurice, both priests of the Church of England. A branch of the union was formed in 1893 with Right Rev. P. D. Huntington of the diocese of Central New York as president...”

“The distinct advance of Socialist sentiment and movement among the church people of America was coincident with the spread of Socialism beyond the groups of the foreign born.
At the national convention of the Socialist Party in Chicago in 1902 there were among the regular delegates a number of clergy and lay officials of different churches. Since that date two Christian Socialist organizations have been formed and are now very active, with the avowed purpose of extending the principles of Socialism among church people of America.

“The first and largest of these is the Christian Socialist Fellowship, an inter-denominational organization with offices in Chicago. It was organized in Louisville, Kentucky, in 1906. From the beginning its general secretary has been Rev. Edward Ellis Car, Ph. D. It publishes a weekly and monthly paper called The Christian Socialist, with offices in Chicago. It has over fifty branches and a large proportion of its members are allied with the Socialist movement and party. It holds annual and frequent district conferences. Through its general offices and local centers, Socialist sermons and lectures have been delivered in thousands of churches. Millions of copies of the official paper of the Fellowship have been circulated to preachers, teachers and social workers. Churches, Y. M. C. A.’s and colleges are opened to the message of Socialism as put forth by the Fellowship.”

“In 1911 the Church Socialist League in America was organized by a few clergy and lay people of the Episcopal Church.

The I. W. W. (Industrial Workers of the World), an expression of syndicalism in the United States, was born in Chicago in 1905. Delegates from forty-three labor organizations were in attendance at the organizing convention. Eugene V. Debs, William D. Haywood, Daniel De Leon, William E. Trautmann, and Vincent St. John were the leaders and organizers. Its purposes were Marxian and revolutionary.

The organization became strong in the lumber camps of the Northwest, among dockworkers in port cities, in the wheat fields of the central states, and in textile and mining areas.

In 1924 a split developed among the members on the question of “centralization”, the majority going to the Eastern faction of the organization. As a result the “Westerners” set up a new organization with headquarters in Oregon.

When the Communist Party of the United States was organized in Chicago in 1919, many of the members of the I. W. W. were the first to join. There had been around a hundred thousand of them in 1912.

Along about 1910 four left-wing members of the Caucasian race organized what they were pleased to call The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The four were Mary White Ovington, William E. Walling, Dr. Henry Moskowitz and Oswald Garrison Villard. Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, a left-wing Negro, was the fifth member. Dr. Moskowitz was Jewish, and the N.A.A.C.P. has been in the hands of the Jews ever since. Its
current president is the Jew Arthur B. Spingarn, who succeeded his brother, J. E. Spingarn.

“Desegregation” and “integration”, in addition to the promise of an autonomous state in the “black belt” of the South, is the type of bait used to agitate the American Negro in order to bring him within the revolutionary forces of Jewish Marxism. Mary White Ovington observes that “the White American is growing darker, and the colored American seems to be slowly growing lighter.” (The Walls Came Tumbling Down.) She has great admiration for the Negro pro-Soviet Paul Robeson. “Whenever I see or hear Robeson,” she writes, “I feel in the presence of a controlled, deeply sympathetic personality . . . I wish he might represent us in Europe at the world’s councils.” She also reports that the Jews Louis Marshall and Felix Frankfurter acted as N.A.A.C.P. lawyers, and that Jacob Schiff came to its “rescue” so that its bills might be paid.

Upton Sinclair published his “Jungle” in 1906. It may be said to have been the most successful of the “muckraking” series. Winston Churchill said: “This terrible book . . . pierces the thickest skull and most leathery heart. . . . The issue between capital and labor is far more clearly cut today (in America) than in other communities or in any other age.” The readers of the book in the United States, however, did not rush into the Socialist Party. They demanded that the government supervise the processing of their meat supply.

Ida M. Tarbell, Lincoln Steffens and Ray Stannard Baker were other prominent “muck-rakers”. Tarbell wrote the history of the Standard Oil Company, Baker exposed corrupt labor leaders, and Steffens wrote “Shame of the Cities”.

The increasing Jewish population in the United States encouraged the Jewish leaders to alter the Christian character of the country. Backed by the teeming thousands of revolutionary Khazars from Russia, these leaders early attacked the hated “Christological manifestations” of America. On October 21, 1906, the Jews of Oklahoma addressed a petition to the Constitutional Convention of the Territory, protesting against the acknowledgment of Christ as a deity in the proposed state constitution. They argued that such acknowledgment of Christ as the Son of God would be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States.

On February 13, 1907 the Board of Education of New York City, bowing to the protests of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of the United States and Canada, adopted resolutions prohibiting the singing of Christian hymns or songs in the public schools; reading from any Christian book or other Christian religious
treatise, other than the Bible; the writing of essays or compositions
on any Christian religious topic, or the holding of Christmas
exercises in which the birth of Christ is mentioned or depicted.

Acting on Jewish protests, Shakespeare’s “The Merchant of
Venice” was dropped from the curriculum of the public schools
in Galveston, Cleveland, El Paso, and Youngstown, Ohio, in March
of 1907.

* * * * * *

Under the Taft administration Socialism flourished. The Austrian-
born Jew Victor Berger (1860-1929), took his seat in Congress,
the first Socialist to be elected to that exalted body in the history
of the United States. He was to be sentenced to prison for
twenty years on the charge of giving aid and comfort to the
enemy in time of war (1918-1919), but the sentence was to be
reversed in 1921.

Eugene Debs had toured the country in his “Red Special” train
in his all-out campaign for the presidency on the Socialist ticket.
“Big Bill” Haywood, ex-cowpuncher and miner, came out of the
far West, heading his revolutionary Industrial Workers of the
World (I.W.W.). Red banners were unfurled in Lawrence, Massa-
chusetts, and Patterson, New Jersey. Haywood preached “class
warfare” and fought employers with sabotage and violence. His
motto was “good pay or bum work”. Theodore Roosevelt helped
the communist cause by declaring that socialism was the result
of “the dull, purblind folly of the very rich”.

Eugene Debs never tired of telling his proletarian audiences that
“every capitalist is your enemy and every workingman is your
friend”.

The “progressive insurgents” under Taft successfully carried
a number of Socialist demands through Congress. Among these
were parcel post, postal savings, Department of Labor, Bureau of
Mines, the Mann-Elkins Act regulating railroad rates, the 16th
Amendment establishing Federal income tax, and the 17th Amend
ment providing for popular election of United States Senators,
instead of election by the members of state legislatures.

* * * * * *

The Khazar Jews were pouring so steadily through the New York
port of entry that a Kosher kitchen was installed at Ellis Island
on June 12, 1911.

* * * * * *

As a result of the elections of April, 1911, Socialists were elected
at Berkeley, California; Butte, Montana; Flint, Michigan, and in
several smaller towns in Kansas, Illinois, and other states. Addi-
tional victories came in November in Schenectady, New York;
Lima and Lorain, Ohio, and Newcastle, Pennsylvania. In New-
castle, the new Socialist administration fired the entire police force and filled their places with Socialists.

* * * * *

Theodore Roosevelt called for a “square deal” when he split with Taft and sought the Republican nomination for the presidency in 1912. Failing in his objective, he assembled the “Roosevelt Progressives” in Chicago, and they promptly nominated him. “I’m feeling like a bull moose,” he beamed to reporters, and the Progressive Bull Moose Party was born.

Roosevelt’s campaign slogans helped the Socialists. The “mon­eyed privilege” and “special interests” were the key-notes of his campaign. Woodrow Wilson was his Democratic opponent. He beat Taft 4,126,020 to 3,483,922 votes, but Wilson had polled 6,286,214.

On November 5 1909, the School Board of Bridgeport, Pennsylvania, in response to Jewish protests, voted to discontinue the reading of the Bible and the recitation of the Lord’s Prayer in public schools.

Simon Wolf and Judge Julian W. Mack appeared before the Immigration Commission at Washington, D. C. to argue against the Commission’s “restrictive” measures on Jewish immigration. In order to disguise the Jewish character of the overwhelming flood of immigrants Wolf and Mack protested against the Commission’s practice of classifying the Jewish immigrants as “He­brews” and insisted that they be officially listed as “nationals” of the country of their origin.

On the 10th day of December, 1909 the Jews of Chicago presented the School Board with a petition requesting that the singing of Christian hymns in the public schools be prohibited.

On April 4, 1910, the Superintendent of Public Schools of Cleveland, Ohio, acting on the demands of the Jewish community, issued an order to the school principals prohibiting the “teaching of Shakespeare’s ‘Merchant of Venice’ ” in the city’s schools.

The next day, Percy Williams, manager of eight vaudeville theatres in New York City, acting on Rabbi Silverman’s request, announced that he would bar actors from his theatre who impersonated Jews.

Magistrate Cornell of New York City publicly criticized the increase of criminality among Jewish youth in the city’s east side. On June 18, 1910, the Central Federated Union of New York City, publicly denounced the Magistrate for his “attack upon the Jews” and called for his impeachment!

* * * * *

During 1914 the revolutionary socialist forces of the world were mobilizing with unprecedented vigor. The League of Nations Association was organized in London. The Industrial Workers of
the World (I.W.W.) was flexing its muscles. Intellectual gang­sters and revolutionaries were becoming popular and socialism was gaining respectability. Marx had declared that the “imperial­ist war” must be transformed into civil war and revolution, and Lenin and Trotsky were getting ready to do just that. Socialists everywhere were urging the “people” to hamper, frustrate and sabotage their respective government’s war efforts. All capitalist wars must be turned into proletariat revolution! The morale of the armed forces of every warring nation must be undermined and destroyed! The workers must be discouraged and urged to keep out of the capitalist fighting forces! Patriotism must be ridiculed! People everywhere must be turned against their own governments!

It was a big job for the socialists of America, but they went to work. The American League to Limit Armaments was organ­ized in New York City on December 18, 1914. The Emergency Federation of Peace started its propaganda campaign from Chi­cago at almost the same time.

Among the active organizers of the American League to Limit Armaments were a number of individuals who were also active in the Emergency Federation of Peace, which latter group was directed by Louis Lochner. Among these were Jane Addams, Rev. John Haynes Holmes, David Star Jordan, Dr. Jacques Loeb, Dr. George W. Nasmyth, George Foster Peabody, Oswald Garrison Villard, Morris Hillquit, Hamilton Holt, Elsie Clews Parsons, Lillian D. Wald, Stephen S. Wise, and L. Hollingsworth Wood.

The League to Limit Armaments ultimately became the American Union Against Militarism.

Dr. Woodrow Wilson, as president of Princeton in the early nineteen hundreds, embarked on a crusade to rid the campus of “snobbery” by abolishing “student clubs”. He failed in his objective but the publicity won him the governorship of New Jersey. Chairman Will Hays of the Republican National Committee said of Wilson’s plan to “rebuild the world” that it was to be “in unimpeded conformity with whatever Socialistic doctrines, whatever unlimited government-ownership notions, whatever hazy whims that may happen to possess him at the time”.

As President of the United States, Wilson pushed through Con­gress a Federal Trade Commission, the Clayton Act (anti-trust law), the Underwood Act (reducing tariff on many items), special aid to merchant seamen, farmers, and labor unions, and the Fed­eral Reserve Act of December 23, 1913.

World War I was declared April 6, 1917. Wilson announced that the United States was fighting the German ‘ruling class’, and not the German people.

The socialists liked that.
Shortly after Victor Berger, Germer, Engdahl, Kruse and Tucker had been indicted for violation of the Espionage Act (on which indictment they were all subsequently convicted), the Jewish leader, Morris Hillquit, attempted to mobilize the Marxist forces for their defense. Under the heading, “Socialist Party Has Been Indicted; Whole Socialist Party Must Respond”, Hillquit, as a member of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, wrote ("Eye Opener", March 16, 1918): “The indictment against Berger, Germer, Engdahl, Kruse and Tucker is, in effect, an indictment against the Socialist Party. No other government of a country at war, not even Germany, has had the sad courage of resorting to criminal proceedings to suppress a political party in opposition. The Socialist opposition to war does not spring from a sentiment of hostility to the people of America but on the contrary is rooted in a deep feeling of loyalty and devotion to the masses and workers of this country and the world. The charge of espionage against our comrades is a legal absurdity and a political blunder and a moral monstrosity. The whole Socialist movement has been challenged. The whole Socialist movement must respond.”

In Russia, Hillquit would have attempted to defend Berger’s revolutionary and seditious activities as a “pogrom” stemming from “anti-Semitism” and “religious intolerance”. In America he was forced to fall back on “political” oppression and “persecution”.

In the latter part of 1918 communist revolutions flared up in Germany—in Munich, Hamburg and Berlin. On November 9, 1918, the Kaiser abdicated and fled to Holland.

The Armistice came November 11, 1918, and World War I was over.

* * * * * * *

Anarchist Communism was defined in the March 15, 1919 issue of "Freedom" as “voluntary economic co-operation of all towards the needs of each. A social arrangement based on the principle: To each according to his needs; from each according to his ability.”

Prominent among the leaders of the Anarchist Communist movement in the United States before and during World War I, so far as its prolific propaganda was concerned, were Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, both of whom were ultimately deported to the Soviet Union. These two assumed the leadership of the anarchists and distributed large quantities of pacifist, anti-draft and anti-military literatures immediately preceding and during the war. They organized the No Conscription League and maintained offices at 20 East 125th Street in New York City.

On June 15, 1817 Goldman and Berkman were arrested in the offices of the League. M. Eleanor Fitzgerald, Carl Newlander, Walter Merchants and W. P. Bales, assistants of Goldman and
Berkman, were present in the office at the time of the arrest. The two Jewish leaders were indicted for violation of the Espionage Act and subsequently convicted.

While Goldman and Berkman were in prison the revolutionaries organized the League for Amnesty of Political Prisoners, a program that had worked rather well in Europe after unsuccessful revolutions. The new League set up offices at 857 Broadway in New York City and unleashed its propaganda. M. Eleanor Fitzgerald became its secretary. The finance committee consisted of Jessie Ashley and Leonard D. Abbott. The legal advisory board was composed of Isaac A. Hourwich (Jewish head of the statistical department of the Soviet Bureau under Ludwig C. A. K. Martens), Jessie Ashley, Theodore Schroeder, Harry Weinberger and Bolton Hall. Harry Weinberger was legal counsel for Goldman and Berkman. The General committee consisted of Leonard D. Abbott, Lillian Brown-Off, Dr. Frederick A. Blossom, Lucy Robins, Helen Keller, Elizabeth Freeman, Prince Hopkins, Margaret Sanger, Rose Baron, Robert Minor, Anna M. Sloan, Stella Comyn, Lincoln Steffens, Alexander Cohen, Roger N. Baldwin and Rose Strunsky.

The political philosophy of the League for Amnesty of Political Prisoners is indicated by the statements of its members. Rose Baron, member of the general committee, addressed a cablegram to Lenin and Trotsky, Council of People's Commissars, Smolny Institute, Petrograd, Russia, in which she declared: “You have our wholehearted faith and support. Ready to organize and send you international revolutionary army from America.”

On March 2, 1918, M. Eleanor Fitzgerald sent a cable to William Shatloff, Smolny Institute, Petrograd, Russia: “Mother Earth group,” she said, referring to a radical publication, “with our lives and our last cent are with you in your fight.”

Louise Bryant and Lincoln Steffens signed a cable addressed to Lenin and Trotsky on March 4, 1918. “Important you designate unofficial representative here,” it read, “who can survey situation, weigh facts and cable conclusions you might accept and act upon. Will undertake secure means of communication between such man and yourself.”

It is at least interesting, if not shocking, to learn that Lincoln Steffens subsequently accompanied William Bullitt on his official mission to the Soviet Union.


Emma Goldman preached that God was non-existent; that “conceit, arrogance and egotism are the essentials of patriotism;”
that love has no relationship with that poor little state and church-begotten weed marriage.”

Hiram Johnson and William E. Borah led the Senate fight against the League of Nations. Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts had favored it until Wilson sponsored it. Thereafter he also opposed it. The treaty was finally rejected by the Senate of the United States on November 11, 1919.

The American Union Against Militarism came into existence in 1917. Lillian Wald was its chairman. Amos Pinchot, L. Hollingsworth Wood, Crystal Eastman, Roger Baldwin and Charles Hallinan were members. Baldwin (described by Norman Thomas as an “intellectual anarchist”), was “Associate Director”.

On May 2, 1917, the American Union Against Militarism merged with the Emergency Peace Federation, the Socialist movement, the Labor Party, and the Women’s Peace Party, to become The First American Conference for Democracy and Terms of Peace. On May 3, 1917 Baldwin wrote to Emily Greene Balch, stating that “emphasis should be placed upon the cooperation of the peoples—not the governments—on organizations of internationalism.”

The American Union Against Militarism ultimately withdrew from The First American Conference for Democracy and Terms of Peace, and thereafter devoted its efforts to the defense of conscientious objectors. Branch offices were opened in Washington, D. C, and New York City under the name Civil Liberties Bureau. They soon became the legal departments of the American Union Against Militarism. Says the New York Lusk Legislative Report: “Though this bureau under Baldwin continued to cooperate in an advisory way with the First American Conference, for the most part it created and developed entirely new machinery for hampering the military strength of the country, during the war and afterwards.”

During 1919 four million workers went on strike in the United States. Three hundred and fifty thousand steelworkers struck against the United States Steel Corporation. The Federation of Churches backed the strikers. In West Virginia the police compelled 118 revolutionary strikers to kneel and kiss the American flag. The strike was broken.

Anti-foreign, anti-socialist feeling swept across America. The rising tide of communism was inundating the land. The most obtuse instinctively sensed that the United States’ policy of unlimited immigration had something to do with the foreign “isms” that were threatening the very foundations of the American way of life. The agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation seized communists in coast-to-coast raids. The Justice Department de-
ported 249 to Russia. Socialist legislators were barred from the New York legislature. Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer was vigorous in prosecuting subversives. A communist killed himself in his attempt to bomb Palmer's house in Washington. War veterans smashed up a Socialist newspaper office in New York City. In riots in Centralia, Washington, four veterans were killed. The Detroit Journal, sensing the true nature of communism, declared: "Socialism is Bolshevism with a shave."

The policemen of Boston went on strike—1,117 of them. They were fired and replaced.

The People's Council of America was launched in 1917. It was modeled after the Bolshevik Workmen's and Soldier's Council, which, the organizers believed, exercised the sovereign power of the Soviet Union at the time. The People's Council actually was an outgrowth of the First American Conference for Democracy and Terms of Peace, which, in turn, had been a reorganization of the 1917 Emergency Peace Federation. This last named front was an out-cropping of the American Neutral Conference Committee, which had developed from the Ford Peace Party. All of which, of course, grew out of the original peace maneuvers of 1914. It should be obvious that these organizations were clearly revolutionary and socialist in character, in spite of the thin veneer of "pacifism" and "peace" with which they were plastered.

Early in June of 1917, Louis Lochner wrote to a number of California citizens and congressmen in furtherance of a People's Council Conference set for early July at San Francisco, stating that the Conference was "to be analogous as far as our American conditions permit, to the Council of Workingmen and Soldiers of Russia and to a similar body just created in England".

The program of the People's Council contemplated drawing all the radical forces together, suggesting mass action; a plan of Soviet (Committee) representation; discrediting the government; a scheme to agitate for discontent and disloyal measures—and finally for international cooperation with the Socialist forces of Europe.

Roger N. Baldwin had already advised Lochner and Miss Balch early in May as to the details of organization. He wrote (May 9, 1917): "Do steer away from making it look like a Socialist enterprise. Too many people have already gotten the idea that it is nine-tenths a Socialist movement. You can of course avoid this by bringing to the front people like Senator Works, Miss Addams and others who are known as substantial Democrats. Do get into the movement just as strong as possible the leaders in the labor circles, particularly the substantial men, not the radical socialists, both of whom ought to be recognized ... I
think it would be error to get the public thinking that we are launching a political party in Minneapolis. To be sure we are launching a political movement, but that is quite another matter from a political point . . . We want also to look like patriots in everything we do. We want to get a lot of good flags, talk a good deal about the Constitution and what our forefathers wanted to make of this country, and to show that we are folks that really stand for the spirit of our institutions.”

Lochner, in answering, stated: “I agree with you that we should keep proclaiming our loyalty and patriotism. I will see to it that we have flags and similar paraphernalia.” (August 24, 1917.)

On May 25, 1919 the People’s Council of America staged a mass meeting at New York City’s Madison Square Garden, which was advertised as “Justice to Russia”. The purpose of the meeting was to protest the blockade of the Soviets and intervention against the Bolsheviks. Rabbi Judah L. Magnes, Lincoln A. Colcord, Frederick C. Howe and Amos Pinchot were the speakers. Louis Lochner presided.

After Congress passed the Conscription and Espionage Acts, the American Union Against Militarism faded away, leaving its entire field of endeavor in the hands of its Civil Liberties Bureaus. In October of 1917 both offices and their scope of activities were enlarged under its new name, National Civil Liberties Bureau. On January 12, 1920 the name was again changed to the American Civil Liberties Union.

Roger N. Baldwin was convicted for violation of the Selective Service Act, and served a year in jail. His statement to the Court at the time he was sentenced is in full compliance with recognized revolutionary tactics. “Though, at the moment,” he declared dramatically, “I am a tiny minority, I feel myself just one protest in a great revolt surging up from among the people—the struggle of the masses against the rule of the world by the few—profoundly intensified by the war . . . It is a struggle to break in full force only after the war. Russia already stands in the vanguard, beset by her belligerents . . .”

“The American Civil Liberties Union”, reported the Lusk Committee of the New York Legislature, “in the last analysis, is a supporter of all subversive movements and its propaganda is detrimental to the state. It attempts not only to protect crime but to encourage attacks upon our institutions in every form. Many of the members of its Committee are undoubtedly sincere in their convictions, but the consequences of their activity is injurious to the public interest.”

“The American Civil Liberties Union”, reported the Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities in California, “may
be definitely classed as a Communist front or ‘transmission belt’ organization. At least 90 percent of its efforts are expended on behalf of Communists who come into conflict with the law. While it professes to stand for free speech, a free press and free assembly, it is quite obvious that its main function is to protect Communists in their activities of force and violence in their program to overthrow the government."

The radical left-wing Socialists walked out of the Socialist Party and joined the new Communist and Communist Labor parties. Both of these groups later amalgamated with the Workers’ Party (communist).

* * * * *

It appeared that all of the men of the earth were blinded and deceived. The strange spell of Jewish Marxism had lulled the most wise into a strange stupor. No longer could they think clearly. Old and cherished values suddenly seemed worthless, and time-honored guide-posts no longer pointed the way. For some strange and unexplained reason it appeared right and proper to send American boys into the eternal wars of Europe. Everything that seemed right yesterday seemed wrong today, and the black-evil of the not-so-distant past, looked shiny-white and good in this new half-light of the twentieth century.

Everywhere the beast walked men fell down to worship and admire. Whatever the beast demanded, men hastened to do. Throw down our Crosses that ye be not offended? In a frenzy of fear and trembling the Crosses were thrown aside. Deny Jesus? A thousand times before the cock might crow but once! Supplant our Christian traditions with those of the beast so that it be made comfortable? Willingly! Oh, so willingly! And these dazed, deceived men made an image of the beast—built a mammoth image in its likeness and worshipped it! Where, in all of man’s wildest fancy, had there been such a beast? It had been mortally wounded by a sword, but still it lived and performed miracles!

And the deceived people of the world came to believe that Salvation lay only in the mark of the beast, and they hastened to receive it in their right hands or in their foreheads. For they had come to believe that he who did not have the mark of the beast must surely die!  

* * * * *
BEASTS OF THE APOCALYPSE

V

THE RISE of international Jewish finance and commerce, supplemented by the spread of Jewish international Socialism, gave rise to the Jewish necessity to destroy patriotic nationalism and national boundaries. Integrated with the ideas of world government was the central driving force of Zionist nationalism, an apparent paradox that was not easily revealed nor explained. The Jewish objective to establish Israel's world-wide authority in Palestine was never an acknowledged plan for world conquest, except among the Jews themselves in their esoteric interpretations of the Scriptures and the Talmud. As has been seen, Jews, whether they moved in the dizzy realms of international finance or in the damp cellars of revolutionary conspiracy, met on the common ground of Israel's exalted destiny. Every Jew instinctively knew his role in the tacit conspiracy to destroy Christianity and Gentile nations. For two thousand years the inherited fibers of the Jew's very being had been saturated with his race's twofold mission to destroy Christian civilization and to establish Israel as the dominant ruling power of the world. "The law must go forth from Zion!"

The terrible power of the purse of international Jewish finance and the destructive force of Jewish revolutionary socialism had won undreamed of victories for Israel since the Napoleonic wars. The control and direction of Christian officials in the governments of Europe and the New World had proved childishly simple for the sons of Abraham. Where persuasion and argument had failed, bribes had prevailed. Where governments had stood obstinate and unyielding, terror and revolution had succeeded. If, by great effort, the several governments might be bent to the Jewish will, how much easier might a single world government be permanently controlled?

The important question confronting the international Jewish financier and revolutionary was how to convince the goyim that world government was to its advantage. Unless the United States could be brought into the jurisdiction of a world power, such a plan could conceivably fail, or, at best, be greatly delayed. In 1914, Germany, Great Britain and even France, were arrogant and extremely nationalistic in pride of empire. The United States, following the admonition of George Washington, had refused to permit itself to become embroiled in the intrigues and quarrels of Europe, and, by virtue of its Monroe Doctrine, was rapidly moving to empire proportions in the western hemisphere. China, languishing in opium stupors imposed on it by England for the
benefit of the Sassoons, was a sleeping giant without initiative or
direction. India, under the heel of the British government, was
in about the same condition. Only Japan, following the enter­
prise and daring of the capitalistic West, stirred as the dominant
power in the Orient. The Latins of South America, the teeming
blacks of Africa, the uncounted millions of colonial peoples—all
these world-elements were numbered potentials in any plan for
world domination.

The Jews had made but negligible progress in their scheme to
capture Palestine. The Jewish “colonists” had neither been for­
midable in numbers nor notable in accomplishment. Zionism was
no closer to its “home” in Palestine in 1914 than Theodor Herzl
had been in 1897.

Both Zionism and Jewish Socialism had established an image
of the beast in the Gentile world, and both movements had given
life to the image. No longer was it necessary that the Jews them­selves speak out; their words were in the mouth of their image.
The Christian banker unconsciously spoke the language of the
Rothschilds; the Christian minister and the Christian labor leader
spoke the language of Marx and Lassalle. The Christian politician
echoed the doctrines of Berger and Hillquit; of Trotsky, Bern­
stein and Moses Hess. University professors and school teachers
taught the philosophy of Freud and the principles of the Second
International. And few courageous souls dared cry out against
the Jewishness of it all, for fear of economic reprisal and death.

It was easy to say, and easy to believe, that “modern” forces
had been at work changing the economic condition of the world,
drawing its many parts together, and making possible a “per­
manent international political organization.” All of the world
had been made smaller by the net-work of communication encirc­
ing it. Commerce had become international, so that the interests
of a financier in a given country were bound up with the financial
interests of all countries. Labor in one country was affected by
the economic condition of labor in other countries, and the welfare
of the world might be seriously effected by the action of a Zulu
chief in Africa.

These were some of the arguments in 1914 . . .

International Jewish conferences became more frequent during
the second half of the nineteenth century. Such meetings were
held in the years 1869, 1872 and 1878. The Central-Verein Deut­
scher Staatsburger-Jüdischen Glaubens was organized in Germany
in 1883. By 1929 it was alleged to have had 555 units and over
60,000 members. It was Leo Pinsker and Theodor Herzl who had
called for international organization of the Jews, but it was the
Rothschilds and the other Jewish financiers who made it possible.
The sudden rush of Jewish delegates from the many lands of their birth to meet in international conferences for strictly Jewish purposes would have been considered fantastically treasonable in the eighteenth century, but it passed without effective criticism in the latter part of the nineteenth.

Pinsker had demanded a “National Congress of Jews”. Herzl had called for “The Society of Jews”. The conference at Basel, Switzerland in 1897 had given birth to the World Zionist Organization, which embodied both ideas. Although Herzl was quick to announce its strictly political character, it was, in effect, an international Sanhedrin, and there was nothing new in the organization or the reasons for its existence. “I wish it to be clearly understood from the outset,” Herzl declared, “that no portion of my argument is based upon a new discovery.”

In 1903, Simon Dubnow urged that the World Zionist Organization be reformed as a World Jewish Congress in order to be able to act on all Jewish affairs and represent Jewry as a nation in its conflict with Gentile governments. While this function was its purpose, if not its announced intention, the World Zionist Organization failed to act on Dubnow’s suggestion. Its position, in this respect, was made quite clear by the adoption of the so-called “Copenhagen Manifesto” in 1918 (ratified at Carlsbad in 1921). In addition to reaffirming world Jewry’s claim to Palestine, the “Manifesto” called for “full and de facto equality of Jews in every country, as well as national autonomy with regard to cultural, social and political activities for the Jewish communities of the countries with a Jewish mass population, and of all other countries where the Jewish population may demand such autonomy”.

Never before in the history of the world had people demanded more than equality before the law. The “Copenhagen Manifesto” demanded a double privilege; full equality plus the special privilege of being autonomous (self-governing) in Jewish affairs. The “Communist Manifesto” had called for the confiscation of all private property and the overthrow and destruction of all existing governments. The “Copenhagen Manifesto” called for the conquest of a foreign country which the Jews neither occupied (and few had even seen) to which they held neither legal nor moral title. In the same breath and at the same time the “Manifesto” demanded that the Jews be treated as citizens and sojourning monarchs in the lands of their birth and “temporary” abode.

Ultimately, however, the World Zionist Organization was willing to delegate some of its assumed jurisdiction over world Jewry, in order to apply its full energy to the conquest of Palestine. Jewry’s second international was therefore launched with Zionist blessings in 1932. “We are a people—one people!” declared Herzl.
“The longer anti-Semitism lies in abeyance the more fiercely will it break out. The infiltration of immigrating Jews, attracted to a land by apparent security, and the ascent in the social scale of native Jews, combine powerfully to bring about a revolution. Nothing is plainer than this rational conclusion.”

The World Jewish Congress is actually the creation of the American Jewish Congress. World War I forever destroyed the fiction that Jews were citizens of the countries of their birth or naturalization. This myth came nearer realization in the United States than anywhere else in the world before 1881, and it might have become a reality had the Khazar Jews stayed in Russia. The American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, organized in 1914, was unable to distinguish between the Jews serving the Kaiser and Jews serving the Allies, indicating the lack of loyalty of the Jews to either side. As the war developed and Allied victory became certain, American Jewry prepared to join with the international Jews of the world for participation as a nation in the inevitable Peace Conference. The impudence of the plan is curious in itself, but not nearly so curious and amazing as is the fact that no one appears to have questioned it. Ordinarily a group of American citizens presuming to participate in an international conference where its members were already represented by their duly elected officials, would be preposterous. Yet, this is exactly what American Jewry proposed to do!

B. G. Richards, N. Sykin and B. Zuckerman submitted a resolution to an extraordinary Zionist conference held in New York City, proposing “a convention for the purpose of considering Jewish affairs.” The Zionist Conference (August 30, 1914) referred the resolution to the Provisional Zionist Committee. Louis D. Brandeis was delegated to discuss the resolution and Zionist policy with the officers of the American Jewish Committee, a select group of fifty Jews. There was some hesitation on the part of the members of the American Jewish Committee to entrust a convention of such magnitude to the Jewish masses, fearing that the completely un-American Khazar revolutionaries would dominate the meeting to the detriment of Jewish purposes. The National Workmen's Committee on Jewish Rights joined with the American Jewish Committee in opposing the “collaboration of classes in an organization representing the entire Jewish collectivity—thus exemplifying the curious alliance of right and left-wing solidarity for common Jewish purposes. The Workmen's Circle, composed largely of members of the old Jewish Socialist Bund, held out for mass collaboration, and criticized the stand of the National Workmen's Committee on Jewish Rights and the American Jewish Committee.
On March 15, 1915, Judge Julian Mack, Louis D. Brandeis and Dr. Stephen S. Wise set up the Jewish Congress Organizational Committee. The man who was destined to become a Justice of the United States Supreme Court was able to declare (September 27, 1915) that the American Jewish Congress was to be "an incident of the organization of the Jewish people—an instrument through which their will may be ascertained, and when ascertained may be carried out."

Meanwhile, the Kehillah (Jewish ruling body) of New York City proposed a secret conference for October 24, 1915, and the American Jewish Committee proceeded to make arrangements for it. Brandeis, believing that bold action was the better policy, opposed the meeting. "Secrecy," he said, "will lead necessarily to suspicion and misrepresentation of Jewish purposes and deprive us of non-Jewish support. We seek action in the open so that there shall be no misunderstanding either among our own people or among our fellow-citizens, as to our aims and methods." The future Justice of the Supreme Court had no hesitancy in distinguishing between "our own people" and the strangers—"our fellow-citizens." Likewise, he emulated that other outspoken Jew—Karl Marx—who deplored secrecy when he declared: "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions."

The preliminary conference of the American Jewish Congress was held in Philadelphia March 26, 1916. Three hundred and sixty-seven delegates, representing more than a million American Jews, participated. Dr. Stephen S. Wise made the "keynote" address—American Israel and Democracy.

Although the United States had not yet been involved in World War I, the Jews looked ahead to the "Peace Conference." They called upon "the Congress" to "consider the question of securing to Jews free and equal rights, civil, political and religious, in all such lands where these rights were denied to them; that the Congress consider the question of securing to the Jews national rights in all such lands in which national rights were or ought to be recognized". The Congress went on record for cooperation with the Jews of other lands "in furtherance of the Congress program", thus laying the ground-work for the World Jewish Congress.

Louis D. Brandeis was named honorary chairman of the organization. A National Executive Committee was elected. Jewish groups of the world were invited to work with the Congress. The American Jewish Committee and the National Workmen's Committee on Jewish Rights went along with the program. At a meeting held Christmas Day, 1916, representatives of the various groups agreed that the American Jewish Congress would confine...
itself to the “Peace Conference” and dissolve when its purposes in this connection had been accomplished.

The National Workmen’s Committee on Jewish Rights, organized early in 1915, was composed of four of the most radical of the American Jewish organizations—the United Worker’s Circle, Hebrew Trades, the Jewish Socialist Federation of America, and the Forward Association. The 1918 officers of the National Workmen’s Committee were Frank F. Rosenblatt, treasurer; J. B. Salutsky, secretary; A. Baroff, I. Baskin, Isidor Cohen, M. Gillis, J. Halpern, A. Held, B. Hoffman, E. H. Jeshurin, H. Lang, M. Lulow, M. Olgin, Jacob Panken, Max Pine, Frank F. Rosenblatt, J. B. Salutsky, L. Schaffer, J. Schlossberg, S. Valitzky, B. Vladeck, M. Winchevsky, directors. M. Olgin was destined to become one of America’s outspoken Communists. His “Why Communism?” is probably the most daring exposition of what the United States may expect from Marxism.

The Central Verband of the Bund Organizations of America, organized for the support of the Jewish Socialist Bund in Russia, Poland and Lithuania, maintained branches in “all cities of the United States and Canada”. Its avowed purpose was financial aid to the revolutionary Jews in Russia. During 1904 through 1907 “the branches of the Bund were the most active and influential bodies in the Jewish radical spheres in this country.” The Bund Organizations of America worked feverishly in the United States during 1904, raising money to finance its “comrades” of the Jewish Socialist Bund in their desperate attempt to overthrow the Russian Government. Tens of thousands of dollars passed through the American Bund to buy arms and ammunition for the Jewish assassins in Russia. Simultaneously, in concert with other American Jewish organizations, the Bund fought a rear-guard action for their revolutionary “comrades” by painting the Czar’s measures for self-defense as “pogroms” and “religious persecutions”. The Central Verband continued its fund-raising activities in the United States after the successful Bolshevik Revolution of 1917—this time “to assist the Russian Bund in its work against counter-revolutionary forces.”

During 1918, M. Gurwich was secretary and Dr. C. Kopelson was treasurer of the Central Verband.

The work of these revolutionary organizations indicates the widespread support of American Jewry for the Russian Revolution. Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Sverdlov, Uritsky, Volodarsky and many other such famous names of revolutionary Bolshevik leaders may have sounded “Russian” to the Gentiles of America, but the Jews knew that these pseudonyms concealed the Jewish character of the new government that was rising over Russia. There was great joy in the hearts of American Jews at the fall of the Czar, and, in the excitement of the great “victory”, they did not hesitate
to take full credit for the result. "There is much in the fact of bolshevism itself," boasted the London Jewish Chronicle of April 4, 1919, "in the fact that so many Jews are bolsheviks, in the fact that the ideals of bolshevism at many points are consonant with the finest ideals of Judaism". American Jewry glorified in the rise of Jewish power over the Gentiles. Isaac Steinberg, a member of the Soviet of People's Commissars, suddenly became a Commissar of Justice. Uritzky, Chief of the powerful Cheka, striking terror into the hearts of Christian Russians, became an avenging angel in the minds of Israel. American Jewry—indeed world Jewry—believed that the red dawn that had broken over Russia was ushering in a new day for Israel; a Neo-Messianic age that must fulfill the promise of the Covenant and deliver the world to Israel.

The American Hebrew of New York, September 10, 1920, hailed the promise of the "Red Dawn" and anticipated its breaking over the Western World: "What Jewish idealism and Jewish discontent have so powerfully contributed to accomplish in Russia, the same historic qualities of the Jewish mind and heart are tending to promote in other countries."

In June, 1914, Crown Prince Francis Ferdinand of Austria and his wife were assassinated at Sarajevo, Bosnia. The Crown Prince was the nephew of Emperor Franz Joseph of Austria. Gabrilov Prinkip and the men who had fired the fusillade were of Serbian birth but Bosnian citizenship. Austria, suspecting Serbian connivance in the murders, issued an ultimatum involving Serbia's independence. Serbia turned to Russia, champion of the Balkan slavs, seeking help and advice. Germany announced that if any power intervened she would back Austria. Austria rejected Serbia's reply to her ultimatum, and declared war on July 28th. Russia mobilized, declaring that she would intervene only against Austria if the latter should march on Belgrade. The German Ambassador in St. Petersburg told the Russian Government that any mobilization meant war with Germany. Russia ordered general mobilization. Germany declared war on Russia. World War I opened with the muffled thunder of marching armies.

The United States did a tremendous business with the Allies during the neutral years. It is estimated that American exports during this period exceeded seven billion dollars. The Bethlehem Steel Company earned $24,821,408.00 in 1915, and by the end of 1916 the figure was $61,717,309. In the first quarter of 1916 United States Steel earned over $81,000,000, and for the entire year $348,000,000. J. P. Morgan and Company is said to have totaled three billion dollars.

* * * * *
As has been heretofore pointed out Jewry was pro-German in the early years of the war. First and foremost Jewry could not support any cause that Russia espoused; and secondly, Jewry looked to the Kaiser and Germany to wrest Palestine from the Turks for its benefit. German-American Jews, such as Paul and Felix Warburg and Jacob Schiff of Kuhn, Loeb and Company, backed Germany.

American financiers and American industry, reaping a golden harvest by virtue of Allied need, unquestionably favored the Allied cause, although it is extremely doubtful if any of these Americans could have clearly defined what that cause happened to be. Just why England and France should be logically embroiled in a bloody and disastrous war with Germany, merely because Russia mobilized to assist Serbia, because a hand full of Serbian assassins had murdered a Crown Prince of Austria, and Austria had declared war on Serbia, was most baffling to anyone attempting to stick to the surface facts. Behind the miserable purported causes lay the age-old balance-of-power policy of the British Empire that George Washington had feared. England's blockade of Germany cut American industry off from Germany's markets, and thus, perhaps, by virtue of geography, altered the course of history. The recipients of seven billion dollars in trade must properly concede that the customer is always right—war or no war!

But the American people, who would have to do the fighting, the dying and the paying, were in no mood to choose sides. Most of them had heard of George Washington in those days, and their school teachers had told them what the father of their country had to say about getting mixed up in Europe's eternal wars. Yet, for some inexplicable reason, many American officials were working feverishly to find an excuse for involvement. In his "War Memoirs", Robert Lansing wrote:

"I believed that it was unwise (in 1915) to attempt to obtain from Congress a declaration of war until American public opinion was practically unanimous in demanding such action. While it was hard to await the slow process of complete conversion to the cause of the Allies and to a right appreciation of the menace to human liberty in the possibility of a triumphant Germany, which then seemed more remote than in the autumn of 1914, there was no other course for the Administration to take, even though it aroused bitter criticism in many quarters."

Lansing urged war in August, 1915. A sinister character, holding no position of any kind in the government of the United States—Colonel Edward Mandell House—joined Lansing in his efforts. The Colonel thought we lost a great opportunity to break with Germany in October of 1915 and wrote that "we should do something decisive now—something that would bring us in with the Allies."
House, in his "Intimate Papers" relates how he intrigued with the Jew Chief Justice Reading (Sir Rufus Isaacs), Grey, Arthur Balfour and other British statesmen to force Wilson to take action. He formulated a code to keep his communications with Grey secret from the British Ambassador and the United States State Department. Ambassador Page wrote in 1916 that House was in London, "full of the idea of American intervention." He stated that House proposed that he and Page "and a group of the British cabinet should at once work out a minimum program of peace, the least the Allies would accept, which he assumed would be unacceptable to the Germans, and the President would present this program to both. The side that declined would be responsible for continuing the war. Then to end the war, the President would help the other side—that is, the Allies. Of course the fatal moral weakness of the foregoing scheme is that we should plunge into the war not on the merits of the cause but by a carefully sprung trick."

* * * * *

As the war progressed the German supported Turkish armies in the Near and Middle East were successful in driving back the British. The Arabs, long suffering under Turkish rule, were Britain's desperate hope. Through Colonel J. E. Lawrence, who had gained the confidence of the Arabs, correspondence was initiated between General McMahon, England's Governor General of Egypt, and the Shereef of Mecca (Hussein), in which, in return for Arab support of Great Britain against the Turkish-German alliance, England pledged support of Arab independence within boundaries proposed by Hussein. This agreement, which included Palestine, became known as the McMahon-Hussein Treaty.

Hussein's son, Emir Feisal, commanded the Arab forces fighting for England. Colonel Lawrence, who was with Feisal, said: "If we won the war, the promises to the Arabs were dead paper. Yet the Arab inspiration was our main tool in winning the Eastern War. So I assured them that England kept her word in letter and in spirit. In this comfort they performed their fine things; but, of course, instead of being proud of what we did together I was continually and bitterly ashamed."

Colonel Lawrence had good reason to be ashamed. While the Arabs were fighting and dying in England's war believing that they were also fighting and dying for Arab independence, Britain's Foreign Minister, Arthur Balfour, was bartering Palestine for Jewish pledges to bring the United States into the war on England's side. In addition to this treachery, England and France, by the terms of the Sykes-Picot Treaty, agreed to divide the Arab lands between them at the end of the war. Ramsey MacDonald, English statesman, summed up this triple dealing:
“We encouraged an Arab revolt in Turkey by promising to create an Arab kingdom from the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire, including Palestine. At the same time, we were encouraging the Jews to help us by promising them that Palestine would be placed at their disposal for settlement and government; and also at the same time we were making with France the Sykes-Picot agreement partitioning the territory which we had instructed our Governor General of Egypt to promise to the Arabs. The story is one of crude duplicity and we cannot escape the reprobation which is its sequel.”

Few voices were raised to ask those questions that moral indignation might be expected to prompt. By what right did the British government propose to dispose of the land of another people? Upon what moral ground may one nation seek to establish a “national home” for an alien people in the territory of another? Palestine did not belong to Britain. Throughout the War England and her allies continuously proclaimed that they were fighting for world freedom. What kind of world freedom is contained in the Balfour Declaration?

Arnold Toynbee in “A Study of History”, speaking of this tragic affair, states: “While the direct responsibility for the calamity that overtook the Palestinian Arabs in A. D. 1948 was on the heads of the Zionist Jews who seized a lebensraum for themselves in Palestine by force of arms in that year, a heavy load of indirect, yet irrepudiable, responsibility was on the heads of the people of the United Kingdom; for the Jews would not have had in A. D. 1948 the opportunity to conquer an Arab country in which they had what amounted to no more than an inconsiderable minority in A. D. 1918 if, during the intervening thirty years, the power of the United Kingdom had not been exerted continuously to make possible the entry of Jewish immigrants into Palestine contrary to the will, in despite of the the protests and without regard to the forebodings of Arab inhabitants of the country who in A. D. 1948, were duly to become the victims of this long pursued British Policy.”

The news from the Eastern front, confirmed by Jewish intelligence, convinced world Jewry that Russia must soon collapse. Lord Reading’s trip to the United States as head of the British financial mission to obtain a loan, had made an impression on American Jewry. But more important than these events, World Jewry had made a deal with Great Britain, and this was the determining factor that finally seduced Wilson to abandon his fight for peace and plunge America into its first world war!

The Jewish population of the United States in January of 1917 was estimated by the Jews to be about three million. It was a recognized fact of life that the Jews would serve any cause that
served the Jews. With a British army marching on the Holy Land, Jewish prospects for Palestine at the hand of the Kaiser began to fade. If Great Britain would guarantee world Jewry a foothold in Palestine, world Jewry would work for Great Britain. Negotiations were opened with the British government in February of 1917 with Sir Mark Sykes acting as the principal intermediary. On November 2, 1917, Lord Balfour reduced the results of the bargaining to writing in a letter addressed to Lionel Rothschild, the uncrowned King of Israel. This letter became known as the “Balfour Declaration”, and reads as follows:

“Dear Lord Rothschild—I have much pleasure in conveying to you on behalf of His Majesty’s Government the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations, which has been submitted to and approved by the Cabinet: ‘His Majesty’s Government views with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.’ I should be grateful if you would bring this Declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.”

The Jews labored diligently to make the Gentile public believe that Lord Balfour, seeing the “justice” of their cause, wrote the declaration after “selling” the idea to the British government. In reporting the issuance of the letter, the Zionists said: “The Balfour Declaration is justly so-called, not only because it fell to Sir Arthur Balfour, as Foreign Secretary, to write the historic letter, but also because he, more than any other single statesman, is responsible for the policy embodied in the Declaration.”

And, of course, nothing could be further from the truth. The original draft was written by the Jews themselves. Justice Brandeis edited it, President Wilson approved it, and it was then submitted to Balfour for his signature. No event in the history of the United States is more humiliating.

In his Biography of Justice Brandeis, Dr. Jacob de Haas tells the behind-the-scenes story: “A considerable number of drafts (of the Balfour Declaration) were made in London and transmitted to the United States through War Office channels for the use of the American Zionist Political Committee. The American ascendency in the war councils led the British to ask for President Wilson’s consent and approval of the terminology of the declaration before its issuance. The draft, cabled from government to government, was handed to the Brandeis regime for its approval. After a most necessary revision, President Wilson, acting through Colonel House, who was in full sympathy with the Zionist aims, authorized cabling to the British Government.
Most students of Jewish intrigue suspected both the British and Jewish scheme and purpose behind the Balfour Declaration. Although the United States had been in the War for nearly seven months when the Declaration was made public, its significance as the factor that involved the United States was not unnoticed. There was considerable evidence available from which accurate inferences might be drawn. Governmental negotiations for deals of this nature, however, are always secret, and it is usually very difficult to obtain conclusive evidence at the time of the transaction. When the event is beyond repair and lost in the mists of the past, men are apt to write their memoirs and boast of secret exploits that one time rocked the world. So it is with Mr. Landman. He was Honorary Secretary of the Second Joint Zionist Council of the United Kingdom, editor of the Zionist, and Secretary and Solicitor of the Zionist Organization. Later he was legal advisor to the New Zionist Organization. Under the title "Great Britain, the Jews and Palestine", published in the London Jewish Chronicle for February 7, 1936, Mr. Landman writes, in part, as follows:

During the critical days of the war, in 1916, when the defection of Russia was imminent and Jewish opinion generally was anti-Russian, and had hopes that Germany if victorious would in certain circumstances give them Palestine, several attempts were made by the Allies to bring America into the War on their side. These attempts were unsuccessful. Mr. Malcolm, who, at that time, was in close touch with the late Sir Mark Sykes (of the War Cabinet Secretariat) and Mr. George Picot (of the French Embassy in London) and M. Gout of the Quai d’Orsay (Eastern Section), took the initiative in convincing these representatives of the British and French Governments that the best and perhaps the only way to induce the American President to come into the War was to secure the co-operation of Zionist Jewry by promising them Palestine. By so doing the Allies would enlist and mobilize the hitherto unsuspectedly powerful force of Zionist Jewry in America and elsewhere in favour of the Allies on a quid pro quo basis. At that time, President Wilson attached the greatest possible importance to the advice of Mr. Justice Brandeis. . . . Sir Mark Sykes obtained permission from the War Cabinet to authorize Mr. Malcolm to approach the Zionists on that basis. Neither Sir Mark Sykes nor Mr. Malcolm knew who were the Zionists leaders and it was Mr. L. J. Greenberg to whom Mr. Malcolm applied for information to whom he should address himself. . . . The Zionists carried out their part and helped to bring America in, and the Balfour Declaration of November 2nd, 1917, was but the public confirmation of the verbal agreement...
of 1916. This verbal agreement was made with the previous knowledge, acquiescence and approval not only of the British, American, French and other Allied Governments, but also of the Arab leaders. . . . As already explained elsewhere by me in detail, Dr. Weizmann and Mr. Sokolow knew that Mr. James Malcolm came to them as the emissary of the British War Cabinet, which authorized him to say in their name that England would 'give Palestine to the Jews' in return for Zionist assistance, through Justice Brandeis, in inducing the United States to come to the help of the Allies. . . . Both Sir Mark Sykes and Mr. Malcolm informed the Arab representatives in London and Paris that without the assistance of the United States the prospects of any Arab State arising after the War were most problematical, and they must therefore agree that Palestine should go to the Jews as the reward for their assistance in bringing in the United States."

"Quid pro quo"—Something for something! Since the Germans appeared unable to deliver Palestine to the Jews in return for their support, international Jewry withdrew its support and pledged the blood and money of the United States—quid pro quo—Palestine! When it is remembered that world Jewry—in England and the United States—was secretly cooperating with Germany and sabotaging Russia—one of the Allies—in her war efforts on the Eastern Front right up to the time of the verbal pact—the plot is fully revealed in all its horrible implications.

American Jewry was immediately mobilized. As a result of intense propaganda, Zionism won over the masses and most of the leaders of American Jews. Jacob Schiff, president of Kuhn, Loeb and Company, who had been an active financial supporter of the Russian revolution since 1905, was probably the last to be converted. He had been a financial supporter of the German Jews Mutual Aid Society and during the war before American intervention, he and Heubsch formed the Neutral Conference Committee which hoped to coerce the belligerants to make peace on Jewish terms. It was this Committee that advanced the idea of a League of Nations.

In 1916 the Zionists transferred their headquarters from Berlin to London.

Probably the most powerful Jew in the British Government during the negotiations that resulted in the Balfour Declaration was Lord Reading. Lord Rothschild, Sir William Goschen, Sir Alfred Mond (Lord Melchett), Sir Edgar Speyer, Sir Ernest Cassell, Sir Edwin Samuel Montague, Herbert Lewis Samuel (Lord Samuel), Sir Harry Simon Samuel, Lord Swaythling (Lewis Samuel Montague), Sir Stuart Samuel, Sir Hamar Greenwood, Sir Philip Sassoon, and Isaac Blumchen, were some of the Jews and pro-Zionists among the Jewish Privy Councillors who pressured the British Government for the Declaration.

Senator George W. Norris, speaking on the Declaration of War,
said: “I know that this war madness has taken possession of the financial and political powers of our country . . . we are committing a sin against humanity and against our countrymen.”

With the declaration of war, Wilson appointed the Jew Bernard Baruch chairman of War Industries and gave him a virtual dictatorship over the industrial forces of the United States.

Hubert Herring, in his book “And So To War” (1938) sums up the price the United States paid so that the Jews might have Palestine (page 20):

“We paid for the war. We paid with the lives of the 126,000 dead, of the 234,300 mutilated and wounded. We paid with the dislocated lives of hundreds of thousands whom the war wrenched from their accustomed places in a peaceful world. We paid in the imponderable damage to our national morale through the lashing of war hysteria. We paid with a period of economic confusion from which we have not yet escaped. The direct bill for the war has reached the figure of fifty-five billions of dollars. The indirect bill can never be reckoned.”

Russia was collapsing from within during the spring of 1917. Germany was battering her armies on the Eastern Front. The railroads broke down in March adding to the food shortages in the crowded cities. The Duma asked the Czar for a new Cabinet. He replied by sending a battalion to Petrograd to restore order, and commanded the Duma to dissolve. The troops were unable to restore order and the Duma continued its meetings in the Tauride Palace. On March 12th the mob arrested the Cabinet and selected the president of the Duma, Michael Rodzyanko to chair a temporary committee to organize a new government, and to notify the Czar that he must abdicate.

The Czar, returning from the front, was stopped by railway employees at Tsarkoe-Selo, where he was confronted by the delegation from Petrograd and informed that he must abdicate. Having no alternative Nicolas complied, naming his brother, the Grand Duke Michael as his successor. The Grand Duke announced that he would not accept the crown unless the forthcoming Constituent Assembly ratified his accession. Prince George Lvov became the head of the Provisional Government, and Alexander Kerensky, Jewish socialist member of the Dumas’ Temporary Committee, became Minister of Justice. Socialist Nicholai Chkeidz, president of the Petrograd Soviet of Worker’s and Soldier’s Deputies (of which Kerensky was vice-president) refused to cooperate with the Temporary Committee of the Duma, and continued to hold rump meetings in the Tauride Palace. (“Soviet” is the Russian word for “Committee.”) It was the policy of the Soviet to dictate to the Provisional Government without taking over governmental powers. In the beginning the Provisional Government passed the decrees dictated by the Soviet. These included a general amnesty
for all imperial prisoners; freedom of speech, press and assembly; labor's right to strike; universal suffrage, and a call for a Constituent Assembly through elections to be held in the autumn.

The Soviet (although the Provisional Government had met all of its basic demands) refused to dissolve. It continued its sessions. Without consulting the Provisional Government, it issued to the Army, on March 14th, its own decree, "Order No. 1". The soldiers were told to organize committees (Soviets) and obey the Soviet in political decisions; to disregard orders of the Duma which conflicted with Soviet decisions; that the weapons in their hands were their own, and were not to be surrendered to their officers.

Lenin had been in Galicia when the War began. He returned to Switzerland where he continued to write and propagandize, calling on the "toiling" masses of Russia and the world "to turn the imperialist war into revolution". With the abdication of the Czar and Russia's revolutionary masses wrestling for supremacy, Lenin sought a means of returning to Petrograd. Germany had counted strongly on revolution to take Russia out of the War, and when Lenin and his revolutionary henchmen in Switzerland requested assistance for the journey, the German Government was quick to oblige. In addition to Lenin, there were the Jews Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek and about twenty-five other Bolsheviks to be transported. Germany provided a "sealed" car which was routed through Denmark, then through Sweden and Finland. The revolutionaries arrived in Petrograd on April 16th.

Father Edmund A. Walsh (vice-president, Georgetown University) explains the "sealed car" as follows: "They were put in a car—a so-called sealed car, which was only a metaphor. It was not physically sealed. But it was sealed, if you want to call it such, because the German Government, knowing what kind of people these were, and what a dangerous influence, made them agree that in passing through Germany, and going over to Finland, when the train stopped in a German state, the car was to be isolated, and therefore, in that sense—in that their intent, nominally, to overthrow the government—should not be known to the German people—the car was sealed. That is the meaning of the words 'sealed car'."

Joseph Vissarionovich Djugashvilla, who called himself Stalin ("steel") was in exile in Siberia when the Czar gave up his throne. He had met Lenin briefly in Tammerfors, Finland, in 1905. It is reported that Lenin distrusted Stalin, although the Russian communist writers during Stalin's dictatorship attempted to make the world believe differently.

The little Jew Trotsky, whose real name was Lev Bronstein, had
long before fled the borders of Russia, one jump ahead of the Russian police. When the March revolution brought the three hundred year dynasty of the Romanovs to an end, Trotsky was on a soap box in Union Square in New York City berating the Government that had given him refuge. News of Lenin’s arrangements with the German Government to return to Russia must have reached Trotsky in New York. In any event he raised enough money to make an attempt to join his fellow revolutionaries in Petrograd. He was apprehended by British authorities and detained in Halifax for a time. It is one of the ironies of history (or it was planned that way) that Trotsky, who was to be largely responsible for the overthrow of the Kerensky Government, was finally released by the British and permitted to proceed to Russia at Kerensky’s request!

Max Eastman wrote a biography of Trotsky in 1924. He states in his preface that he was seeking the “character” of the Bolsheviks. “Instead of writing another dissertation about it,” he writes, “therefore, I decided to compose the portrait of one of these characters. I chose Trotsky because he seems to me the most universally gifted man in the world today. . . . If we can understand how Trotsky became a Bolshevik, we shall have some human understanding of what Bolshevism is.”

The Jewish revolutionaries, the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, together with their Gentile recruits, did not number more than 30,000 to 40,000 during the March and November revolutions of 1917.

Lenin took over a private house for his headquarters in Petrograd. It has been said—and the facts appear to confirm the reports—that the German Government had supplied Lenin with a considerable sum of money to finance his campaign in destroying Russia’s will to continue the War. Lenin, the master mob psychologist, immediately assumed command of the communist wing of the Soviet of Worker’s and Soldier’s Deputies, and set up the cry, “All power to the Soviets”, which was equivalent, of course, to crying, “Down with the Provisional Government”.

Kerensky did everything within his abilities to reorganize the Russian armies and carry on the war in support of the Allies. The able General Brusilov was made commander-in-chief, and Russia’s offensive on the Austrian front was successful at first. Lenin—confirming the reports of his deal with the Germans—brought all of his talents into play in demoralizing the troops. Communist propaganda reaching the armies called upon the soldiers to fraternize with the enemy, give up the war, go home with their arms and confiscate land for themselves and take over the factories. Kerensky did not help matters by appointing political commissars to represent the Provisional Government at the front. With
whole regiments deserting, General Brusilov's campaign ultimately failed.

* * * * * *

A Congress of Soviets was held in Petrograd in June, 1917. Lenin had worked feverishly in organizing such committees throughout Russia. Although all of the delegates were revolutionaries, each group sought control and direction of the revolution. Lenin's Bolshevik (majority) wing was still in the minority with only 105 delegates. The Mensheviks (minority) had 248—of which Leon Trotsky, who had just arrived from New York, was one. The Social Revolutionaries topped the list with 285 delegates. Kerensky acted promptly in this crisis and Lenin was forced to seek refuge on a farm near Razliv on the Finnish border.

* * * * * *

With the collapse of the Austrian front, General Kornilov demanded discipline and death for deserters. The Russian people responded to a strong voice, and Kerensky made Kornilov commander-in-chief. Kornilov sent General Krymov with a strong force to establish order in Petrograd, which resulted in a military engagement with Kerensky instead. Bleeding Russia became hopelessly divided.

Kerensky, relying on socialist revolutionaries in the army, ordered Kornilov's arrest. General Krymov committed suicide. About all that Kerensky could count on were the women's battalions. The armies continued to disintegrate and chaos and conflict wracked the country.

* * * * * *

In October Trotsky was elected vice-president of the Soviet. The Constituent Assembly was scheduled to convene within a few days, and Lenin and Trotsky concluded that the time to strike was now or never. On October 25 (November 7 by the Western calendar) the revolutionaries stormed the Winter Palace where the Kerensky Government was then established. The cruiser Aurora was brought up the river from Kronstadt and her guns turned on the palace. Petrograd was in the hands of Lenin and Trotsky before the dawn broke October 26th. Red guards were posted throughout the city and the Red flag fluttered from the flag-pole over the Royal Palace. The revolution belonged to Lenin and Trotsky.

Kerensky managed to escape but most of the members of his Cabinet were captured and imprisoned.

* * * * * *

The revolutionary Jews in the new Soviet Government outnumbered the Gentiles by amazing percentages. The following were all Jewish: Trotsky (Bronstein), Stecklov (Nakhames), Martov (Tzderbaum), Zinoviev (Apfelbaum), Kamenev (Rosenfeld),
Dan (Gourevitch or Yurewitsch), Gametsky (Furstenberg), Parvus (Helphand), Uritsky (Padomilsky), Larin (Lurge), Bohrin (Nathansohn), Martinov (Zibar), Bogdanov (Zelberstein), Garin (Garfeld), Suchanov (Gimel), Kammelv (Goldman), Sagersky (Krochmann), Riazanov (Goldenach), Solutsev (Bleichmann), Patnitzyk (Zivan), Axelrod, Glasunov (Schultze), Zuriesain (Weinstein), and Lapsinky (Lowensohn).

The Ministry or Commissariat—the People’s Commissars—was composed of 3 Russians, 1 Georgian, 1 Armenian and 17 Jews. The Central Committee had 5 Russians, 6 Letts, 1 German, 2 Armenians, 1 Czech, 1 Imeritian, 2 Georgians, 1 Karaim, 1 Ukrainian and 41 Jews. The Extraordinary Commission at Moscow had 1 Pole, 1 German, 1 Armenian, 2 Russians, 8 Letts, and 23 Jews.

Out of 556 important functionaries of the Bolshevik Government, there were (in 1918-1919) 17 Russians, 2 Ukranians, 11 Armenians, 35 Letts, 15 Germans, 1 Hungarian, 10 Georgians, 3 Poles, 1 Czech, 3 Finns, 1 Karaim, and 457 Jews.

In conformance with the international character of socialism and the Marxian doctrine that the workers of the world should unite in order to seize the instruments of production and distribution, the Russian Communist Party after the November, 1917 revolution, by means of the Central Soviet of People’s Commissars, issued a decree appropriating two million rubles for international revolutionary propaganda. The decree reads as follows:

“Inasmuch as the Soviet power firmly adheres to the principles of international solidarity of the proletariat and of fraternity of the toilers of all lands, and inasmuch as the struggle against war and imperialism can be brought to victory only on an international scale:

“Therefore, the Soviet of People’s Commissaries deems it necessary to bring all possible means, including money, to the aid of the Left International Wing of the Workers’ movement of all lands, quite regardless of whether these countries are at war or in alliance with Russia; or whether they are neutral.

“To that end the Soviet of People’s Commissaries orders to appropriate for the needs of the revolutionary international movement 2,000,000 rubles, to be taken charge of by the foreign representative of the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs.”

The decree was signed by Lenin as President of the Soviet People’s Commissaries, and by Trotsky, as the Commissar of Foreign Affairs. As a result of this appropriation, well financed propagandists were dispatched to European countries and to the United States.

* * * * * *

On March 19, 1917, at eight o’clock in the evening David R. Francis, United States Ambassador to Russia, addressed Communication No. 1110 to the United States Secretary of State. Among other things, the Ambassador reported that it was “immeasurably important to the Jews that (the) revolution succeed.” (House Docu-
In Communication No. 1361 (June 5, 1917) the Ambassador told the Secretary that Russian refugees were returning from America and that they were “planning to inspire attack upon Root charging that as Secretary of State he refused to permit certain Russian refugees to enter the United States.” (Ibid., page 114). In reply Secretary of State Robert Lansing cabled Ambassador Francis setting forth the contents of a letter written Jacob Schiff by Mr. Root under date of October 16, 1908, explaining United States law as it pertained to political refugees entering the country. (Ibid., 114, 115.)

On July 18, 1917 Ambassador Francis notified the Secretary of State that the Socialists of Russia were “making supreme effort to put their principles into operation” and that they were being “assisted by German money in abundance.” The Ambassador pointed out that the “Russian population comprises Caucasian, yellow and Semitic races as classified here and composed of seventy-four nationalities.” He believed that the problem was “extremely difficult but not insoluble.” He referred to “deplorable conditions mainly attributable to returned exiles, majority from America, Trotsky being most troublesome.” (Ibid., page 203).

The Red Ambassadors from Soviet Russia to Berlin, Paris, Rome, Tokyo, Ankara, Brussels, Oslo, Stockholm, Bucharest, Riga, Tallin and Helsingfors were all Jews. William G. Sharpe, Ambassador to France reported to the United States Secretary of State, February 9, 1918: “Your 3118 (3154) February 7. I have just been informed by the Foreign Office that the report to which you refer is entirely correct. It was explained that the British Government having received a representative of the Bolshevik Government there was nothing else to do for the French Government but to adopt a similar course. It has therefore visaed the passport of Kamenev proceeding to Paris via England in the capacity of Envoy Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at Large. I have been informed that it is also (true that?) Zalkind has been appointed in the same capacity to Switzerland. I am told that the latter is the brother-in-law of Trotsky and has been his assistant secretary. The Foreign Office informs me that until recently a representative of the Bolshevik government by the name of Holzman was here in Paris . . .”

The following excerpts are from translated documents sent to the Secretary of State: “Document No. 1. Circular 18 February 1914 . . . The management of all German banks which are transacting business abroad and by agreement with the Austro-Hungarian Government the Oesterreichische-Kreditanstalt Bank are hereby advised that the Imperial Government has deemed it to be of extreme necessity to the management of all institutions of
credit to establish with all possible dispatch agencies in Lulea, Haparanda and Vardo on the frontier of Finland, and in Bergen and Amsterdam. . . . Moreover, the managements of banking institutions are urged emphatically to make provisions for very close and absolutely secret relations being established with Finnish and American Banks. In this direction the Ministry begs to recommend the Swedish Nya Banken in Stockholm; the banking office of Furstenberg; the commercial company Waldemar Hansen, in Copenhagen, as concerns which are maintaining relations with Russia." The circular was signed "N3737." (Ibid., page 372.) Ambassador Francis commented: "This is outline of basic financial structure begun February, 1914, five months before the war was launched and still in operation; notice reappearance in subsequent Lenin messages, towns Lulea and Vardo, likewise reference to American banks. Olof Aschberg, one of the heads of the Nya Banken, came to Petrograd month ago and boasted that N. B. (Nya Banken) was the Bolshevik Bank. He was overheard by one of our own group . . . Furstenberg is now at Smolny under the name of Ganetski, is one of the inner group and is likely soon to be placed in charge State Bank. Aschberg now in Stockholm but returning. The material in this and other comments is independent of the documents and accurate on fact statement." (Ibid., pages 372 and 373.)

Document No. 2 is signed by "Doctor Fisher", and is headed "Circular June 9 (November 2?), 1914." It was addressed to "all military attaches in the countries adjacent to Russia, France, Italy, and Norway." It announced that "special war credits have been opened for the subsidiary war requirements" in all branches of German banks in Sweden, Norway, Switzerland and the United States. "The General Staff," reads the communication, "is authorizing you to avail yourself in unlimited amounts of these credits for the destruction of the enemy's factories, plants and the most important military and civil structures. Simultaneously with the investigation (instigation) of strikes it is necessary to make provisions for the damaging of motors, of mechanisms, with the destruction of vessels, setting incendiary fires to stocks of raw material and finished products, deprivation of large towns of their electric energy, stocks of fuel and provisions. Special agents detailed, which will be at your disposal, will deliver to you explosive and incendiary devices and a list of such persons in the country under your observation who will assume the duty of agents of destruction." (Ibid., page 373.) Ambassador Francis pointed out that the document was dated six weeks before the outbreak of war in 1914.

Document No. 3 is signed "Risser", and dated "Circular November 2, 1914". It is addressed to the representatives of the Nya Banken and the agents of the Diskonto Gesellschaft and Deutsche
Bank. “At the present time,” the document reads, “there have been concluded conversations between the authorized agents of the Imperial Bank and the Russian revolutionaries, Messrs. Zenzinov and Lunacharski. Both the mentioned persons addressed themselves to several financial men, who, for their part, addressed themselves to our representatives. We are ready to support the agitation and propaganda projected by them in Russia on the absolute condition that the agitation and propaganda (carried on?) by the above mentioned Messrs. Z. and L. will touch the active armies at the front. In case the agents of the Imperial Bank should address themselves to your banks we beg you to open them the necessary credit which will be covered completely as soon as you make demand on Berlin.” An addition to the document states that “Z. and L. got in touch with the Imperial Bank of Germany through the bankers (D?) Rubenstein, Max Warburg and Parvus.” Comments Ambassador Francis: “L. is the present People’s Commissar of Education. Z. is not a Bolshevik, but a right Social Revolutionist and in the discard, whereabouts unknown. Parvus and Warburg both figure in the Lenin and Trotsky documents. P. is at Copenhagen. W. chiefly works from Stockholm.” (Ibid., 373-374.)

Document No. 5 is signed “Kirdorff,” president of Kirdorff’s Rhenish Westphalian Industrial Syndicate, and is addressed to the central office of Nya Banken in Stockholm; Svenson Baltzer, a representative of Diskonto Gesellschaft in Stockholm, and to a Mr. Kirch, representative of the Deutsche Bank in Switzerland. “The Rhenish Westphalian Industrial Coal Syndicate,” writes Kirdorff, “charges you with the management of the account of what you have been apprised for the support of Russian emigrants desirous of conducting propaganda amongst Russian prisoners of war and the Russian army.”

Document No. 6 is dated June 18, 1917 at Copenhagen, signed “Svensen”, and addressed to “Mr. Ruffner, Helsingfors.” The communication reads: “Please be advised that from the Diskonto Gesellschaft account, 315,000 marks have been transferred to Mr. Lenin’s account in Kronstadt as per order of syndicate ...” Comments Ambassador Francis: “Kronstadt, the navy base, was the nerve center from which L’s activities radiated during the summer, both before and after he fled from Petrograd. Sailors were, and still are, his first dependence ...”

Document No. 7 is signed “Svenson”, dated September 8, 1917 at Stockholm, and addressed to “Mr. Farsen, Kronstadt (via Helsingfors),” and reads as follows: “Carried out your commission: passports and the indicated sum of 207,000 marks as per order of your Mr. Lenin have been handed to person mentioned in your letter. The selection met with approval of his excellency the ambassador. Confirm the arrival of said persons and separate
receipt of your counter receipts.” Ambassador Francis noted that the ambassador referred to was probably “Von Lucius”, a complimentary reference.

Document No. 8 is signed “Kriek,” Deutsche Bank, dated at Kontrakrazvedka, Geneva, June 16, 1917, addressed to Mr. Furstenberg at Stockholm. It reads as follows: “Please note that at the request of Mr. (Julias?) francs 32,000 have been paid for the publication of Maximalist socialist pamphlets. Advise by telegram addressed to Decker of the receipt of the consignment of pamphlets, number of bill of lading and date of arrival.”

Document No. 9, signed by J. Furstenberg, addressed to Mr. Raphael Scholnickan at Haparanda, reads as follows: “Dear Comrade: The office of the banking house M. Warburg has opened, in accordance with telegram from Rhenish Westphalian Syndicate, an account for the undertaking of Comrade Trotsky. The attorney (?) purchased arms and has organized their transportation and delivery track Lulea and Vardo to the office of Essen & Son in the name of Lulea receivers and a person authorized to receive the money demanded by Comrade Trotsky.” Comments Ambassador Francis: “This is the first reference to Trotsky. It connects him with banker Warburg and with Furstenberg. Lulea is a Swedish town near Haparanda.” (Ibid., pages 375-376.)

Document No. 10 was signed by J. Furstenberg, dated October 2, 1917, and addressed to Mr. Antonov at Haparanda. It reads: “Comrade Trotsky’s request has been carried out. From the account of the syndicate and the Ministry (probably Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Berlin, press division) 400,000 Kroner have been taken and remitted to Comrade Sonia who will call on you with this letter and will hand you the said sum of money.” Comments the Ambassador: “Antonov is the chief military leader of the Bolsheviks. He was in command of the forces that took St. Petersburg. He is now in the field against Kaledin and Alexeev. At the date of this letter Trotsky was already at the head of Petrograd Soviet and the Bolshevik revolution was only a month away.” (Ibid., page 376.)

On October 8, 1918, the Charge d’Affaires in London transmitted to the United States Secretary of State a copy of a note (October 1, 1918) and a report from M. Oudendyke, Netherlands Minister, “relating to conditions in Petrograd.” The note from the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Balfour) to the American Ambassador (Page) is numbered 162839/W/38 and reads as follows:

“The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs presents his compliments to his excellency the United States Ambassador and, with reference to his note No. 1261 of the 25th September, has the honour to transmit herewith, for his excellency’s confidential information, a copy of the report by the Netherlands
Minister, relating to conditions in Petrograd, which was received through His Majesty’s Minister at Christiana.

“Mr. Balfour trusts that his excellency will agree with him in considering that it is undesirable that any of the information contained in the report should be made public until the Allied subjects and citizens now in the power of the Bolsheviks have left that country.” (House Document No. 1868, 65th Congress, 3rd Session, page 674.)

Among other things, the Netherlands Minister reported that “the Red Guards under the direction of the several commissaries . . . behaved with greatest brutality,” and that the “whole Soviet government has sunk to the level of a criminal organization . . .”

“The danger is now so great,” continued the Minister, “that I feel it my duty to call the attention of the British and all other Governments to the fact that if an end is not put to Bolshevism in Russia at once the civilization of the whole world will be threatened. This is not an exaggeration but a sober matter of fact; and the most unusual action of German and Austrian Consul Generals before referred to, in joining in protest of neutral legations appears to indicate that the danger is also realized in German and Austrian quarters. I consider that the immediate suppression of Bolshevism is the greatest issue now before the world, not even excluding the war which is still raging, and unless as above stated Bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately it is bound to spread in one form or another over Europe and the whole world as it is organized and worked by Jews who have no nationality, and whose one object is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things . . .” (Ibid., pages 675, 678-679.)

Trotsky and Lenin believed that the success and permanency of the government they had won for themselves depended on world revolution. It was Stalin, in later years, who advanced the idea that “socialism in one country” was feasible. In the beginning, however, Marxist leaders could not conceive of bourgeoisie governments permitting such a world threat to fester on their doorsteps without exerting strenuous efforts to eradicate it. Hence it was that Tcheidze, president of the Executive Committee, issued a manifesto to the workers and socialists of foreign countries. “We appeal to our brothers,” read the document, “to the proletarians of the German-Austria coalition, and above all to the German proletariat . . . We call upon you to throw off the yoke of your absolutist regime . . . Workingmen of all countries! . . . we summon you to the work of renewing and solidifying international unity. In that lies the guaranty of our future triumph and of the complete liberation of humanity. Workers of all countries, unite!”

A “Bureau of International Revolutionary Propaganda” was
established. (After World War II this Bureau was revived as the “Cominform”—a contraction of Communist Information Bureau.) Here international revolutionary propaganda was prepared and translated into the major languages for distribution in other countries. Agents were dispatched to the key-industrial centers of the world for the purpose of setting up open revolutionary communist parties, and impressing upon socialists everywhere the necessity to “defend the Soviet Union”- a slogan which is still the number one commandment of all Communist parties. Lenin declared: “Only after we have completely forced down and expropriated the bourgeoisie of the whole world and not of one country alone, will wars become impossible,” thereby re-emphasizing the basic Jewish idea of world government.

It was only by virtue of this open and hostile attitude of the new rulers of Russia that the Western World partially awakened to the menace of the monster it had permitted to live. Diplomatic representatives were withdrawn from Russia and the Allies ordered a blockade of the Russian ports. Counter-revolutions started early—in Siberia, Southern Russia, and in the Murmansk district. Admiral Kolchak headed the revolt in Siberia; General Denikin in the South. The counter-revolutionists of the Archangel district were assisted by Allied troops among which were American units.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Government was brutally frank. It declared itself the enemy of every existing government. Radek and Jaffe were in charge of guiding the revolutionary movement of the Spartacists in Germany. Axelrod was the communist agent in Bavaria and Bela Kun (Aaron Cohen) became the scourge of Hungary. Trotsky and his cut-throats were actually more hostile toward the Allied nations than they were toward Germany. The shameless Brest-Litovsk Treaty—separate peace with Germany—appeared as a brazen admission of the truth of the charge that Lenin and his Bolshevists were, in fact, German agents.

The Soviet Government was in real danger of collapsing. The struggle for power of the various Jewish revolutionary groups, the resistance of Christian Russia, and the famine and misery of the people generally, created a chaotic internal situation. It was seriously aggravated by the Allied blockade and the counter-revolutionary armies of Kolchak and Denikin. The Jewish leaders soon realized that the regime must fall unless outside pressures were relaxed. Lenin and Trotsky found themselves on the horns of a dilemma. To seek friendship with the foreign powers they had openly vowed to destroy would thoroughly discredit the communist government with the revolutionary forces of the world. To continue open advocacy of the destruction of all governments as the central theme of Soviet foreign policy must necessarily increase Allied hostility. Marxism, however, had a ready solution for
such a predicament. Starting with the premise of bourgeois stupidity, the communist strategists worked out a plan whereby they might have their cake and eat it at the same time, thereby proving that the “bloated” capitalist nations could be made to believe that the Soviet Union was, indeed, both fish and fowl. They, therefore, called for an “autonomous” international organization, separate and distinct from the Soviet Government. The Soviets might now seek recognition by foreign governments, disclaiming any jurisdiction over the international body that called for bloody revolution throughout the world.

* * * * * *

In response to a “call” during January, 1919, by the Russian Soviet government for a constituent congress to organize the third socialist international, a conference was held March 2nd through the 6th, 1919, at Moscow. Thirty-two delegates representing communist and radical socialist groups in twelve different countries answered the roll-call at the opening session. In addition to the “accredited” delegates from Russia, Germany, Hungary, German-Austria, Sweden, Norway, Bulgaria, Roumania, Finland, Ukrainia, Estonia and Armenia, there were “fraternal” delegates with voice but no vote, from Switzerland, Holland, Bohemia, Jugo-Slavia, France, Great Britain, Turkey, Turkestan, Persia, Korea and the United States.

Trotsky, Lenin, Bucharin, Kamenev, Tchitcherin, and N. Steklov of the Russian Communist Party, took the leading roles in the conference. Rakovsky of the Balkan Socialist Federation; Skripnik of Ukrainia; Stang, representing the Norwegian Left Socialists; Grimlund of the Swedish Socialist Party; Sadoul and Guilbau of the French Socialist Party; Platten of the Swiss Socialist Party; Albrecht of the German Spartacus group, and Sirola of the Finnish Communists, were other leaders who took active parts in the deliberations of the proceedings.

The Spartacan, Albrecht, opposed the immediate formation of the Third International as premature. The Second International had not ceased to exist and its member organizations had not had an opportunity to make known their attitude toward the new organization. The prevailing opinion was that the immediate formation of a new International would stimulate discussion and decision on the part of the Socialist parties with regard to their affiliation with elements who were attempting to revive the Second International. The Conference therefore “liquidated” the Zimmerwald movement, and perfected the organization of the new International, which would become known as the “Comintern”, the contraction of the name “Communist International”. Zinoviev became the President of the Executive Committee.

Boris Reinstein represented the American Socialist Labor Party
at the Conference. In his speech to the assembled "comrades" he declared: "There is an America of Wilson and the millionaire Morgan and other stranglers of the American working class; there is an America of the proletariat, the workers, striving toward liberty the same as you are striving here. And in the name of these millions of the American proletariat, not only socialistically revolutionary inclined, but, I tell you, bolshevistically inclined, I appear here." This ridiculous statement was enthusiastically applauded.

"Comrade" Feinburg spoke for the Socialist Party of England. One Lenivudi spoke for Scotland. Pertz represented Germany, and Markovich brought revolutionary greetings from Serbia. Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Rakovsky and Fritz Platten were commissioned to write the Comintern's manifesto. It ends in Marxian fashion:

"Proletarians of all lands! In the war against imperialistic barbarity, against monarchy, against the privileged classes, against the bourgeois state and bourgeois property, against all forms and varieties of social and national oppression—UNITE! Under the standard of the Workingmen's Councils, under the banner of the Third International, in the revolutionary struggle for power and the dictatorship of the proletariat, proletarians of all countries UNITE!"

There was no actual difference in opinion among the leaders of the various socialist groups in the United States as to ultimate goals, although there was a difference of opinion in regard to immediate tactics. The success of the revolution in Russia was an intoxicating incentive to the Jewish socialists and other foreign language groups. Many of the older leaders, understanding something of the American people, opposed an open revolutionary party as premature. The Jewish leaders of the Left Wing socialists believed that the entire working class was anxiously waiting for the clarion call that would bring them rushing to the barricades. The Russian Socialist Federation, under the leadership of Alexander Stoklitisky, Oscar Tywerowsky and Michael Misleg, was in close touch with the "comrades" in Russia, and its members were convinced that their organization was a much further "advanced" Marxist revolutionary group than the others. After all, N. Bukharin had been the editor of their official organ "Novy Mir," and "comrade" Leon Trotsky had been on the editorial staff during his stay in New York City in 1917. Ludwig C. A. K. Martens, now the unofficial representative of the Soviet Union, was currently connected with the paper. Santeri Nuorteva, the representative of the Finnish Socialist Republic, had even appealed to Gregory Weinstein, Novy Mir's editor, for assistance in 1917. Consequently the members of the Russian Socialist Federation called for the formation of a Communist Party of the United States.

"Der Kampf," the official organ of the Jewish Socialist Federa-
ation, raised its voice in favor of a militant revolutionary Communist Party. Other radical left-wing socialist groups joined in the clamor.

On February 15, 1919 a socialist meeting was held in New York City. Certain delegates bolted, procured a hall in the Rand School of Social Science at 7 East 15th Street, and elected a Committee of Fourteen to prepare resolutions and manifestoes. As a result, a manifesto was drafted and a convention was called. Maximilian Cohen was elected Executive Secretary; L. L. Wolfe, recording secretary (later succeeded by Fanny Hourwich); Rose Pastor Stokes, treasurer; and Rose Spanier, financial secretary (later succeeded by Milton Goodman). A City Committee of Fifteen was elected to carry on the work of the organization. They were: Benjamin Gitlow, Nicholas I. Hourwich, Fanny Hourwich, Jay Lovestone, James Larkin, Harry Hiltzik, Edward I. Lindgren, Milton Goodman, John Reed, Joseph Brodsky, Dr. Julius Hammer, Jeannette D. Pearl, Karl Brodsky, Mrs. L. Ravitch and Bertram D. Wolfe.

An Executive Committee was selected to carry on actively the work of organizing the Left Wing Section. Its members were Benjamin Gitlow, Nicholas I. Hourwich, George Lehman, James Larkin, L. Himmelfarb, George C. Vaughn, Benjamin Corsor, Edward I. Lindgren and Maximilian Cohen.

Headquarters were immediately opened at 43 West 29th Street, New York City, and a vigorous campaign was carried on to enroll members of the Socialist Party in the Left Wing Section.

John Reed, the first “American” communist, whose body is interred in the wall of the Kremlin in Moscow, became the editor of the Left Wing Section’s official paper, the New York Communist. Eadmonn Mac Alpine was associate editor, and Maximilian Cohen was business manager. The publication’s first issue appeared April 19, 1919, and its subversiveness is made clear by its editorial. “We take our stand,” it declares, “with the Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik) with the Spartacists of Germany, and the Communists of Hungary and Bavaria, believing that only through the dictatorship of the proletariat can the Socialist order be brought about.”

The National Conference of the Left Wing met pursuant to call in New York City on June 21, 1919. The Conference decided to “continue the fight to rally all revolutionary elements for a Communist Party.” The Conference was composed of over ninety delegates from twenty different cities. In addition to those already mentioned, the following are of importance: Louis C. Fraina (editor of the “Revolutionary Age”); William Bross Lloyd, of Chicago (elected permanent chairman); A. Renner, of Detroit (elected vice-chairman); Dennis E. Batt, C. E. Ruthenberg, I. E. Ferguson, A. Wagenknecht, A. Anderson, Jack Carney and John Ballam.

A National Organizing Committee was set up by a rump caucus.
of the Conference, consisting of Dennis E. Batt, D. Elbaum, O. C. Johnson, John Keracher, S. Kopnagel, I. Stilson, and Alexander Stoklitsky. Offices were opened at 1221 Blue Island Avenue, Chicago. The Committee issued a “call” or a “national convention” at Chicago, September 1, 1919, to organize a Communist Party of America. The announcement was printed in the Novy Mir issue for July 7, 1919, and read, in part, as follows:

“In this the most momentous period of the world’s history, capitalism is tottering to its ruins. The proletariat is straining at the chains which bind it. A revolutionary spirit is spreading throughout the world. The workers are rising to answer the clarion call of the Third International.

“Only one Socialism is possible in this crisis. A Socialism based upon understanding. A Socialism that will express in action the needs of the proletariat. The time has passed for temporizing and hesitating. We must act. The Communist call of the Third International, the echo of the Communist Manifesto of 1848, must be answered.”

The Convention opened as scheduled. I. E. Ferguson, writing in the “Communist” for September 27th, describes the revolutionary vigor with which the “party” got under way. “There was one moment,” he relates, “which revealed the tense enthusiasm of this Convention, a moment never to be forgotten. On Monday, September 1st, near the hour of noon, an orchestra struck the first chord of the Internationale. Instantly there was a thunderous accompaniment of sustained cheering and spontaneous singing. There was no mistaking the martial challenge. It was as if the voices of the millions had come into this colorless hall to impress upon these delegates their deprivations and longings, their strength and readiness for the final conflict. It was a rare singing of the Internationale. So began the Communist Party of America.”

Louis C. Fraina of New York was elected temporary chairman. The principal business before the delegates was the formulation of a constitution and program. The “program” committee was composed of Louis C. Fraina, D. Elbaum, Alexander Stoklitsky, Nicholas I. Hourwich, A. Bittleman, Dennis E. Batt, Max Cohen, Jay Lovestone and H. M. Wicks. The “constitution” committee consisted of H. Hiltzig, Carl E. Ruthenberg, George Ashkenouzi, Isaac E. Ferguson, Oscar Tywerowsky, J. G. Stilson, and A. Forsinger.

Louis C. Fraina was chosen as International Secretary; Carl E. Ruthenberg, of Cleveland, National Secretary. The International delegates selected were: Ruthenberg, Nicholas I. Hourwich, Alexander Stoklitsky, and Isaac E. Ferguson; alternate International delegates, D. Elbaum, A. Bittleman, John Ballam, and Jay Lovestone. The Executive Committee consisted of Schwartz, Oscar Tywerowsky, Petras, Karosses, Max Cohen, Dirba and Wicks.

The work of organizing locals and branches proceeded at a rapid
pace. Harry M. Winitsky became the Executive Secretary for Greater New York. Communist Party headquarters were established at 207 East Tenth Street. The "Communist World" became the official organ of the Party, with Max Cohen as editor, Bertram D. Wolfe, associate editor, and George Ashkenouzi, business manager. The first issue appeared November 1, 1919.

Jewish Marxism had come to America, and the Communist vehicle for destruction of the United States was launched.

* * * * *

Red terror swept Hungary. Nine-tenths of the Soviet Government of the unfortunate country was Jewish. Aaron Cohen, alias Bela Kun, ruled the Christian population with blood-stained hands, backed by his Jewish chief executioner, Tibor Szamuelly. The world had probably never seen such cruelty. Arpad Cohen confessed eighteen murders. Otto Korvin Klein, Eugen Hamburger, Bela Szanto (Schreiber), Bela Vago (Weiss), Ascherowitz, Izkowitz, Kereks, Goldberger, Lobl, Janosik, Dinnyes, Meszare, Imre Dogei, Alex Pap, Joseph Gaspar, Dezso Reiheimer and Isidor Bergfeld—all Jews, were Kun's chief henchmen and cut-throats. Bergfeld confessed to 155 murders!

Major Francis Yeats-Brown, who wrote "Lives of a Bengal Lancer", is also the author of "European Jungle", in which he recounts European events immediately following World War I. The following excerpts indicate the Jewish horror that shook Hungary:

"Soon a levy of hostages began, among whom were former ministers, several Bishops, and many leading business men. There is nothing to be obtained without blood," said Bela Vago, one of the chiefs of the Revolutionary Tribunal. "Without blood there is no terror, and without terror there is no Dictatorship." Bela Kun was of the same mind: "We must drown the counter-revolution in blood," he cried. (Page 224.)

"...the people of Hungary have not forgotten that a young Jew, Leo Reiss, spat on the Host when it was being carried through the streets of old Buda on the day of Corpus Christi." (Page 192.)

"Joseph Pogany (John Pepper in America) some-time Commissar of Education, was a mountebank of notorious incapacity and profligate life, who imagined himself to be the Napoleon of the movement, and was generally surrounded by prostitutes. He was despised even by his own associates; indeed, nobody took him seriously except the victims of his robberies and murders." (Page 225.)

"In Szolnok, Szamuelly hung twenty-four people (including Paul Suranyi, the President of the Court of Chancery) without even the semblance of a trial." (Page 226.)

"Count Tisza was shot on October 31st, 1918, by soldiers said to belong to the Social Democratic Party of Hungary, under the direction of a young Jew, Joseph Pogany, who afterwards became a Minister under the Communist regime of Bela Kun." (Page 220.)

* * * * *
In Munich, Germany, the communists established a “Soviet”. Hostages, held by the members of the “Soviet” Commissars were robbed, murdered and their bodies mutilated. Dr. Oscar Cohen in Berlin admitted that he had received four million rubles from the Soviet Ambassador, M. Jaffee, for the purpose of fostering revolution. Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht and Clara Zetkin led the Spartakus League (Communist). Worker’s and Soldier’s Councils (patterned after the Soviets) were organized in many German cities immediately after the armistice by direction of Rakó (Sobelsohn). Three Russian Jews, Levine-Nissen, Levien, and Axelrod, constituted the Soviet power in Munich.

Major Yeats-Brown (“Europeon Jungle”), speaking of England’s deal with the Jews, quotes Mr. Lloyd George addressing the House of Commons, June 19, 1936 (page 196): “It was important for us to seek every legitimate help we could get. We came to the conclusion, from information we received from every part of the world, that it was vital we should have the sympathies of the Jewish communities.”

“So what did we do?” Major Yeats-Brown continues (page 196), “We sold the Arabs to win favor of the Jews, especially the Jews of the United States of America. Mr. Lloyd George justified this action by claiming that we had to reward Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the Zionist leader, ‘who saved the British army at a moment when a particular ingredient essential for our guns was exhausted.’ But were we unable to find anything which was ours to give Dr. Weizmann?”

Henry Wickham Steed, one of the most distinguished journalists of the twentieth century, was foreign correspondent of the London Times at Rome (1897-1902), Vienna (1902-1913), foreign editor of the Times (1914-1919), and editor (1919-1922). Among his many books, he wrote and published “Through Thirty Years” in 1924. The following excerpts from his book summarizes the Jewish successes of World War I, and indicates the disasters that were yet to come:

“... 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 ... Mr. Philip Kerr and, presumably, Mr. Lloyd George, knew and approved of this mission ... 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 Bolshevist representatives to Paris at the beginning of the Peace Conference ... The well-known American-Jewish banker, Mr. Jacob Schiff, was known to be anxious to secure recognition for the Bolshevists, among whom Jewish influence was predominant, and Tchitcherin, the
Bolshevist Commissar 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 Bolshevists 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 Bolshevist; Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and even Germany, were in danger, and European feeling against the blood-stained fanatics of Russia ran extremely high. Therefore, when it transpired that an American official, William C. Bullitt, 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 Bolshevist regime by April 10th, dismay was felt everywhere except by those who had been privy to the sending of Mr. Bullitt.” (Page 301-302).

“. . . shortly after leaving Colonel House, information reached me that Mr. Lloyd George and President Wilson would probably agree next morning to recognize the Bolshevists in accordance with Mr. Bullitt’s suggestions.

“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 Bolshevists at the bidding of Wall Street.’” (page 303.)

“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 Bolshevists that very morning.” (page 304.)

(Mr. Steed’s article on the contemplated recognition of the Soviet Union by Wilson and Lloyd George had been published in the London Daily Mail. Bullitt, whose mother was a Jewess of Philadelphia, married the widow of John Reed, the “first American Communist”.)

“That day Colonel House asked me to call upon him. I found him worried both by my criticism of any recognition of the Bolshevists and by the certainty, which he had not previously realized, that if the President were to recognize the Bolshevists in return for commercial concessions his whole ‘idealism’ would be hopelessly compromised as commercialism in disguise . . . 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 Bolshevists in order to secure a field for German and Jewish exploitation of Russia. (Page 302.)

"Yet Jewish influence was more persistent and more efficient. Had it been united, and could it have been coherently directed, it might well have prevailed; but, in point of fact, Jewish idealism served, in part, to counteract the work of Jewish finance and of Jewish cosmopolitan agencies. This Jewish idealism was of two kinds. Though, in one of its forms, it strengthened for a time the pro-German and pan-German tendencies of Jewish finance by bringing Jewish hatred of Imperial Russia into line with Jewish attachment for Germanism, its support of Germanism slackened when the Russian Empire fell... Against Russian Christian fanaticism was ranged an intense Jewish fanaticism hardly to be paralleled save among the more militant sects of Islam. This Jewish fanaticism allied itself with the anti-Russian forces before and during the earlier years of the war. It abated only when the Russian Revolution of March, 1917 and the subsequent advent of Bolshevism, largely Jewish in doctrine and in personnel, overthrew the Russian Empire and the Russian Orthodox Church. The joy of Jewry at these events was not merely the joy of triumph over an oppressor but was also gladness at the downfall of hostile religious and semi-religious institutions.

"When international Jewish sentiment had thus ceased to be actively pro-German, another form of Jewish idealism came more effectively into play. The Zionist, or Jewish National, movement which was started by the late Dr. Theodore Herzl in the last decade of the 19th Century... Towards the end of 1916, mainly through the instrumentality of the late Sir Mark Sykes, then an Under Secretary to the British War Cabinet, and of Mr. James A. Malcolm, a prominent British Armenian, the Zionist organizations in Europe and in the United States began to identify themselves with the Allied cause. Mr. Malcolm rightly urged that the Jews were less pro-German than anti-Russian and that their national aspirations were not inimical to the Allied cause. As a result of discussions with Zionist leaders in England, especially Dr. Weizmann, Mr. Sokolow, and Dr. Greenberg, communications were established with prominent American Zionists who used their influence in favour of American participation in the war." (Page 390-391.)

* * * * *

The beast that had been mortally wounded had survived for two thousand years. And his deadly wound was healed.

A second beast with two horns like a lamb—Marxism and Zionism—had come up out of the earth, and it spake as a dragon. All of the power of the first beast was exercised by the second, who caused the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast whose deadly wound was healed.

And the second beast did great wonders. In the sight of men it brought down the fire of revolution from heaven on the earth to devour all that men had built in the sight of God. Christianity was utterly smashed and destroyed in Holy Russia. All the world had been immersed in a horrible blood-bath, and Christian had
set his hand against Christian so that Christianity might be
weakened and destroyed everywhere. And the two-horned beast
deceived them that dwell on the earth by means of those miracles
which it had the power to do in the sight of the first beast. Through
its great power of deception, it seduced the United States to
sacrifice its young men, its wealth and its honor so that the first
beast might establish its authority in Zion.

The two-horned beast, growing bolder in the exercise of its
miraculous power, spoke, commanding them that dwell on the
earth to make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a
sword, and did live. And men everywhere hastened to do its will,
feverishly rebuilding the earth in the likeness of the seven-headed
beast that had raised up out of the sea. Upon the heads of the
image was the name of blasphemy, and those who made the likeness
worshiped the image and the name in shameless abandon. The
two-horned beast had the power to give life unto the image of
the beast, so that it was enabled to both speak and cause that
as many as would not worship its likeness to be killed. And its
power swept over the world like a tidal wave.

The war that was to “make the world safe for democracy”
made the world safe only for Marxism and Zionism!
ON JUNE 10, 1917 American Jewry cast 350,000 ballots for delegates to the first American Jewish Congress. Thirty organizations were to be represented. After a number of postponements the Congress opened in Philadelphia December 15, 1918. War in Europe had taken a recess on November 11, 1918.

Among the delegates representing the “Jewish people” were Louis Marshall, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., Henry Monsky, Nathan Strauss, Yehoash, Jacob H. Schiff, Oscar S. Straus, Judge Mayer Sulzberger, Abraham S. Schomer, Henrietta Szold, Dr. B. Revel, Dr. Chaim Zhitlowsky, Dr. H. Pereira Mendes, Joseph Barondess, Rev. H. Masliansky, Gotthard Deutsch, Rabbi M. S. Margolies, Abraham I. Elkus, Judge Julian W. Mack, Dr. Israel Friedlander, Isaac Hourwich, Jacob de Hass, Felix Frankfurter, David Pinsky, Baruch Zuckerman, Dr. Samuel Margoshes, Louis Lipsky and Emanuel Neuman.

The Congress—speaking for American Jewry only—demanded that the forthcoming Peace Conference establish “equal, civil, political, religious, and national rights for all citizens of a territory without distinction as to race, nationality, or creed; autonomous management of their own communal institutions, whether they be religious, educational, charitable, or otherwise, by members of the various national as well as religious bodies; recognition of the historic claims of the Jewish people with regard to Palestine, and establishment of such political, administrative, and economic conditions in that country as would assure its development into a Jewish Commonwealth.”

Possibly no other event in the world’s history presents so many amazing paradoxical absurdities as does this incredible Congress of American Jews. Having won full citizenship rights in the United States they now boldly proclaimed that they are a single, separate nation. With tongue in cheek and crossed fingers they had accepted American naturalization, swearing to uphold the Constitution, and abandoning any and all allegiance to any foreign Potentate or sovereign. Meeting in Convention they brazenly demanded a special status for themselves and their ethnic brethren in all the nations of the world! In particular they demanded recognition of their “historical” claim to the land of another people, and called upon the world powers to assist them in their proposed conquest of that land. Always an imperium in imperio, Jewry now arose to heights of impudence never heretofore dared—an infinitesimal minority assuming to be a law unto itself—a govern-
The Khazars of Russia had finally conquered the Americanized Jews of the United States. The revolutionaries from the cellars of Minsk now sat in the palaces of the Czars, and ruled from the high places of a world Sanhedrin.

Louis Marshall presented a “Jewish Bill of Rights.” The Congress went on record in support of the World Zionist Organization in its campaign to implement the Balfour Declaration. The officers of the Congress were instructed to take the necessary steps in cooperation with Jewish bodies in other countries to convene a World Jewish Congress.

Julian W. Mack, Louis Marshall, Stephen S. Wise, Harry Cutler, B. L. Levinthal, Jacob de Haas, Joseph Barondess, Leopold Benedict (Morris Winchevsky), Bernard G. Richards and Dr. Nachman Syrkin were selected to represent the Congress at the Peace Conference. They were instructed “to cooperate with representatives of the Jews of other lands.”

Nathan Strauss declared with deep satisfaction that the Congress had at last achieved “unity of mind and purpose as we always had at heart.”

* * * * *

American Jewry had openly declared that it was a single and separate and distinct nation—“one people!” In effect, it announced that its “citizenship” in the United States was merely a device to be used as a weapon for defense and offense, and cast aside when it had served its purpose. It was not a question of dual loyalty. There was no conflict in the heart of American Jewry between loyalty to the United States and the Jewish Nation. The conflict was between appearance and reality; the question was how best use the advantages of American citizenship until it might be openly discarded. Brandeis had counseled an open and frank announcement of Jewish purposes, and certainly this technique more effectively concealed the importance of these purposes. Visible on every hand, few paused to investigate. While Jewish orientation toward Moscow and chauvinistic devotion to Palestine went hand in hand there were comparatively few who dared call attention to the fact. Jewish names would dominate all others when subversive lists were compiled but few would point it out for fear of being called “anti-Semitic”. Thus, without opposition, the American Jewish Congress marched forth for the conquest of the world!

* * * * *

“The League of Nations is a Jewish idea,” declared Nahum Sokolow at the Carlsbad Congress. “We created it after a fight of twenty-five years.”

The League to Enforce Peace was ultimately supplanted by other organizations of a more definitely left-wing, socialist and collective
The leading Jewish organizations throughout the world were already on record for an international federation. The League of Free Nations Associations, although further to the left than the League to Enforce Peace, worked for the same purpose, and was one of the first to endorse the League of Nations Covenant. During the Peace Conference Jacob Schiff represented the League of Free Nations Associations, and as its spokesman sent instructions to President Wilson on May 28, 1919. Schiff's group became the New York Foreign Policy Association after the war.

Ultimate world government is also the objective of Socialism. The Fabian Society of England worked vigorously for the League of Nations Covenant, and cooperated closely with the League of Nations Society in propagandizing for a world organization.

A League of Nations Society was established in France. In May, 1915 the English League of Nations Society was organized. It was the result of a series of meetings instigated by the Fabians. W. H. Dickinson, M. P., was the first chairman. He had been prominently identified with the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches.

In March 1916 Theodore Marburg, who founded the League to Enforce Peace in the United States June 17, 1915, addressed the League of Nations Society and declared "that the objects of the League to Enforce Peace and the League of Nations Society were almost the same."

By November, 1916, the League of Nations Society claimed 300 members. In July of 1917, Lord Parmoor was a vice-president of the Society. Noll Buxton, M. P., G. Lawes Dickinson, and L. S. Woolf were members of the Executive Committee.

In July, 1918, a letter of invitation to join a League of Free Nations Associations was circulated, signed by Gilbert Murray and H. G. Wells. In November the League of Free Nations Society merged into the League of Nations Union. H. N. Brailsford, a member of the General Council of the Union, wrote a preface to Trotsky's "The Defense of Terrorism."

"The Outline of History" by H. G. Wells—"written with the advice and editorial help of Mr. Ernest Barker . . . and Professor Gilbert Murray"—made its first appearance in semi-monthly parts. In addition to its plain orientation toward atheism, socialism and internationalism, it attempts to make a rational and plausible argument for a super-world government. Douglas Reed describes Wells as "a disbeliever and sedentary pamphleteer in whose mind inconsequent ideas scurried about from first reaction to second thought and later after thought like a riotous mob that surges forward to destroy, reels backward at the word 'police', and then scatters and scuttles through the by-ways, throwing a random stone from aimless rage." Although he was ultimately to declare
that he saw “the world as a jaded world devoid of recuperative power,” Wells envisioned the “world state” as an inevitable historical development. “It will be based,” he declared, “upon a common world religion, very much simplified and universalized and better understood. This will not be Christianity nor Islam nor Buddhism nor any such specialized form of religion . . .” He did not say that it would not be Judaism.

Whatever else may be said of Wells’ contribution to the “world super-state” idea, his “Outline of History” became an important wheel in the propaganda machine designed to destroy patriotism in Great Britain and the United States.

The League of Nations Union was supported in 1920 by donations. Most of these contributions came from Jewish sources. The Zionist Organization gave £210; Barons E. B. d’Erlanger, F. A. d’Erlanger and N. M. Rothschild donated £3,000 each. Major David Davies, M. P., made the largest contribution—£14,737. Other donors were the Government of the Peruvian Republic, £1,000; F. Eckstein, £500; Sir M. Samuel, £210; and Sir Carl Meyer, £210.

Thus the Jewish socialists, financiers and Zionists, together with their stooges and innocents, promoted the League of Nations and laid the foundation for world government. One World War was incapable of accomplishing the ultimate objective, and World War II may fall a little short of the mark. World War III, it is believed, will finish the job and usher in the Neo-Messianic Age.

President Wilson, surrounded by the Jewish financial fraternity, pushed hither and yon by the sinister Colonel House, and counsellod by the Zionist Brandeis, imagined himself the great “peace-maker” of all history. He was an historian who proved that he knew nothing of history. In the hands of the Jews, who used him for their own particular purposes, he plunged his country into a disastrous war, and started a chain of events that may ultimately destroy the great American Dream. Flattered and eulogized by those who bent him to their will, he fancied himself playing God, remaking the world and its people in his own image.

We have seen that Marxism not only emphasizes the necessity for the destruction of Christianity, but also calls for the abolition
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of nationalism. Religion and patriotism—‘for God and Country’—have always been the outer ramparts of Christian civilization. If Jewish Marxism is to conquer, then these outer defenses must first be destroyed. In order to demolish these citadels of strength, the Marxist must attack the defenders—the Christian men and women who bar the way. Religion and patriotism are logically and naturally an extension of the inborn instincts of the integrated family unit—a tacit expression of the family units that make up a nation. Hence Marxism strikes at the family unit, and seeks to utterly destroy it. Men and women are to be considered workers—part of the collectivity. Marriage is abolished as a religious institution, and breeding becomes a collective affair. The children of temporary unions and incidents of impulse become the property of the Socialist State. The “family unit” ceases to exist. But Marxism does not stop, even here. The God-given dignity of man—his initiative, his individuality—all these characteristics must be destroyed, so that he is reduced to the common denominator of mediocrity that is the collectivity.

Propagandists of the Socialist persuasion attack the accepted connotations of “home”, “mother”, “heaven”, “the flag”, “fatherland”, “patriotism”, and similar terms, with effective subtleness. These cherished and respected terms together with the sacred things they picture, are made to appear ridiculous and “reactionary”—obsolete remnants of tribalism perpetuated by sinister men for sinister purposes. War-makers must have “cannon fodder” say these propagandists, and you cannot make war without patriots. By an “elaborate inculcation” of the concepts of “mother”, “home”, “fatherland”, etc., into the minds of the people, “patriots” are “manufactured.” Destroy the pictures conjured by these terms and patriotism is destroyed! This is best done through “education.” Once the child understands that the “reverence” attached to these obsolete “catch-phrases” of bourgeois society is “provincial” and “reactionary”, patriotism is on the wane. “Home” is where the worker “hangs his hat”; “heaven” is a bit of opium for the exploited “sucker”, making him docile in the physical world with promise of plenty in the “hereafter”. The “flag” is just a rag, and “fatherland” is an illusion. The “progressive” knows but one flag—the red symbol of revolution that distinguishes him on the barricades, and his “fatherland” is the whole world. “Mother” is just the name of a female who became pregnant. “Patriotism” is a hypnotic delusion that compels men to sacrifice their lives in battle so that the capitalists may continue to exploit and enslave the masses.

“In “scientific” language the propagandists define nationalism as a form of overdeveloped “ethnocentrism”—regarding one’s own race as the chief interest and center of culture; a combining form
that gives the subject a bad odor. By this approach the "malady" is removed from the realm of the simple and knowable to the dissecting room of the pseudo-scientific and conjectural. The conclusions of "science" are not easily rebutted unless its language is understood. The student is rarely in a position to argue with the instructor who postulates with the authority of an infallible oracle.

The critics of patriotism are in full agreement that nationalism only menaces Jews and Socialists. This remarkable fact is carefully concealed by the Jews and Socialists. Only the Jews and the Socialists seek world domination, and nationalism is the one last barrier that must be broken down if they are to achieve their ambition. To organized Jewry, Gentile patriotism means nationalism; nationalism means "fascism", and fascism means "anti-Semitism". This concept, of course, has no reference to Jewish Nationalism, which was ordained by Jehovah and is the mission of Israel!

President Wilson's "self-determination" and "political independence" planks in his platform for world government proved embarrassing to the Jewish propagandists. Yet they dared not openly attack them lest they endanger the Wilson prestige in the drive for world power. If nations reserve the right of self-determination and political independence and such rights are protected by the combined power of all nations, then, of course, domination by a single nation becomes impossible. As a result, propagandists have quietly played down the "self-determination" and "political independence" principles as additional "ethnocentrism" symptoms.

Irrendentism may be said to be another road-block to the Jewish ideological conquest of the world. The rarely used term refers to the principles, policy, or practice of a party, or of persons, who seek to reincorporate within their national boundaries territory of which their nation has been deprived. Irrendentism is therefore considered another form of extreme nationalism. Like all other forms of nationalism irrendentism is conveniently considered a world peace-disturbing nuisance, except, of course, in the case of the Soviet Union or Jewish nationalism.

Homogeneity—of the same kind; similar—is another symptom of paranoia of the nationalistic mind, according to the Jewish proponent of "one worldism". The demand for homogeneity is always depicted as evidence of persecution of "minorities" because of race or religion. Factors of allegiance, assimilation and national security are brushed aside by the propagandist—except as they are manifestations of his own philosophy. The antagonistic,
subversive activities of foreign-born anarchists, communists and Zionists, all working against the country of their adoption and refuge, are, to be sure, the elements to be protected! In countries, such as Great Britain and the United States, where the discordant and unassimilable elements have found freedom and hospitality, the cry against homogeneity has been the loudest. It is not enough that these revolutionaries found haven and freedom; they must, by necessity of their inborn discontent, continue to create the agitations that caused them to flee from their native lands. They must destroy the homogeneous instincts of their hosts so that their own minority homogeneity may dominate.

The United States has, in truth, been the melting-pot of the world. It has successfully absorbed the immigrants of the nations of Europe. The homogeneity that was emerging was not so much a homogeneity of language, race, religion and culture as it was of a new and unique concept of freedom. The United States generously opened its arms to those who desired to come, and most of those who came were people of good will who gratefully merged into the American pattern. Only the hordes of Khazar Jews, with their twin philosophies of Marxism and Zionism, came with tongue in cheek and refused to assimilate. On the one hand they have insisted on remaining a separate people; a fragmatized “nation” in dispersion, and on the other they have sought to refashion the religion, the traditions and customs of the land of their “exile”. They predominate among the revolutionary and subversive forces at work in the country, and their names always over-balance any list of un-Americans. They seek, through every medium of propaganda, the universal acceptance of their own peculiar heterogeneity so that their refusal to assimilate may pass as something special in the resulting dissonance.

We have observed that the Jews sent representatives to the Congress of Vienna, where they sought to influence the official delegates through bribes and presents. The elder Rothschild, it will be recalled, was fearful that the special Jewish privileges he had brought from Karl von Dalberg, prince primar of the Confederation of the Rhine, might be lost unless incorporated in the new constitutions that the Congress was expected to draft. Jacob Baruch (father of Ludwig Boerne), G. G. Uffenheim and J. J. Gumprecht, Rothschild’s emissaries, would have been run out of town by the Viennese police had not Metternich intervened. The Jewish representatives, of course, had no official position in the Congress. The most important Jewish influence on the members of the Congress came from the Jewesses who opened their salons in lavish entertainment to the leading statesmen and rulers who were attending the sessions of the Congress. The most prominent
of these Jewesses were Baroness Fanny von Arnstein, Madam von Eseleis, Rahel Levin von Varnhagen, Madam Leopold Herz, and Dorothea Mendelssohn von Schlegel.

The best the Jews were able to accomplish at the Congress of Vienna was a number of draft proposals that invariably offered full rights of citizenship to those Jews who “assume performance of all the duties of citizens.” This clause, of course, did not meet with the peculiar demands and requirements of the Jewish “nation” which actually desired all rights of citizenship without the usual obligations.

The Conference of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818 was also confronted with uninvited Jewish representatives. Lewis Way, an English clergyman, acted as the Jewish mouth-piece, and introduced a petition to the Conference advocating Jewish emancipation in Europe.

Jewish influence in the 1856 Congress of Paris and the 1858 Conference of Paris is evident in the work of both meetings. It does not appear that Jewry was permitted official representation at either of these two conferences. When the Congress of Berlin also discussed the Jewish problem, the Jewish “nation” was not recognized as a participant.

American Jewry influenced the United States to present Jewry’s demand for “full and equal rights” to the Bucharest Peace Conference of 1913, although the United States was not officially represented at the Conference. On October 13, 1913 the London Board of Deputies of British Jews and the Anglo-Jewish Association addressed a joint memorial to Sir Edward Grey, urging that new affirmative guarantees for the Jews be secured, pointing out that Roumania had repeatedly ignored and repudiated similar assurances. Elihu Root, United States Secretary of State, had issued strong instructions, at the direction of President Theodore Roosevelt, to Ambassador White, representative of the United States at the Algeciras Conference of 1906, directing him to urge upon the conference “the consideration of guarantees of religious and racial tolerance in Morrocco.

The dawn of 1919 found Paris literally flooded with Jews from all over the world. From Palestine, Russia, Canada, the United States, the Ukraine, Poland, Roumania, Galacia, Transylvania, Bukovina, Italy, Czechoslovakia, England, Yugoslavia, Greece; from West, South, East and North—orthodox Jews, Socialist Jews, rich and poor Jews, financiers and revolutionaries—they poured into the French capital. Whatever their status in the lands that harbored them, they remained merely the sons of the Covenant; one people; one nation! Each felt that he was playing a historic role in the destiny of Israel. Not one of them was concerned with “making the world safe for democracy.” They shared a single
thought and purpose—the capture of Palestine and a world government to make the world over for Jewish domination.

They went to work. The Comité des Delegations Juives auprès de la Conference de la Paix (Committee of Jewish Delegations at the Peace Conference) was fully organized by March 25th. In addition to the delegates from the various countries, representatives of the World Zionist Organization and the B’nai B’rith were included in the Committee’s membership. It purported to speak for ten million Jews.

Woodrow Wilson, George Clemenceau and the other influential figures at Versailles were putty in the hands of these international Jews. Although the idea of a world super-state had long been a Jewish dream, Wilson’s conceit in believing it was his own particular creation was pandered and puffed on all sides by the Jewish delegation and their controlled world press. “The principles of national self-determination and homogeniety were not permitted to be carried to extremes,” writes one Jewish historian with satisfaction. The finesse of the Jewish delegates is clearly discernible in the finished product of Versailles. The ground-work for the destruction of state sovereignty throughout Christendom was well laid by the masterminds behind the Comité des Delegations Juives. “Absolute state sovereignty was restricted.” As the basis for a second World War “the new and enlarged states” were compelled “to assume an obligation to embody in a treaty with the principal Allied and Associated Powers such provisions as might be deemed necessary by the said Powers to protect the inhabitants who differed from the majority of the population in race, language, or religion.” The crowning Jewish triumph was the provision that brought “domestic group rights” under the international guarantee and jurisdiction of the League of Nations.

The work of World Jewry at the Peace Conference is nowhere better indicated than in the provisions imposed on Poland by the Versailles Treaty. A ruthless conqueror could not have been more severe. The Polish representatives signed the Minority Treaty June 28, 1919, thereby committing Poland to divided sovereignty and a “superior” and privileged class of citizenry. The Treaty, pursuant to successful Jewish pressure, was guaranteed by the League of Nations. Among other things “minorities” were to be admitted to Polish nationality and citizenship “in the fullest sense”; guaranteed the right to use their own language; to maintain their own institutions; to receive primary instruction in their own language and, where the minority population was considerable, to receive “an equitable share in the enjoyment and application of public funds.” “Racial, religious or linguistic minorities” is the official Versailles verbiage, but it means what the Comité des Delegations Juives intended it to mean—Jews.
Poland, by the provisions of the Treaty, was prohibited from holding elections on Saturdays. The Jewish Sabbath was established by law. “Jews shall not be compelled to perform any act which constitutes a violation of their Sabbath, nor shall they be placed under any disability by reason of their refusal to attend courts of law or to perform any legal business on their Sabbath . . . Poland declares her intention to refrain from ordering or permitting elections, whether general or local, to be held on a Saturday, nor will registration for electoral or other purposes be compelled to be performed on a Saturday . . . Education communities of Poland will, subject to the general control of the state, provide for the distribution of the proportional share of the public funds allocated to Jewish schools in accordance with Article 9.”

Lloyd George, British Prime Minister, attempting to meet the harsh demands of Georges Clemenceau, proved himself—on paper, at least—a greater statesman than either the vindictive Clemenceau or the starry-eyed Wilson. Writing at Fontainbleau over a quiet week-end in March of 1919, he said:

“When nations are exhausted by wars in which they have put forth all their strength and which leave them tired, bleeding and broken, it is not difficult to patch up a peace that may last until the generation which experienced the horrors of the war has passed away . . . It is therefore comparatively easy to patch up a peace which will last for thirty years. What is difficult, however, is to draw up a peace which will not provoke a fresh struggle when those who have had practical experience of what war means have passed away . . . You may strip Germany of her colonies, reduce her armaments to a mere police force and her navy to that of a fifth-rate power; all the same in the end if she feels that she has been unjustly treated in the peace of 1919 she will find means of exacting retribution from her conquerors. The impression, the deep impression, made upon the human heart by four years of unexampled slaughter will disappear with the hearts upon which it has been marked by the terrible sword of the great war. The maintenance of peace will then depend upon there being no causes of exasperation constantly stirring up the spirit of patriotism, of justice or of fair play . . .

* * * * * *

The purpose of the leaders of the Comite de Delegations Juives was to insure heterogenity within nation populations. By imposing the “minority” treaties on the new states carved out of the ruins of Europe, world Jewry would be in a dominating position. The success of the maneuver depended, of course, upon the proposed World Government—the League of Nations. Only the threat of the combined power of world police might enforce the Jewish invasion of sovereignty embodied in the “minority” treaties, and such military power was unthinkable unless authorized and main-
tained by a world parliament. Hence the establishment of the
League of Nations was of the greatest importance to the Jewish
strategists.

Czechoslovakia followed Poland. Her representatives signed
the “minorities” treaty on September 10, 1919; Jugoslavia (Sep­
tember 10th); Roumania (December 9th) and Greece (August 10,
1920). The Treaty of St. Germain (Austria) September 10, 1919;
the Treaty of Neuilly (Bulgaria) November 7, 1919, and the
Treaty of Lausanne (Turkey) July 24, 1923, contained the minor­
ities provisions. Albania and the Baltic States were ultimately
forced into line. Fifteen nations in all were compelled to swallow
the indigestible and unassimilable elements within their popula­
tions, thus assuring a regurgitation that no international power
might hope to control.

The “minority” treaties were placed under the League of Nations
as matters of “international concern.” The Permanent Court of
International Justice was given jurisdiction over disputes arising
out of alleged violations or infractions of the provisions of the
treaties.

* * * * *

When President Wilson arrived in Paris in January of 1919, he
immediately declared that the League of Nations “is the central
object of our meeting.” In spite of the protests of Lloyd George
and Clemenceau, he insisted that the first order of business before
the Peace Conference was the League proposal. Political and
territorial matters could wait. He won his point—with the help
of the Jewish delegations. His Commission of nineteen presented
the draft proposal to the Conference on February 14th. On April
28th, after some revisions and amendments, the Covenant was
unanimously adopted by the Conference. The League of Nations
was given official status on January 10, 1920.

* * * * *

The Covenant of the League of Nations called for the promotion
of “international cooperation” in world health, labor, transporta­
tion, communications, finances, etc.—functions that were to become
integral parts of United Nations’ philosophy. Although the Cov­
enant failed to authorize their creation, the Council of the League
established commissions to deal with these projects. The Economic
and Financial Organization, International Office of Public Health
(established at Paris), Organization for Communications and Tran­
sit, and the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation,
were among the permanent bodies created. The International
Committee on Intellectual Cooperation (established in Paris in
1924) coordinated the work of such sub-groups as the International
Research Council, the Institute of International Law, the Interna­
tional Academic Union, etc. The International Cinematographic
Institute, together with innumerable committees of one kind or another, ultimately became known as the International Cooperation Organization.

The International Labor Organization was authorized by Article 23 of the Covenant. Its primary purpose was the promotion of uniform labor legislation throughout the world. Its efforts, as might have been expected, were futile. The United States became a member by Presidential proclamation August 20, 1934. Isador Lubin was the first United States representative. It survived the League fiasco to become an agency of the United Nations.

Although the Bank for International Settlements was not strictly a League of Nations organization, its role in the development of internationalism is important. It was created in 1930 to act as trustee and agent for the creditor governments in the collection and allocation of indemnity payments. Its stock of one hundred million dollars was underwritten by banks in Great Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Japan, Belgium and the United States.

By the end of 1938 the collapse of the League of Nations was almost complete. Of the sixty-two nations that had constituted its membership only forty-nine remained. At the close of 1940 it had ceased to exist. It had gone the way of its predecessors—the Holy Alliance, the Concert of Europe and the Permanent Court of Arbitration. It had failed because the United States had refused to participate, and because humanity had not yet been reduced to its common denominator of mediocrity. “Mother,” “home,” “the flag,” “heaven” and “God and Country” were still too deeply rooted in the minds and hearts of the people. Another war, and perhaps yet another, would be necessary before such “reactionary, bourgeois” concepts were blasted from the breasts of human beings.

In December of 1920 the British Government submitted to the League of Nations its proposed terms for the Palestine mandate. A modified version was approved by the Council at its meeting in London on July 24, 1922.

The British Government previously had issued a statement interpreting the Balfour Declaration as meaning: “not the imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, but the further development of the existing Jewish community, in order that it may become a centre in which the Jewish people, as a whole, may take, on grounds of religion and race, an interest and pride.”

The Mandate became effective on September 23, 1923. The Balfour Declaration is recited in the preamble of the Mandate
Commission. Various articles deal with the problems of immigration.

Article 22 of the *League of Nations Covenant* declares: “Where populations are not yet able to stand alone” the machinery of government should be set up for them in keeping with the accepted beliefs that “the well being and development of such peoples forms a sacred trust of civilization.” Thus were the Wilsonian doctrines of “self-determination” and “political independence” restricted. Further, the men who played God in the *League of Nations* were given authority to determine when populations were able to “stand alone.”

Aside from the political maneuverings and the immorality of the “British Mandate over Palestine,” the action of the *United Nations* in awarding Palestine to the Jews in 1948, does violence to the “sacred trust of civilization” doctrine hypocritically set forth in Article 22 of the *League of Nations Covenant*. World Jewry, long since, had effectually cancelled out Wilson’s claim to fair play in his insistence on the right of “self-determination”—world Jewry finally succeeded in obliterating the last semblance of the “sacred trust of civilization” from the minds of the accommodating men of the *United Nations*. Morality had followed God in his banishment from world affairs.

* * * * * *

The Arabs were represented at the *Peace Conference* by Emir Feisal, son of Hussein, Shereef of Mecca. He had commanded the Arab troops as an ally of England under the agreement of the *McMahon-Hussein Treaty*, believing that Britain would keep its word and give the Arab Nations—including Palestine—their independence. Feisal did not quite understand all the Jewish intrigue that was going on about him, and, because of his imperfect knowledge of English and French, found himself at great disadvantage. The issue became so confused that Wilson finally dispatched an American Commission to Palestine to investigate.

The *Crane-King Commission’s* report to Wilson favored the Arabs in every respect. Over nine-tenths of the Palestine population opposed Jewish immigration into the country. “To subject a people so minded,” the Commission reported, “to unlimited immigration, and to steady financial and social pressure to surrender the land, would be in gross violation of the principle just quoted, and of the people’s rights, although it kept within the forms of law . . . With the best possible intentions, it may be doubted whether the Jews could possibly seem to either Christians or Moslems proper guardians of the Holy Places, or custodians of the Holy Land as a whole.”

It is rather interesting to note that the *Crane-King Report*, like so many other documents unfavorable to the Jews, “disappeared”
from the President's files. Fortunately, however, the report was published in "Editor and Publisher."

The British authorities unquestionably were more concerned with the Jewish bankers of international Jewry than they were with the Arab nations. The McMahon-Hussein Treaty was ignored and the Balfour Declaration became the basis of the British Mandate over Palestine. Hence Great Britain and world Jewry may be directly responsible for World War III.

When Justice Brandeis heard that the British officials administering the "Mandate" were not favoring the Jews, he immediately set out for Palestine accompanied by his friend and biographer, Dr. Jacob de Haas. Upon their arrival in the Holy Land they found the reports to be only too true. Dr. de Haas writes that the British Commander-in-Chief and military and civil aides regarded the Balfour Declaration as a forgotten episode of the war. So our "American" Supreme Court Justice went straight to Balfour. Reports de Haas: "A few hours later the British Foreign Office was reminding the military authorities in Egypt and Palestine not only of the verbal contents of the Balfour Declaration, but that the matter was a 'chose jugee.' A number of Palestinian officials sought desirable 'exchanges' and Colonel Meinertzhagen, a pronounced pro-Zionist, was dispatched to Palestine. There had been no protest meetings, no stirring of troubled political waters. "The Brandeisan direct action diplomacy had achieved results."

* * * * *

A civil administration was established in Palestine in July, 1920. The World Zionist Organisation launched a campaign to purchase land, and started the flow of Jewish immigrants into the country. Around 280,000 Jews came into Palestine between 1918 and 1936—61,854 entering in 1935. By the end of 1936 the Jewish population in the country was estimated at 400,000.

The World Zionist Organisation was nearly bankrupt. Money was needed to buy more land, to exploit the country's resources, and to infiltrate more Jews among the Arabs. Chaim Weizmann entered into negotiations with American Jewry through Louis Marshall. As a result the Jewish Agency for Palestine was enlarged and revitalized. "We feel," declared Weizmann, "that it is time that we displayed renewed devotion in bringing Zionism before the Jewish world as a question calling for a moral decision. . . . What we aim at is to win over the youth to decide in favor of acknowledging its national responsibilities."

In 1914 the Jews were in possession of 177 square miles of Palestine. By 1936 they held 545 square miles. Between 1919 and 1933 they had established over four thousand industries. Nevertheless they were still a small minority among the Arab population. (Pal-
The resentment of the Arabs flared into violence in 1929. Jewish-Arab controversy over the Jewish and Mohammedan rights to the Wailing Wall of Herodian Temple developed into open conflict, the Christian Arabs joining with the Mohammedans against the Jews. A British Commission reported that the disturbances were caused by Arab fears of a rising Jewish majority, and the systematic acquisition of their land by the invaders. The Commission recommended that restrictions be placed on immigration and the purchase of land. In spite of the cries of the Zionists, the recommendations were accepted. The British Government published its findings in what is known as the *White Book*, October 20, 1930.

A new Arab outbreak came in April of 1936. The Palestine Arabs arose in open rebellion against the Jews and Great Britain, supported this time by all Arab countries, including Egypt. Loss of life was great. Another British Commission under the chairmanship of Earl Peel was dispatched to Palestine in November. The report again stated that the Arabs feared the domination of the Jews, and that their demand for self-government was being frustrated by world Zionism. The Peel Commission, finding the aspirations of the Jews and of the Arabs “mutually exclusive and irreconcilable”, recommended the partition of Palestine between them. The *Zionist Congress*, meeting in Zurich in 1937, reluctantly accepted this proposal but the Arabs resolutely opposed it.

The violence that broke out in 1937 was met by the British with strong measures. The leading Arab Committee was outlawed and its members imprisoned. The Mufti of Jerusalem fled abroad. Military courts were established and full scale military operations for control of the country were put into effect. The revolt, in spite of all these stern measures, continued with growing intensity. In 1938 the Jews resorted to terrorism. By fall, although suffering appalling casualties, the heroic Arabs were still in control of most of their country. They held Bethlehem, Hebron and Ramallah. All normal traffic throughout Palestine was at a standstill.

In November of 1938 the British government announced that it would drop the partition proposal and attempt to promote an understanding between the Arabs and the Zionists by direct negotiations in London. The Arabs took the understandable position that their country was being stolen from them, and that the negotiations were in the category of bargaining with a thief for the return of some portion of your own property. When the Arabs and the Jews were unable to reach an agreement the British announced that it would have to find a solution of its own. In its *White Paper* of May 17, 1939, it rejected its former interpretations of the *Balfour Declaration* as contrary to British obligations to
the Arabs and suggested an independent Palestine which would safeguard the essential interests of Arabs and Jews alike. A Jewish immigration of 75,000 was to be allowed over a period of five years with further Jewish immigration dependent upon Arab agreement. Regulations for the sale of land to the Jews were also to be established.

Both the Jews and the Arabs rejected the proposals of the White Paper. The Jews answered with a general strike and further acts of terrorism. Jewish immigration continued illegally, as world Jewry rushed to reinforce the invaders.

The statesmen of Britain undoubtedly realized the unfairness of the Balfour Declaration to the Arabs after it was too late to do much about it. The so-called MacDonald “White Paper” of 1939 was an apparently sincere desire to correct the wrong of 1917. The “White Paper,” in attempting to rationalize Balfour’s policy, insisted that the “Jewish home” in Palestine had already existed. So that there would be no doubt as to Britain’s future stand, the White Paper declared:

“His Majesty’s Government therefore no declares unequivocally that it is not part of their policy that Palestine should become a Jewish State. They would indeed regard it as contrary to their obligations to the Arabs under the Mandate, as well as to the assurances which have been given to the Arab people in the past, that the Arab populations of Palestine should be made the subject of a Jewish State against their will.”

The wrath of the Jews knew no bounds. The new British policy on the subject meant the defeat of their carefully laid plans, and they had no intention of permitting the controversy to end with the White Paper. They unleashed a world-wide campaign of abuse against the British government supplemented by propaganda material thoroughly distorting the facts.

Concluding at last that Great Britain as the Mandatory would never permit them to set up the “Jewish State” in Palestine, the Jews embarked on a campaign of violence to drive the British to either repudiate its “White Paper” or surrender the Mandate to the United Nations. Hagana, organized by the Jewish agency on the pattern of a regular army, was mobilized and held ready to strike. Two terrorist groups—the “Irgun Zvi Leumi” and the “Stern Gang” were unleashed against the British Mandate authorities and the people of Palestine. The terrorists, following the techniques and traditions of their Khazar brethren of Poland and Russia, assassinated, bombed and plundered.

Nathan Strauss convened the second meeting of the American Jewish Congress at Philadelphia May 30, 1920. The delegation
to Paris," he reported, "led by Judge Mack, Mr. Louis Marshall, and Dr. Wise, has done everything that could be done in order to protect and further Jewish interests. The Jewish name is more honored today than it was because we Jews have had the courage and self-respect to stand up together and try to solve our own problems."

The Peace Conference delegates emphasized the Jewish necessity of pressuring the members of the United States Senate for ratification of the Versailles Treaty, adding "soberly and prophetically" that the success of the Jewish concessions won in Paris depended upon favorable action of the government of the United States.

Pursuant to agreement Judge Mack adjourned the Congress sine die, after ruling out of order motions for the election of officers and procedures for reconvening the Congress. Within a few minutes after the sine die adjournment Gedaliah Bublick reopened the meeting, declaring: "The Congress is not dead; it is just born!" Calling itself the Provisional Organization for the American Jewish Congress, the delegates elected Louis Lipsky temporary chairman, established an Executive Committee of seventy-one (the number of members of the Great Sanhedrin) under the chairmanship of Nathan Strauss, and ordered it to reconvene the permanent American Jewish Congress within one year.

“Our activities and the progress we have made,” said Herzl at the Fourth World Zionist Congress, “can be summed up in a single sentence: we are organizing Jewry for its coming destiny.”

The American Jewish Congress was another step toward that destiny.

At the Second World Zionist Congress Herzl had declaired: "Men with convictions similar to ours, worthy and capable of filling these distinguished positions, must be nominated and elected in the name of the national idea. The prestige of the Jewish community, the means at its disposal, the people whom it supports, must not be used to oppose the will of our people. There I think I voice the sentiments of you all, fellow delegates, in proposing to make a conquest of the Jewish communities one of our immediate aims."

The creation of the Provisional Organization for the American Jewish Congress was the beginning of the vigorous conquest of the Jewish communities of the world, mobilizing Jewry for its “coming destiny.”

* * * * * *

The success of the Comite des Delegations Juives, in putting over the major portion of Jewry’s program on the legitimate representatives of the Peace Conference, encouraged its members to perpetuate the Committee. An ad hoc organization in the beginning, it now became permanent. The "aupres de la Conference
On August 3 and 4, 1926, a conference was held in London, attended by Dr. Stephen S. Wise, Abraham Goldberg, Louis Lipsky, Marvin Lowenthal, and Mrs. Archibald Silverman of the American Jewish Congress; Dr. Leo Motzkin, M. N. Tsatskis of the Comite des Delegation Juives; Dr. Isaac Gruenbaum, Dr. Osias Thon, Dr. Jerzy Rosenblatt, of the Polish Parliament; Dr. Leon Ringel, Chief Rabbi Isaac Rubinstein, of the Polish Senate; Chief Rabbi Zvi Peretz Chajes (Austria), and Dr. Shemariah Levin, representing Palestine.

The purpose of the Conference was the strengthening of the Comite des Delegations Juives. The necessity was considered so important that the delegates decided to call a general conference in August, 1927.

Sixty-five Jews from thirteen countries, representing forty-three organizations, met at Zurich, August 17 to 19, 1927. The meeting became known as the Zurich Conference on the Rights of Jewish Minorities. The American delegation included Stephen S. Wise, Judge Gustave Hartman, Judge Hugo Pam and Max B. Steuer. It was a very sad affair. Six of these poor oppressed Jews were members of the Polish Sejm (Parliament); one was a Polish Senator; one a member of the Latvian Parliament, and two were members of the Judiciary of the United States! Yet, here they were, valiantly striving for their rights! The name, of course, was a misnomer. It would have made sense had it been the Zurich Conference for the Right of the Jews to Dominate the World!

The World Zionist Organization put its stamp of approval on the Conference by sending the President of its executive Committee, Nahum Sokolow as its representative.

The Council on the Rights of Jewish Minorities was the creation of the Conference. Headquarters was established at Geneva in the

At the adjournment of the Seventeenth Zionist Congress (Basel, Switzerland, 1931), Stephen S. Wise called a meeting of leading Jews and set up a provisional committee for a World Jewish Congress. The committee was composed of Stephen S. Wise, Bernard S. Deutsch, Isaac Gruenbaum, Oscar Cohn, Leo Motzkin, Dr. N. Nurok and Z. Tygel. The Tenth Annual Session of the American Jewish Congress approved the decisions of the Provisional Committee and went on record for a conference at Geneva August 14, 1932. Dr. Nahum Goldman made the necessary international arrangements. He traveled throughout Europe mobilizing Jewry for its "destiny." On July 4, 1932, the annual convention of the Zionist Organization of America pledged its support to the forthcoming World Conference.

Ninety-four delegates from seventeen countries met in Geneva August 14-17, 1932. It was no accident that the show of Jewish strength was staged under the very noses of the members of the League of Nations. Leo Motzkin keynoted the conference by pointing out the importance of the League of Nations to the Jews. He was alarmed at the growing repudiation of the principles the Jews had written into the peace treaties at Versailles, and called on world Jewry to mobilize support for those principles and the League of Nations.

Dr. Goldman gave notice that it was the purpose of the World Jewish Congress to wrest Jews from their respective "citizenships" and ghettoize them as a nation apart. "It is to establish the permanent address of the Jewish people," he cried. "It is to establish a real, legitimate, collective representation of Jewry which will be entitled to speak in the name of sixteen million Jews to the nations and governments of the world, as well as to the Jews themselves.

Joseph Sprinzak revealed Jewish strategy when he declared: "Palestine needs a strong, efficient Jewish community in the Diaspora, and the Diaspora needs a powerful Jewish center in Palestine." Dr. Wise, Dr. Goldman, I. Jefroykin, Dr. Nurok and B. Zuckerman were elected to the Executive Committee.

Meanwhile the Comité des Delegations Juives continued its pressures and agitations in the League of Nations. One of the sinister provisions of the Versailles treaties permitted the subjects of certain nations to by-pass their own governments and appeal directly to the Council of the League of Nations—a provision now vigorously urged by Jewry in such United Nations treaties as the Genocide
Convention and the Declaration on Human Rights. Many of the posts in the League of Nations—as in the United Nations today—were held by Jews as nationals of the several member countries; an anomalous situation in view of the Jewish declaration that all Jews belong to one nation—the Jewish nation! It follows, therefore, that the Council of the League could hardly be a dispassionate and neutral body when presented with a Jewish problem.

A Jew named Franz Bernheim, a resident of Upper Silesia, complained to the Council that he had lost his employment solely because he was a Jew. As in all other such cases, the Jews in the League of Nations and the horde of Jewish lobbyists in Geneva, publicized such “discrimination” throughout the world. The Bernheim case was made a cause celebre and led to a League of Nations investigation of Jewish discrimination in Germany. The report, issued June 3, 1933, was not acceptable to Keller, the German representative, and he challenged the League’s legal jurisdiction of such a matter. Germany had not forgotten its betrayal by its own Jews when they sold their support to England in return for the United States participation in the war, and the League of Nations’ report did not serve to soften German sentiment toward them. Had organized Jewry deliberately sought to stir up anti-Semitic feeling in Germany, it could not have selected a better means.

The Second Preparatory World Jewish Conference met in Geneva September 5-8, 1933. Its principal objective appears to have been an effort to arouse the world against Germany. Its most important accomplishment was the organization of a “moral and economic boycott” against the Third Reich. The Conference went on record against the Jews transacting any business whatever with Germany. It demanded that the League of Nations recognize the alleged persecution of German Jews as “an international problem.” It called for “an international solution for the international problems of Jewish emigration created by the policy of repression, and . . . the machinery necessary for the systematic organization of a wholesale Jewish immigration into Palestine.” All of which led some observers to believe that world Jewry purposely exploited the situation to stimulate the Jewish invasion of Palestine.

The Comintern (Communist Third International) followed with a declaration October 3, 1933: “. . . the anti-fascist workers are rallying to the support of the heroic struggle of the German workers. In France, in Spain, in Belgium, in Sweden, in Denmark and in Holland, Communists and Social-Democratic workers are boycotting the ships sailing under the swastika flag.”

The Comintern extended the boycott to all nations, except, of course, the Soviet Union. “Nothing,” it thundered, “but a simultaneous struggle against one’s own and against German fascism
can be of any avail . . .”—and the Comintern supplied its own italics.

* * * * *

The third and last Preparatory World Jewish Conference convened in Geneva on August 20, 1934. Dr. Nahum Goldman had succeeded Leo Motzkin as president in December, 1933. The problem of the German Jews was the main concern of the delegates. Stephen S. Wise declared that “World Jewry, not German Jewry, is under attack!”

The League of Nations was criticized for the “narrow basis” on which it was attempting to solve the problem of Jewish refugees fleeing Germany. The Conference’s desire to organize a World Jewish Congress was reaffirmed—“a permanent body representing Jews all over the world, whose task it will be, in the name of the whole of Jewry, to defend the common interests, and to protect the rights of Jewish communities wherever they may be threatened.”

* * * * *

On September 13, 1934, Poland’s Foreign Minister, Josef Beck, announced to the Fifteenth Assembly of the League of Nations that Poland would henceforth refuse to abide by the provisions on “minority rights” imposed on Poland by the Versailles Treaty, until the adoption of a “general and uniform system” for all nations. Pending the adoption of such a system, the Minister declared, “My Government is compelled to refuse, as from today, all cooperation with the international organizations in the matter of supervision of the application by Poland of the system of minority protection. I need hardly say that the decision of the Polish Government is in no sense directed against the interests of the minorities. Those interests are and will remain protected by the fundamental laws of Poland, which secure to minorities of language, race and religion free development and equality of treatment.”

* * * * *

During February, 1936, the Comité des Delegations Juives and the Executive Committee of the World Jewish Congress met in Paris and resolved to call the World Jewish Congress into session in Geneva the following August.

On June 3-4, 1936, more than a thousand Jewish delegates assembled in Washington, D. C, purporting to represent ninety-nine Jewish communities in thirty-two states. Fifty-two delegates and sixty-four alternates to the forthcoming World Jewish Congress were elected.

The Jewish nation was planning World War II for Christendom.

* * * * *

It may have been symbolical that the first session of the World Jewish Congress opened in the Batiment Electoral, the building that
had housed the Assembly of the League of Nations before it moved to its own premises. Representatives of various governments; observers representing the Secretariats of the League of Nations and the International Labor Office, and representatives of governmental delegations to the League, attended the Congress sessions. Instinctively, perhaps, they knew that it would be this Jewish Congress that would determine the future course of the world—that the will for war or peace had passed out of Gentile hands and resided in the strange Parliament of a nation without a country!

Two hundred and eighty delegates were seated, purporting to represent the Jews of Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Columbia, Czechoslovakia, Danzig, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Libya, Morocco, Palestine, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, United Kingdom, the United States and Yugoslavia.

Dr. Stephen S. Wise, as president of the Comité des Delegations Juives and member of the Executive Committee of the World Jewish Congress, called the first session to order. In his keynote address he made it clear that “no Jew should be excluded from the World Jewish Congress because of political or economic views,” thus announcing that the Communistic-revolutionary Jews were as welcome as the Rothschilds and the Schiffs. “The World Jewish Congress,” continued the Rabbi, “must be wide and catholic enough to include all Jews who would, as Jews, have part with their fellow Jews in facing and seeking to solve the problems of their common Jewish life.”

Wise went on to state what many Gentiles knew yet hesitated to say. He stressed the “essential oneness” of Jewish problems, and declared that “there is an underlying unity” among all Jews; that Jews “are a people”; that they are neither a church nor a creed, but a “Jewish totality, including all of us.”

Dr. Nahum Goldman was equally frank. In order to achieve world government and domination, the Gentile concept of the sovereign state must first be destroyed. “The greater part of what the year 1919 created is now shattered,” he cried. “The march from the predatory practices of states to the great International Court of Justice cannot be accomplished in a few years. In order to bring it to a positive conclusion, there is need for one thing: to outgrow the concept of the sovereign state.”

Dr. A. Leon Kubowitzki of Belgium, in discussing “the organization of the Jewish collectivity”, declared “there is still no negotiorum gester for the everyday Caluth questions of our scattered people,” and that “only the Jewish people can be the instrument of Jewish liberation.” He called for welding the “isolated and dispersed Jewish communities” into a “conscious and organized whole.” The sphere of the World Jewish Congress, he said, “comprises all Jewish political, economic, and social questions,” and “the
Dr. Kubowitzki called for at least four departments within the Congress—a recommendation that appears to have been adopted. He named the Political, Social and Economic, Organization, Information and Propaganda, and Finance. The Organization and Information and Propaganda Departments, he explained, will be charged with establishing "a network of channels for regular, confidential and reliable information."

Judge Julian W. Mack was elected Honorary President of the Congress, and Stephen S. Wise was elected Chairman of the Executive Committee. Dr. Nahum Goldmann was elected Chairman of the Administrative Committee and Louis Lipsky was selected Chairman of the Central Council.

The rapid sweep of organizational activity by the World Jewish Congress is a remarkable episode in the history of international conspiracy and intrigue. While German "tourist" penetration and communist infiltration are notable feats in the field of international power politics, the techniques in each instance involved secrecy. The planting of Jewish nationalist cadres in the hearts of the countries of the world by the World Jewish Congress, however, was done openly. This perfected technique utilized the Trojan horse ruse plus the psychological postulate that boldness allays suspicion. While anxious observers scanned the skies for ominous signs of war beyond their frontiers, they had little time to note the frenzied organizational activities of a comparatively small segment of their "citizens" for a separate and independent nationalism. In the indignation aroused by the ruthless march of Hitler's National Socialism, few accurately analyzed and compared the identical goose-step in their Jewish neighbors.

Offices of the World Jewish Congress were immediately opened in Paris, Geneva and New York City. Paris became the main office. Dr. N. Goldman and M. Jarblum were in charge of "Political Affairs"; B. Zuckerman headed "Organizational Affairs"; Professor George Bernhard became Director of "Economic Affairs" with Dr. E. Knopfmacher as "Research Associate", and Mrs. Kate Knopfmacher was made Executive Secretary of the Paris office. A branch of the "Political Department" was ultimately established in London under the direction of Dr. M. L. Perlzweig.

Within a year the World Jewish Congress had organized thirty-four affiliates in twenty-seven countries on five continents. Before the out-break of World War II the Zionist Trojan Horse had found sanctuary in thirty-one nations. Under the shield of "Jewish defense" the World Jewish Congress launched its assault. While continuing its pressures on the League of Nations and its "use of
influential individuals and their connections”, it stepped up its own propaganda “backed by the political and economic potentialities of the Jewish masses rallying behind the Congress in all lands and continents” for the “mobilization of public opinion.”

On March 14, 1937, the American Jewish Congress and the Jewish Labor Committee jointly organized and sponsored a mass demonstration in Madison Square Garden in New York City. More than twenty-five thousand persons attended. “Moulders of public opinion,” such as General Hugh S. Johnson, Fiorello H. La Guardia and John L. Lewis, were rounded up by the joint sponsors for “principal addresses.” As many prominent Christians as were obtainable were involved. The theme of all speeches was “the menace” of Hitler and his “threat to the peace of the world.” Intensification of the boycott against Germany and the banning of credits to the Third Reich were prearranged.

On November 7, 1938, Ernest von Rath, German diplomat, was murdered in Paris by a Jew named Herschel Grynzpan. German reaction was immediate and drastic. World Jewish Congress members demonstrated throughout the world, involving many non-Jews in their agitation. On March 31, 1939, Hitler attacked world Jewry in a Reichstag speech, charging that it was the Jews who threatened the peace of the world.

The United States was headed for World War II but very few of its Gentile people realized it.

While Jewry agitated within the nations of the world, its representatives continued to use the rostrum in the Palace of the League of Nations at Geneva to spread its propaganda. The internal affairs of German Upper Silesia were under continuous Jewish attack through 1936 and 1937. Poland’s repudiation of the “minorities treaty” sharpened the conflict, and Jewish screams of “anti-Semitism” completely confused the issue.

Ten thousand Jews in the Free City of Danzig became a subject of agitation in the League of Nations. The Christians of Danzig resented the “special status” of the Jews within their midst, and, like Poland, sought to escape the yoke of Versailles. The representatives of world Jewry accomplished little or nothing in their tirades before the League of Nations, but the resultant publicity of “discrimination” against the Danzig Jews was grist in the Jewish war-mill. While the clamor went on the ten thousand Jews departed the Free City of Danzig.

The annexation of Austria on March 11, 1939, was the signal for a frenzied World Jewish Congress appeal to the League for protection of Austria’s one hundred and ninety-two thousand Jews. Hitler’s concern for his “blood-brothers” in Austria, Czechoslo-
vakia, the Sudetenland and other places—similarly duplicated by organized Jewry’s concern for its brethren of the Covenant—was a coincidence that appears to have passed unnoticed.

Poland, which contained the greatest Jewish population, finally became the principal issue. The World Jewish Congress initiated a series of public demonstrations designed to arouse indignation throughout the world. A conference on the Polish “Jewish question” was organized by the American Jewish Congress in New York City, January 31, 1937. Two thousand three hundred and ninety-six delegates representing eight hundred and thirty-five Jewish organizations attended. A similar conference was held in London on April 6, 1937, under the auspices of the British Section of the World Jewish Congress. The Canadian Jewish Congress staged a series of protest demonstrations during the same month. On June 1, 1937, the Federation des Societies Juives de France convoked a protest meeting at Paris. An “emergency conference” was called in New York City June 10, 1937 attended by two thousand four hundred and sixty-two delegates from eight hundred and seventy organizations. A delegation of two hundred, headed by Stephen S. Wise, was dispatched to Washington with a memorandum addressed to the State Department. Why two hundred delegates were necessary is better guessed than explained. The memorandum recited the “oppression” of the Jews of Poland. Its presentation to Secretary of State Cordell Hull on July 12, 1937 was dramatized by a public declaration protesting the treatment of the Jews in Poland signed by one hundred and fourteen non-Jews in the fields of “religion science, literature, and education.”

The World Jewish Congress stepped up its clamor during the succeeding months. The Socialists added their voices. Meetings and demonstrations swept across the world. Wherever Jewish influence had penetrated Christian organizations their presence was revealed by strident cries in Gentile voices repeating the phrases of the World Jewish Congress. Declarations, manifestos, and petitions cluttered the streets of the cities and the desks of public officials. In Belgium seventy university professors, writers and social leaders were induced to address statements of solidarity and protest to the Conseil des Associations Juives. A protest, signed by twenty-five French authors and college professors supplemented a similar protest by the League of the Rights of Man. Resolutions, statements, protests and declarations multiplied through the wizardry of the men of the World Jewish Congress—a resolution from the Polish League for Peace and Freedom in Warsaw; a protest from the Institute of International Education; a declaration from the American Student Union; a resolution from the American Fed-
eration of Teachers, and others too numerable to mention—bom­
barded the people of the world.

In 1938, Poland adopted a law providing that persons who had
been abroad for a period of five years would forfeit Polish citizen­
ship and be forbidden to return to Poland. Jews, among others
who had been absent from Poland more than five years, were
interned in a camp at Zbaszyn when they attempted to reenter
the country. The representatives of the World Jewish Congress
immediately intervened, protesting to the Polish Ambassadors at
Paris and Washington. Dr. M. L. Perlzweig was dispatched to War­
saw to take the matter up directly with the Polish government.
World War II intervened and German troops invaded Poland before
Dr. Perlzweig was able to get down to cases with officials of the
Government.

Roumania, in its attempt to throw off the shackles of Versailles,
declared that Roumanian Jews were not entitled to a special
status over other citizens. A Royal decree issued January 22, 1938
ordered the revision of the special citizenship status of all Jews in
the country. The representatives of the World Jewish Congress
immediately invoked the provisions of the “minority treaty” before
the League of Nations, and dispatched strong protests to the French
and British Ministers. Dr. Perlzweig in London, Marc Jarblum
in Paris, and Dr. Kubowitzki in Brussels, descended on the Foreign
Offices of the respective governments demanding drastic action
against Roumania. Dr. Wise was in constant communication with
the White House, while American Jews kept up a continuous bom­
bardment of the members of Congress and the State Department.
The Roumaian government was forced to resign February 10, 1938.
The American Jewish Congress boasts of its successful efforts in
“the early overthrow” of the Roumanian government. “It is no
mere conjecture,” states its spokesman, that the “efforts of the
World Jewish Congress were responsible.”

* * * * *

In May, 1938, the Hungarian government proposed to limit the
number of Jewish employees in all branches of economy to twenty
percent of the population. The World Jewish Congress intervened.
In Iraq, Uruguay—in all parts of the world—the propaganda agents
of Jewry screamed that Jews were a peculiar people with very
special and superior rights. There was no interlude in the inces­
sant Jewish outcry—no relaxation in their strident roll of the
drums of war!

* * * * *

Jewry carried on an undeclared war on the central governments
of Europe. In the beginning it had successfully imposed its will
on the sovereignty of fifteen nations, and had sought, through the
inadequate machinery of the League of Nations, to hold these nations in iron bondage. With characteristic Jewish subtlety, the master-minds of Israel had planned to use Christian armies to police the world for Jewish interests. When the machinery of the League of Nations failed to function according to design, it became necessary to declare war on the world, destroy the old world organization and build a better machine that would more perfectly meet Jewish demands. In the end few Christians would remember what it was all about, how it started, or why. Those who knew and dared to tell were easily silenced. After it was all over, few would be certain who led the demonstrations, signed the declarations, made the protests, or passed the resolutions. Men would march and men would die—there would be sacrifice, tears, blood and sweat. And Israel would live! Christendom would be further smashed and weakened and Christians would lose a little more of their God-given freedom, but when it was all over they would not really remember much about it. Some might recall that it had been frightful in the sacrifice of Christian blood and the staggering waste of Christian wealth. And there would be those who would slowly learn that there had been no real victory for anyone except the Jews and the Communists, but it would then be much too late to do anything about it. In the end men would come to know that the war for the “four freedoms” and the promised “lasting peace” were as chimerical as had been that other war “to make the world safe for democracy.”

Dr. Stephen S. Wise was born in Budapest, Hungary in 1874. He was the founder and rabbi of the Free Synagogue in New York City. He organized the first section of the Federation of American Zionists, and the Zionist Organization of America. He was one of the first officers of the Civil Liberties Bureau; an endorser of Brookwood College; a member of the Medical Bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy; an endorser of Boycott Japanese Goods Conference; sponsor of the Committee to Save Spain and China; a member of the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo; sponsor of the Conference on Pan American Democracy; participant of a mass meeting held under the auspices of the American League Against War and Fascism and the American Friends of the Chinese People, and an honorary cochairman of the Greater Boston Committee to the Russian Delegation. (Dies Reports, Vol. 1; Appendix IX.)

The leaders of the Soviet Union sought to meet the demands of Jewish Communists by setting up an “autonomous” Jewish state in Russia. Birobidjan was the Soviet’s answer to Zionism. American Jewish Communists—with Palestine still in the distant future—enthusiastically embraced the offer. The American Birobidjan
Committee was immediately launched for the purpose of settling “Jewish victims of Fascism” in this new Jewish “state.” The executive vice-president of this group, in 1950, was J. M. Budish. The executive secretary was Abraham Jenofsky.

On May 14, 1943, Charles Kuntz and Max Levin issued invitations to a Celebration of 15 Years of Biro Bidjan. The invitation read, in part, as follows: “At this gathering we shall hear a report of the results of the Biro-Bidjan celebration, and the Almanac, ‘25 Years U. S. S. R.; 15 Years Biro-Bidjan,’ which was issued by the ‘Icor’ Association.”

The Jewish drive for a world government was launched early in World War II. Whereas it was the “Allies” against the Central Powers in World War I, it was the “United Nations” in World War II. The use of the term was not accidental. “Commissions” of the “United Nations” came into being as early as 1942. A United Nations’ Commission for the Investigation of War Crimes was set up in the fall of 1942 with headquarters in London. The Jews, through their representatives in the World Jewish Congress, immediately “voiced its concern over the limited purview of the commission” They demanded that the Germans should be prosecuted whether the acts complained of took place in occupied territory or in Germany, and whether the acts were committed before or during the war. A delegation composed of Professor E. J. Cohn and A. L. Easterman participated in the deliberations of the Plenary Session of the Commission held in London July 29, 1943. The World Jewish Congress was successful in its demands “and most of its suggestions were adopted by the War Crimes Commission or later by the Prosecution.” The Jewish “suggestions” were reflected in the Charter of the International Military Tribunal.

The War Emergency Conference of the World Jewish Congress convened in Atlantic City November 26-30, 1944, with 269 delegates representing the Jewries of forty countries. Dr. Nahum Goldman placed the blame on the “democratic nations” for the plight of the Jews, claiming “that in a historical sense” they were responsible for the unparalleled Jewish catastrophe, and that their (the democratic nations) was the obligation to repair and to insure that such a tragedy did not occur again. He demanded that Jews should be granted “recognition and representation in all those conferences and agencies where problems vital to their future are under discussion.”

Sidney S. Silverman told the Conference that the World Jewish Congress had obtained for the Jews a standing with governments “such as no other Jewish body had in two thousand years,” with the obvious exception of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

Dr. Goldmann, during the debates, referred to “the callousness of the Gentile world.”
A Declaration was unanimously adopted by the Conference pro-
claiming that “the Jewish people were looking to the United Na-
tions for the establishment of a new international order based on
the Four Freedoms and the Atlantic Charter.”

* * * * *

Jewry had conquered Europe and the United States. The phil-
osophy of Marx was creeping over Asia and would soon swallow
up the teeming Chinese people. Everywhere, in every nation, in
the councils of the great and the halls of the mighty—here was the
mark of the Jew. Some of the great wore it on their foreheads
and some had received it in their right hands. Whether men walked
in the great exchanges of finance or trod in picket lines before
silent factories, the mark was there—in their right hands or clearly
visible on their foreheads. Sometimes the mark was a six-pointed
star and sometimes it was a hammer and sickle—but both sym-
bols were the mark of the Jew. From the public grade school to
the austere University, symbols mingled in composite design—
ominating, directing, triumphant!

He who had not the mark of the beast walked alone in the land
without favor, and wherever he went he was shunned and despised.

* * * * *
BEASTS OF THE APOCALYPSE

VII

THERE are probably many concepts of the term religion, and it would be extremely difficult to devise a definition that would be all-inclusive, so that everyone would find his particular concept satisfied. Literally the term suggests taboo, restraint; to hold back, bind fast; Ligare—to bind. Webster defines it as the service and adoration of God or a god as expressed in forms of worship, in obedience to divine commands, especially as found in accepted sacred writings or as declared by recognized teachers and in pursuit of a way of life regarded as incumbent on true believers; as ministers of religion.

The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and these carefully chosen words mean exactly what they say, nothing more and nothing less. The Founding Fathers were not so presumptuous as to guarantee something that God had already ordained. The Constitution and its amendments were not the acts of a gracious sovereign assuring his subjects that he was endowing them with certain rights. Far from it! In this instance the people were sovereign, establishing a government by consent, and spelling out the exact prohibitions and powers delegated to those who would assume the reigns of that government from time to time. In the First Amendment the sovereign people declared that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion,” meaning that the elected representatives were without power to legislate an official religion for the people of the United States. By the same language Congress is deprived of the right to enact laws prohibiting the free exercise of any religion.

How far did the people go in this last prohibition of the right of Congress to enact laws curtailing the free exercise of religion? Did they mean to say that Congress was without power to forbid human sacrifice because some religious sect sincerely believed that it was an essential element of their faith? To ask the question is to answer it. When certain sects insisted that polygamy was an essential article and an exercise of their religions, the Supreme Court of the United States held, in substance, that the “free exercise of religion” did not go so far as to legalize criminals acts which offended the traditional sense of morality of the vast majority of the people.

The question of the “free exercise of a religion” always involves freedom of conscience; the right to believe in any particular religious doctrine or doctrines, without let or hindrance. And this
freedom of conscience includes the right to carry the precepts of those doctrines into the conduct of every-day life. Like all other freedoms, however, religious freedom is necessarily circumscribed by the rights of others. To reason otherwise is to destroy freedom. Hence license and freedom are distinguished.

Political, like the term religious, is equally difficult to define. Webster tells us that the word pertains to polity, or politics, or the conduct of government, referring in the widest application to the judicial, executive, and legislative branches; or of or pertaining to, or incidental to, the exercise of the functions vested in those charged with the conduct of government; relating to the management of affairs of state; of or pertaining to the exercise of the rights and privileges or the influence by which the individuals of a state seek to determine or control its public policy; having to do with the organization or action of individuals, parties, or interests that seek to control the appointment or action of those who manage the affairs of state.

It should be clear from the foregoing definition that Judaism, so far as it is manifested by the conduct of the Jews, is political and in no sense religious. So far as faith in Jehovah, its rituals and services are concerned, Judaism is a religion. And the rather amazing historical fact is that no one ever complained of the purely religious aspect of Judaism. In every historical episode described by the Jews as "religious persecution", it was either the immoral or criminal act of the Jew or his political intriguing that was condemned.

The central and dominating theme of Judaism is political in the very same way that the Aryan theme was political to Hitler's National Socialism. As a matter of fact Hitler poached on the Jewish idea of race superiority and applied it to his Third Reich. As sons of the Covenant, Jewry strives politically for world domination—strictly a political activity. The Zionist movement, admittedly political, embodies the ingrained political orientation of Jewry.

Christians have been deluded into accepting all Jewish activity as the "exercise of religion." It has been a shield of amazing versatility, and, at times, a weapon of incredible power.

We have seen that the League of Nations was a Jewish idea. Through its international machinery world Jewry hoped to impose its special status on the fifteen helpless nations carved out of Europe by the political butchers of Versailles. It failed for a number of reasons, but the idea did not die. World War II, in many respects, was merely a continuation of World War I, which after all, ended in an Armistice on November 11, 1918. Throughout the war years of 1939 to 1845 the Jews worked incessantly for the revival of a strengthened League of Nations under a new name at the war's end. The United Nations as an allied coordin-
ating agency existed almost from the beginning. The resolution of the War Emergency Conference of the World Jewish Congress, calling for the establishment of "a new International Order," was directed to the United Nations in November, 1944—months in advance of the San Francisco Conference. It is true that the Dumbarton Oaks meeting had indicated the desire of certain persons for a revival of the League of Nations, but there was no manifest expression that the American people had any such ambition. The World Jewish Congress, however, working behind the scenes, started using all of its energies and resources in pressuring governmental officials to establish the foundational apparatus for the new world organization at the very beginning of the War. The name, United Nation, is said to have been coined by President Roosevelt in 1941 to describe the countries fighting against the Axis.

The announcement of the proposal for the United Nations came from Moscow in the fall of 1943. Hull, Eden and Molotov had agreed that there was need for a post-war "international organization."

The Dumbarton Oaks (an estate near Washington, D. C.) Conference, August 21 to October 7, 1944 was a meeting between representatives of Soviet Russia, Great Britain, China and the United States. The purpose of the Conference was to plan a post-war United Nations Organization.

At Yalta, February 4-11, 1945, Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin set the date for the United Nations meeting at San Francisco.

The San Francisco Conference, April 25 to June 26, 1945, created the United Nations, with forty-six nations signatory to the U. N. Charter.

Both Dean Acheson and John Foster Dulles, Secretaries, declared that the United Nations is the "keystone" of American foreign policy. It therefore becomes extremely important to understand this "international world order." It is best understood by analyzing the character and purposes of those who promoted it.

On January 1, 1942 the representatives of twenty-six nations signed the United Nations Declaration in Washington—five months after the Atlantic Charter was signed by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill. The "Declaration" of January 1, 1942 restated the purposes of the Atlantic Charter. The Moscow Declaration of November 1, 1943, signed in Moscow by Molotov, Eden and Hull, and the Chinese Ambassador to the Soviet Union, stated: "They (the signatory ministers) recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practical date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace."
At Teheran Roosevelt and Stalin, between cocktail parties, declared: "We are sure that our concord will win an enduring peace. We recognize fully the supreme responsibility resting upon us and all the United Nations to make a peace which will command the good will of the overwhelming mass of the peoples of the world and banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations."

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference was attended by representatives of China, Great Britain, Soviet Russia and the United States. The results of this Conference were embodied in the United Nations Proposal. It called for a "Security Council" on which the "Big Five"—China, France, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom and the United States—were to be permanently represented. There was no recommendation for voting procedure. On February 11, 1945, Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin announced from Yalta that the question of voting had been settled.

The evil genius of the United Nations was Alger Hiss, member of the Soviet spy apparatus inside the United States government. He became the first General Secretary and Chief executive officer of the United Nations Organization. At all times Hiss maintained contact with the Jew Harry Dexter White, who conceived and operated the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference held at Bretton Woods, N. H., in July, 1944. Truman appointed White director of the Fund. Hiss was the executive secretary of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. He was the most influential adviser to Roosevelt at the Yalta Conference. He organized the San Francisco Conference, and secretly selected most of the U. N. secretariat staff—he recommended about 500 persons for these jobs.

The evil genius of the United Nations was Alger Hiss, member of the Soviet spy apparatus inside the United States government. He became the first General Secretary and Chief executive officer of the United Nations Organization. At all times Hiss maintained contact with the Jew Harry Dexter White, who conceived and operated the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference held at Bretton Woods, N. H., in July, 1944. Truman appointed White director of the Fund. Hiss was the executive secretary of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. He was the most influential adviser to Roosevelt at the Yalta Conference. He organized the San Francisco Conference, and secretly selected most of the U. N. secretariat staff—he recommended about 500 persons for these jobs.

The Communist Party of the United States had long agitated for "collective security" in a world government that must be essentially socialist. And, of course, when the Communist Party of the United States speaks, the words, if not always the voice, express the sentiments of the Khazar Jews of Russia. The Jewishness of the American Communist Party was clearly revealed by the trial of Eugene Dennis and his eleven comrades who made up the National Secretariat of the party. Of the eleven, six were Jews, two were Negroes and three unknown. The Jews were Jacob Stachel, John Gates (Israel Regenstreif), Gilbert Green (Greenberg), Gus Hall (Arvo Mike Halberg), Irving Potash and Carl Winter (Philip Carl Weissberg). Earl Browder was permitted to "front" for this Politburo and the Communist Party of the United States until the change in the international "party-line" decreed from Moscow brought about his "liquidation." In the widely touted Browder propaganda-book "Victory—And After," the Communist "directives" for the formation of the United Nations are set forth. Declares Moscow's American mouthpiece: "The Soviet Union is now an established welcome member of the United Nations. That is be-
cause obviously the Red Army and the Soviet people are fighting our battle for us, laying down their lives in millions, in the most magnificent struggle of all history. We Americans, as we all know, would be in a most disastrous situation but for the fact that we have the Soviet Union as an ally. The *United Nations* would not be in existence today but for the Soviet Union. . . . Signs multiply daily that the American people are developing a profound affection for the Soviet Union and are even beginning to understand it. . . . It is worth noting that the two writers most successful in breaking down the will of prejudice and misinformation that separated our country from the Soviet Union were a successful American capitalist (Joseph E. Davies—"*Mission to Moscow*") and a high dignitary of the Church of England (the "Red" Dean of Canterbury—"*Soviet Power*") . . . The two strongest powers in the *United Nations* are the United States and the Soviet Union. While these two remained at arms' length from one another, the formation of the *United Nations* remained impossible. But when these two countries at long last established a relationship of cooperation then the formation of the *United Nations* followed quickly thereafter. It can be said, without exaggeration, that ever closer relations between our nation and the Soviet Union are an unconditional requirement for the *United Nations* as a world coalition. When these relations are upon a sound footing then all other questions can be solved with a minimum of difficulty . . .

"We are not solidly building the *United Nations* so long as we permit the dominance in the nation's thinking of the belief that some magic or 'accident' can 'explain' our alliance with the Soviet Union, or the Soviet's mighty achievements for our side. Far from being accidental, we must learn to understand these things as the working out of natural law, of historical necessity; as something springing from the deepest forces which move all progressive humanity. That is the powerful conception which gave us Vice-President Wallace's speech of May 8, and made of it a world-wide weapon to recruit the peoples to the *United Nations* banner. We must begin to understand the Soviet Union in its world historical setting, as one of great achievements of the human race in its long forward march, like our own 1776, like the French '92, like the Bolivian revolution of Latin America, and like our own abolition of chattel slavery in the Civil War. We must understand the magnificent achievements of the Soviet Union in this war as the product of long, arduous and heroic preparation for this day when, side by side with the United States, Britain, China, and the whole *United Nations*, she is bearing the main brunt of the fight for humanity's future."

This Communist plea for the *United Nations*, carefully couched in the historical dialectics of Marx, clearly reveals the evolutionary principle of involvement, into which the naive "statesmen" of the
United States led their country. Lady Astor’s observation that “the Russians are fighting for themselves,” although irritating to Browder and his Communist comrades, is too obviously true to deserve comment. The disastrous result of the evolutionary involvement of the United States in the Jewish-Communist United Nations is now clear.

The World Jewish Congress was particularly concerned with the creation of a new World Security Organization with machinery strong enough to enforce the new International Order it contemplated. The Jews demanded the “restoration of Jewish legal rights” and the “retroactive abrogation of all anti-Jewish legislation” throughout the world. They demanded that the “status of Jews and Jewish communities” be placed “under the provisions of municipal or international law.” They went so far as to demand that no nation should be admitted to or continued in membership of the World Order unless it “accepted these conditions and gave assurance of its readiness to enforce them.”

The Political Department of the World Jewish Congress and the Institute of Jewish Affairs went to work on the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals immediately after the adjournment of the War Emergency Conference. Dr. Maurice L. Perlzweig (who headed the “Political Department”) embarked on a campaign to pressure representatives of certain affiliated governments of the United Nations to include Jewish demands in official proposals. It was absolutely necessary, in the opinion of the Jewish leaders, that the provisions of the “minority treaties” imposed by the League of Nations through the efforts of the Comité des Delegations Juives and the World Jewish Congress, be preserved and strengthened in the charter of the new World Government. While the public at large was not apprised of the fact, it was the intention of those who pulled the strings to take over much of the League of Nations.

The World Jewish Congress, in appropriate language, demanded that the qualification for membership in the new World Organization be determined by the applicant-nation’s attitude toward the Jews within its boundaries! The draft proposals made “peace-loving” states the sole test of qualification, which, of course did not satisfy the Jews. As the Security Council and the General Assembly were expected to be armed with wide powers, it was finally decided that the question “whether a state whose laws discriminated against Jews could be considered ‘peace-loving’ was left to the discretion” of these bodies.

With only the Jews in mind, Jewry demanded that “the purposes and principles of the Charter state clearly that it was one of the aims of the organization to protect human rights and not merely to promote respect for them.” Furthermore, the Jews demanded that the power to protect human rights (the Jews) be entrusted to
the Security Council, “which alone would wield any effective power in the new organization.” A “Commission on Human Rights,” armed with “adequate and appropriate powers to perform its functions” was also demanded.

In addition to Dr. Perlzweig’s international lobbying activities, drafts of the Jewish proposals were sent to the affiliated bodies of the World Jewish Congress throughout the world, with instructions to the members to pressure their respective governments and enlist their support for Jewry’s demands.

Through Washington contacts the United States Department of State was persuaded to “invite” the American Jewish Conference, the American Jewish Committee, and the Jewish Labor Committee to name representatives to serve on a body of consultants to the American Delegation at the San Francisco Conference for the United Nations.

The delegation of the World Jewish Congress was headed by Dr. Maurice L. Perlzweig and Dr. Jacob Robinson. The remainder of the delegation consisted of Dr. Simon Federbush, Rabbi Irving Miller, and Dr. Arieh Tartakower, of the United States; A. H. Aranovitch, A. B. Bennett, Samuel Bronfman, Saul Hayes, and S. J. Zacks, of Canada; A. L. Easterman, Great Britain; David Groisman, Argentina; and Leon Dultzin, of Mexico. The American Jewish Conference, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, and the Jewish Labor Committee were represented—Dr. Nahum Goldman and Dr. Stephen S. Wise heading the delegation of the Jewish Agency.

Because the San Francisco Conference limited its work to the drafting of a new charter, the Jews were compelled to forego their plans regarding special Jewish rights and the preferred status of Jewish refugees, and to concentrate on “strengthening the important provisions for human rights and fundamental freedoms contained in the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals.”

A “Joint Memorandum”, signed by Stephen S. Wise, as president of the World Jewish Congress; Israel Goldstein, Louis Lipsky, and Henry Monsky, co-chairmen of the American Jewish Conference; and Professor Selig Brodetsky, president of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, was presented to the United Nations Conference on International Organization. The “memorandum” criticized the Dumbarton Oaks Proposal for failing to provide machinery for the “safeguarding” and protection of human (Jewish) rights. The memorandum declared that “protection involves concrete obligations by the States concerned since only detailed and clearly defined obligations can be either guaranteed or violated.”

By thus destroying the sovereignty of the nations of the world, the Jews planned to use the combined military force of nations to enforce their special status on any single nation that dared resist them. Shorn of its thin diplomacy the Memorandum con-
tended that World War II did not commence with Germany's attack on Poland, but actually started when Germany legislated against the Jews. The Memorandum therefore demanded that the Dumbarton Oaks Proposal be amended by striking the phrase "promote respect for human rights" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "protect (or safeguard) human rights". The implementation of this policy, the Jews demanded, should be the function of the Security Council, or, if assigned to the Economic and Social Council, then that body must be vested with adequate authority to enforce its decrees. In addition, the Memorandum called for the creation of a Commission on Human Rights and Freedom.

The Dumbarton Oaks Proposal called for an International Court of Justice. The Jews demanded that this Court be authorized unequivocally to deal with all violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms "if the procedures or methods of adjustment recommended by the Security Council or the Economic and Social Council do not bring necessary relief."

The Memorandum also called attention to World Jewry's demand for Palestine—thereby indicating its utter disregard for the "human rights and fundamental freedoms" of the Arabs. The reconstruction of Palestine as a Jewish Commonwealth, the Memorandum brazenly declared, "was of prime importance for the future of the Jewish people as a whole."

The "Joint Committee," on May 10, 1945, presented a new memorandum to the Conference. The pretense of "human rights and fundamental freedom" was dropped and the ten "proposals" contained in the memorandum speak of Jewish demands quite frankly. Because the United Nations exists only for the Jews and for Jewish purposes, the ten demands are set out in full:

1. The promulgation of an International Bill of Rights.
2. Immediate restoration to Jews in Europe of all rights formerly guaranteed by national legislation and international treaties.
3. Outlawing of anti-Semitism as an instrument of national or international policy.
4. Punishment of criminals for crimes whenever and wherever committed by the Axis powers and their satellites against the Jewish people.
5. United Nations' aid in relief and rehabilitation of their (the Jews) distinctive needs and on a basis of complete equality.
7. Indemnification to Jews—individuals and communities—for losses caused by the Axis, and reparations to the Jewish people for general damages.
8. Assistance from governmental and intergovernmental agencies in the resettlement of displaced Jews.
9. Opening of the doors of Palestine for unrestricted Jewish immigration and its reconstruction as a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth.
10. Recognition by the United Nations of the justice of the
Jewish demand for representation, for the purpose of advice and cooperation, on agencies that have been and will be set up by the United Nations to deal with the problems of relief, rehabilitation, resettlement, and other aspects of postwar reconstruction.

In spite of the heavy Jewish pressure, both from within and without the United Nations, the Charter omitted enforcement and protection of human (Jewish) rights. Such a brazen invasion of the sovereignty of nations might well have doomed the whole plan to failure at the outset. The Jews found consolation, however, in the provisions of Article 1, paragraph 3 of the Charter. One of the purposes of the United Nations, it is here declared, is the achievement of international cooperation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms. Articles 55 and 56 pledged the member nations “to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization” for the promotion of “universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms.” Article 62 authorizes the Economic and Social Council to make recommendations for the attainment of such “universal respect,” and Article 63 authorizes the creation of a Commission for the “promotion” of human rights.

“Respect” is a sentiment or attitude that has always been earned. It can never be purchased or forced. During two thousand years the Jews had failed to win the respect of their Gentile neighbors. The pathetic truth is that they never tried to earn that respect; they never did the simple, friendly and moral things that win respect. The word “respect,” as used in the Charter, is a misnomer. What the Jews actually demanded and what they mean is subservience; the right to be and act as a superior people without interference by any law of any nation. They, better than any other people on the face of the globe, know that the standing armies of the world are powerless to enforce the most insignificant unit of mankind to “respect” them. Because they actually despise all mankind, except themselves, they care little whether or not mankind “respects” them. As long as they dominate and exploit, with immunity from retaliation or reprisal, the people of the nations among whom they live, they are satisfied. This is the Jewish purpose in world government, this is yet the Jewish goal to be achieved.

Although the Socialists and demagogues joined with the Jews in shoving the United Nations down the throats of unsuspecting sovereign peoples, there were practical considerations that stopped the promoters from making the United Nations the all-powerful world government they are still determined it will be. Too great an invasion of the sovereignty of the United States, for instance, might result in a revolt of the traditional freedom-loving Senate so that confirmation of the Charter might go the way of the
League of Nations. Once the great powers of the world were committed, the Charter could be “strengthened.” A gradual loss of sovereignty and freedom, even in the United States, would go unnoticed until it would be too late to do anything about it. Hence it was that Article 2, paragraph 7 provided that “nothing contained in the Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the Charter.” Exception of this principle, however, is made for the enforcement measures decided upon by the Security Council against threats of breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression. And then, of course, the World court could always hold that any domestic matter of any state actually constituted a “threat of breach of the peace” so that the international armies might land and take over the country. In the meantime, however, it looked very nice on paper and, what is more important, it worked.

The ultimate destruction of constitutional provisions is by way of so-called interpretation. This term is usually a brain-washing devise. The actual process is legislation by judicial usurpation. Groundwork for rewriting the Charter of the United Nations is already in process. Rene Brunet “interprets” Articles 56 and 62 as meaning that “all questions involving the safeguard of human rights were removed by the Charter from the sphere reserved by the individual governments and placed under the direct protection of the United Nations. Consequently, a state hailed before the U.N. in connection with a matter touching human rights cannot escape intervention of the U. N. by invoking the exception of domestic jurisdiction.” On August 22, 1945, the British Prime Minister told the House of Comons that “anti-Jewish excesses were matters that transcended the mere jurisdiction of a state.”

The only victors in World War II were the Jews and Communist Russia.

World Jewry hailed the United Nations as its most important international achievement. If the Charter left a few things to be desired Jewry was confident that it would ultimately fulfill its most ardent hopes. It was a starting point from which the Jews might impose their will on the world. They might now successfully carry on any political activity without interference. Any nation that raised its hand in defense could immediately be indicted for “anti-Semitism” and a violation of “human rights.” Through Jewish pressures the powers of the United Nations will be expanded so that the so-called “domestic jurisdiction” of the member states will ultimately become as meaningless as “state’s rights” under the “interpretations” of the Supreme Court of the United States.

* * * * * *

The Charter of the United Nations went far beyond the Covenant of the League of Nations. Although international Jewry wrote
most of the “minority treaties” of the League, they still had no official standing in the League. Article 71 of the U. N. Charter, however, has been “interpreted” to permit private (as distinguished from governmental) bodies to participate in United Nations affairs in a consultative capacity. Article 71 empowers the Economic and Social Council to make suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations interested in matters of international economic, cultural, education, health, and related matters (Article 62). Article 71 deals generally with international organizations, but also is “interpreted” to admit national bodies after consultation with the respective member states.

ECOSOC (Economic and Social Council) is authorized by the provisions of Article 68. Among its commissions is one for “the promotion of human rights.” On March 3, 1947, the World Jewish Congress presented an official request, signed by Stephen S. Wise, for Consultative membership in the Economic and Social Council. The request was granted.

* * * * *

The Commission on Human Rights, provided for in Article 68, was established by ECOSOC in January, 1946. Although the Jews were not yet “officially” in the Council, they played a considerable part in establishing the Commission, insofar as the idea was theirs in the first place. Dr. Jacob Robinson, who had written propaganda articles on the subject was “invited” by the U. N. in December, 1946 “to serve as special adviser” to the first session of the Commission (January 10, 1947). It was Dr. Robinson who prepared the draft outline of the proposed International Bill of Rights. At the June 9-29, 1957 session of the Commissions, the World Jewish Congress submitted a memorandum signed by Dr. Perlzweig on the proposed draft. In view of the length of time necessary for the brain-washing of fifty-five nations, the Jews demanded immediate “stop-gap” legislation by the General Assembly to compel member nations to affirm “equality before the law for all inhabitants.” The memorandum, of course, demanded that such legislation have teeth in it and that “aggrieved persons or groups” might by-pass their own governments and directly petition the “Human Rights Commission.”

A second brief was submitted by the Jews reiterating the demands of the first, but now maintaining that equality was not enough! They contended that world Jewry would not be satisfied with mere “non-discrimination”; they wanted their dual and special status recognized internationally so that they might hold public offices and engage in the professions, etc., of every country in the world! Moreover, they demanded that free speech and freedom of the press be curtailed to the extent that no one might speak or write critically of the Jews or of their activities!

On December 11, 1946 the General Assembly of the United
Nations adopted the Jewish proposal making “genocide” a crime under international law. The Economic and Social Council immediately undertook “studies” preparatory to a draft proposal on “genocide.” The Jews immediately embarked on an international lobbying crusade and recruited “influential non-Jewish organizations to expedite the matter.”

Dr. Robert Marcus, on July 30, 1947, submitted to the Acting President of the Economic and Social Council, a memorandum stating that deficiencies in existing international law called for action by the United Nations; that however helpful domestic legislation on genocide might be, it could not prevent its commission and would rarely lead to punishment. Marcus therefore requested that the convention on genocide make the crime punishable by an international authority and that no difference be made between war and peace-time.

On November 21, 1947, the U. N. General Assembly adopted a resolution reaffirming that genocide is an international crime entailing national and international responsibility on the part of individuals and states.

During the convention on genocide in the sixth session of the Economic and Social Council February 2, 1948, at Lake Success, Dr. Kubowitzki and Dr. Marcus again presented a memorandum outlining the Jewish demands. The resistance of the Arabs to the Jewish invasion of their country was represented as an illustration of “genocide” presently existing in the world. In addition to former demands abrogating the abridgment of freedoms of speech and press, the Jews now demanded that member nations be compelled to forcefully disband organizations engaging in criticism of the Jews and to dismiss all public officials who participated in such activities. Extradition of persons accused of genocide for trial by the International Court was the culminating brazen demand!

On April 6, 1948 Dr. Marcus was the only representative of a non-governmental organization to appear before the Ad Hoc Committee of the Economic and Social Council at Lake Success. To the former Jewish demands he now added proposals designed to deprive persons accused of genocide of the universally accepted justifications of self-defense or national defense!

Never before in all the history of Christendom, had the world appeared so completely bereft of reason! Never before, in the history of the world, had any group of people demanded so much for so little! Incredible as was the brazen conduct of the Jews, the supine asininity of the world’s statesmen is still more incredible. The United States’ participation in these alien activities marks a degree of deterioration that is alarming. To endanger the Constitution and the Bill of Rights of the United States in an international adventure with mad-men is a betrayal of every
American tradition. But all of these events became inevitable when the bars went down at Ellis Island in 1880. By 1945 nearly everyone wore the mark of the beast, and no one who had not the mark, or the name, or the number of the beast had standing in the world.

Under the guise of concern for “stateless” persons, Jews sought to force unrestricted Jewish immigration on the nations of the world. Pursuant to this tricky scheme, Dr. Marcus on February 12, 1948 addressed a letter to the President of the Economic and Social Council. There was, said Dr. Marcus, a large number of individuals who were deprived of nationality. These persons were regarded by all countries as aliens and foreigners. Each nation made its own rules and regulations concerning them, and Dr. Marcus and his fellow Jews did not think any nation should be permitted to have such power. He therefore demanded that the United Nations take over the subject, issue passports and guarantee the Jews the right to live in any country free of domestic rule or regulations with the same rights and privileges as the native born citizen! Furthermore, the matter was urgent! There were thousands of Jews in Europe and nobody wanted them. Therefore, said Dr. Marcus, the Jews demanded that the Council adopt a resolution calling upon the Secretariat to prepare a Draft Convention based on the following general principles:

1. Stateless persons should be granted in the country of their residence the enjoyment of all civil rights to the same extent as citizens thereof, and thus be exempt from the disabilities of alienage in regard to protection by courts, acquisition of property, economic pursuits, compensation for damages, etc.

2. The United Nations should undertake to accord protection to all bona fide stateless persons, through a specialized agency.

3. Special identity and travel documents issued by the authority of the United Nations should be granted to all bona fide stateless persons and be honored in the same manner as passports issued by governments. These documents should entitled the holder to travel and be admitted into signatory states on no less favorable conditions than are customary in the case of foreigners enjoying the protection of a government.

4. Persons born in a country of bona fide residents or unknown parentage should ipso facto become citizens thereof unless they acquire another nationality by birth.

5. The countries where stateless persons reside in good faith should undertake to naturalize them within a reasonable period of time.

* * * * *

The representatives of the World Jewish Congress and other Jewish organizations—all working to the same end—were merely lobbyists for the Jews officially holding important positions within the United Nations Organization. The Secretariat was overwhelmingly Jewish. Among the Jews holding such positions are the
following: Dr. H. S. Bloc, Chief of Armaments and Enforcement Section; Antoine Goldet, Principal Director, Department of Economic Affairs; Ansgar Rosenberg, Special Advisor, Department of Economic Affairs; David Weintraub, Director, Division of Economic Stability and Development; Karl Lachman, Chief Fiscal Division; Henri Langier, Assistant General Secretary in Charge, Department of Social Affairs; Dr. Leon Steinig, Director of Narcotics Division; Dr. E. Schwebel, Assistant Director Human Rights Division; H. A. Wieshoff, Chief, Analysis and Research Section, Department of Trusteeship of Non-self-governing Territories; Benjamin Cohen, Assistant General Secretary in charge of Department of Public Information; J. Benoit-Levy, Director, Films and Visual Information Division; Dr. Ivan Kerno, Assistant Secretary General in charge of Legal Department; Abraham H. Feller, General Counsel and Principal Director, Legal Department; Marc Schreiber, Legal counsellor; G. Sandberg, legal counsellor; Division for Development and Codification of International Law; David Zablodowsky, Director, Printing Division; George Rabinovitch, Director, Interpreters Division; Max Abramovitz, Deputy Director of Planning Office; P. C. J. Kien, Chief, General Accounts Section; Mercedes Bergman, Executive Officer, Bureau of Personnel; Paul Radzianko, Secretary of Appeals Board; and Dr. A. Signer, Medical Officer in Charge of Health Clinic.

The following Jews are directors of U. N. Information Centers: Jerzy Shapiro, Geneva; B. Leitgeber, New Delhi, India; Henri Fast, Shanghai, China; and Dr. Julius Stawinski, Warsaw.

David A. Morse, a Jew, was Director General of the U. N. International Labor Organization. Three of the four members of the Executive Board—Altman of Poland, David Zellerbach of the United States, and Finet of Belgium—are Jews. Both V. Gabriel-Garcés of Ecuador and Jan Rosner of Poland, correspondents attached to the I. L. O. office, are Jews.

The Jews, for the greater part, have consistently demanded Palestine. Up to 1916 certain Jewish groups indicated a willingness to take territory in Africa and elsewhere, but their voices have been all but drowned out by the tumultuous cries of the Zionists for Palestine. Whenever there arises an organization of Jews opposing the fanatical Neo-Messianic objectives of the Zionists, all Jewry is organized into smear battalions for the destruction of the dissenting group. Individual Jews who fail or refuse to go along with Zionist ambitions are ostracized and humiliated. Whenever it is in the power of the Zionists to apply economic pressures against Jewish dissenters, it is done with thorough ruthlessness.

The Zionist campaign against the Jews of Mexico illustrates
the lengths to which the Neo-Messianics will go in beating dis­senting Jews into line. The American Council for Judaism, whose members proclaim that their nationality is American, their re­ligion Judaism, and their homeland is the United States of America, describe in their publication the treatment accorded the Jews who refuse to do Zionist bidding by the Zionists of Mexico. The account appeared in the “Council News” for September, 1948, and reads as follows:

“A campaign of intimidation and coercion climaxed by ‘mock trials’ with excommunication and sanctions invoked against those who refuse to give as much as was asked by the Committee of the United Campaign for Collecting Money for Israel’s Army, is reported from Mexico by a group organized as The Defense Committee of Mexico City.

“The Defense Committee reported that ten persons were ‘tried’ June 15, by a jury of eleven—hand-picked two weeks pre­viously—that it rendered a verdict imposing the following sanctions:

‘(1) He who is declared guilty by the Jury of Eleven of the People’s Court elected at a called meeting by the Committee of the United Campaign for Collecting Money for Israel’s Army, shall be excluded from all social institutions of which he is a member.
‘(2) All institutions of which he is not a member shall be ordered not to admit him to membership.
‘(3) It shall be demanded of all his friends to break relations with him.
‘(4) All local institutions and campaigns shall be ordered not to accept from him any contribution whatsoever and not allow him to contribute to any enterprise.
‘(5) He shall not be permitted any voice or opinion in any Jewish institution.
‘(6) The names of those declared guilty shall be sent to the Government of Israel in order that they be inscribed in the list kept for that purpose.
‘(7) No Jewish publication shall be allowed to publish any defense of the person or persons judged guilty and condemned by the Jury of Eleven of the People’s Court at the aforementioned meeting.”

Commenting on this “money raising” technique for Israel, the American Council for Judaism states:

“An incredibly shocking story of coercion; of the evocation of a lynch mob spirit and of intimidation by brute force.

“All this is done in the name of sweet charity; and in the name of Israel’s army. All of it is justified by the rational­ization of ‘loyalty’ to Jewish nationalist need.

“It is, of course, possible to appraise this episode as a natural, inevitable expression of the chauvinistic Jewish nationalist spirit that has been aroused. For the episode, while shocking, is not unique; it does not stand by itself. The same mood is manifest in other matters: vide the attitude toward the Arab refugees; the doubt reported in the J. T. A. as to whether the Arabs remaining in Israel will be permitted to vote; the brutalization of youth; the excesses of numerous forces in
Israel which, when public opinion must be mollified, are inevitably described as “irresponsible.”

“The same spirit is not limited to the internal development of Israel itself; it reaches out to Jewish communities in other lands; it moves across the Atlantic—to Mexico, and, for all we know, is germinating, ready to appear full bloom right here in the United States.”

The fabulous wealth of the Dead Sea is a matter of public record, but the facts have been carefully hidden from the general public by devious censorship means. An official report of the British Crown Agents for the Colonies prepared for the Government of Palestine entitled “Production of Minerals from the Waters of the Dead Sea” places the value of potash alone at five thousand billion dollars! The report states that the Dead Sea, in addition to potash, contains forty-two billion metric tons of potassium chloride, magnesium bromide, magnesian chloride, calcium and sodium chloride. This natural resource, which rightfully belongs to the Arabs, is now being exploited by the descendants of the rapacious Khazars through the operations of Palestine Potash, Ltd., a corporate “front” for the secret Zionist “high command.” Red China is a recent customer of Palestine Potash, Ltd.

The Zionist insistence on Palestine, in light of this revelation, becomes more understandable. With the wealth of the Dead Sea at its disposal, Israel, through its net-work of Jewish bankers and its control of the apparatus of the United Nations, may easily dominate the world.

At a special European Conference of the World Jewish Congress held in London, in August, 1945, the delegates resolved that the Congress “fully endorses the demand that the Palestine White Paper of 1939 should be immediately abrogated and that the gates of Palestine should be opened to unrestricted immigration and urges that the United Nations should without delay give their approval for the establishment of a Jewish democratic State in Palestine.”

Ernest Bevin, British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, on November 13, 1945, declared that “Jewry as a whole” must be distinguished from the Zionist Jews who were demanding the ancient home of the Arabs. The World Jewish Congress replied immediately: “The World Jewish Congress,” it announced, “speaking for Jewish communities and organizations in more than 32 countries, and expressing what is without question the attitude of the great majority of the Jews of the world, completely repudiates the existence of any such distinction. The World Jewish Congress and Jews everywhere will continue to give the Jewish Agency for Palestine . . . their fullest support in its battle for the rights of the Jewish people with regard to Palestine. We declare and feel it our duty to affirm that any such attempt to shatter the unity
of the Jewish people in this hour is not only indefensible but it will utterly fail.”

* * * * *

The American Jewish Committee worked with the World Jewish Congress in creating and molding the United Nations in the Jewish image. The international organization was in truth and fact of the Jews, by the Jews, and for the Jews. “As a member of the Consultative Council of Jewish Organisations,” reports the American Jewish Committee, “an officially credited consultant to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, it (the AJC) has been able, together with its colleagues in England and France, to influence Jewish activities in behalf of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Through direct cooperation with the United States Mission to the United Nations and with the United States National Commission for UNESCO we have been able to coordinate our efforts and activities with those of the United Nations designed to guarantee safety to all population groups.” Like the World Jewish Congress the American Jewish Committee means “Jewish” whenever it talks about “human rights.

The American Jewish Committee is no more “American” than the World Jewish Congress. Its activities are international in scope. It maintains offices and agents in Paris, London, Buenos Aires and Israel. It publishes a French periodical, “Evidences,” which circulates in Western Europe and North Africa. It stood behind the “Marshall Plan” and the “Point Four Program.” It is the master-mind behind the American Association for the United Nations, and the United Nations agencies. It continually propagandizes for and assists in “educational programs” on the “meaning of the United Nations.” It opposed an American loan to “Franco Spain.” It continually exerts unrelenting pressure on Congress, demanding the admission of more and more Jews into the United States. It carries on an extensive and expensive program for the destruction of “fascist” sentiments of nationalism and patriotism. There is nothing American about the American Jewish Committee.

In 1944 there were 1,061,277 Mohammedans in Palestine. The Christian population numbered 135,547. By steady “colonization” the Jewish population had increased to 528,702.

In 1946 the Palestinian Jews embarked on a sustained campaign of terrorism against the British administration. Assassinations, bombings and other criminal acts were carried on systematically. Arab spokesmen continued to protest against Jewish immigration. King Ibn Sa'ud of Saudi Arabia and King Farouk of Egypt, issued a joint statement January 10, 1946, declaring again that “Palestine is an Arab country.” Both monarchs pledged every effort of the Arab Kings, presidents and peoples in supporting the Palestinian Arabs.
Upon the announcement of the appointment of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine, the British Section of the World Jewish Congress presented a statement on January 25 to the Committee at its London session. Sydney S. Silverman, M. P., Dr. Noah Barou, and A. L. Easterman allegedly representing World Jewry, gave “oral” testimony before the Committee.

The Committee, in its report, published in Lausanne on March 29th, unanimously recommended that 100,000 immigration certificates should be issued to European Jews and used “as far as possible in 1946.” The report recommended the continuance of the British mandate, pending the execution of a trusteeship agreement under the United Nations, on the ground that “Any attempt to establish either an independent Palestine state or independent Palestine states would result in civil strife such as might threaten the peace of the world.”

Clement Attlee declared on May 1st that the implementation of the report by Britain would depend first on “the extent to which the U. S. government would be prepared to share the resulting military and financial responsibilities.” The Arab countries unanimously rejected the recommendations of the report.

The Palestine Jews, encouraged by Jewish support from abroad stepped up its treacherous terrorist activities. Attacks on air fields and radar stations, armories and military posts became daily occurrences. Railway lines and stations were wrecked; roads were mined and ships were blown up in Haifa harbor. Banks were held up. On July 22nd the Irgun Zvai Leumi terrorists blew up part of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem containing the British military headquarters and the civil secretariat. Ninety-one persons were killed and forty-five injured.

The steady illegal immigration of Jews continued, reaching flood proportions by July. On August 12, British patience having been exhausted, the government announced that it would no longer “tolerate this attempt to force its hand in framing a new policy for Palestine.” Thereafter the Jews attempting to enter the country illegally were sent to camps in Cyprus.

On July 1st Herbert Morrison proposed that the 100,000 certificates be issued, provided that Palestine be divided into an Arab province, a Jewish province, a district of Jerusalem and a district of the Negeb, the over-all sovereignty to remain in the hands of the high commissioner, who would be responsible for defense, foreign relations, customs and excise. The Jewish Agency and the Arab Committee rejected the proposal, and boycotted the Palestine conference which opened in London on September 9th.

Meanwhile American Jewry had been busy in Washington. On October 4th, Harry S. Truman cabled Attlee rejecting the Morrison plan, and urged the immediate issue of the 100,000 certificates on the basis of the Jewish Agency’s counter-proposal to create “a
visible Jewish state in control of its own immigration and economic policies in an adequate area of Palestine instead of the whole of Palestine.”

In June eight leading members of the Jewish Agency for Palestine were arrested by the British and detained in the Latrun camp. The World Jewish Congress immediately passed a resolution condemning the arrests as an act of aggression against the entire Jewish people and a crime against international law!

The strategy of the Jews was obvious. By continuous violence and terrorist activities against the British in Palestine, supplemented by Jewish agitation throughout the world, it was believed that Britain must ultimately succumb to Jewish pressures within the government and refer the entire problem to the United Nations. This is exactly what happened.

On April 28, 1947, the General Assembly met at Flushing Meadows in a special call on the Palestine question. On May 15th a United Nations Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) was appointed, and ordered to report back to the General Assembly September 1st and make its recommendations for submission to the next Assembly.

On May 1st the World Jewish Congress addressed a telegram to Oswaldo Aranha, President of the General Assembly, demanding that the Jewish Agency for Palestine be permitted to participate in the proceedings of the Special Session of the U. N. General Assembly dealing with Palestine.

The Holy Land became an armed camp. The Stern Gang and Irgun Zvai Leumi terrorists intensified their attacks on British troops and police. Lord Moyne, the English Executive, was assassinated. The secret Jewish army, Haganah, in spite of British action in turning back Jews illegally entering the country, vigorously organized Jewish immigration from Europe to Palestine. During 1947 a total of 24,000 Jews were interned in Cyprus. There were 141 British, 56 Jews, 44 Arabs and 10 unclassified casualties in 1947. The Jewish terrorists hung two British sergeants in July. “Booby traps” were attached to hanging bodies so that the British who cut down their comrades-in-arms would be killed or maimed in the act. American Jews applauded these atrocities. A full page advertisement, addressed to the “Terrorists of Palestine,” appeared in the New York Herald-Tribune May 15, 1947, appealing to “Americans” for funds so that the Jewish assassins might continue their terror. “The Jews of America are for you” the advertisement declared. “Every time you blow up a British arsenal, or wreck a British jail, or send a British railroad train sky high, or rob a British bank, or let go with your guns and bombs at the British betrayers and invaders of your homeland, the Jews of America make a little holiday in their hearts.” It was signed by Ben Hecht as “Co-Chairman, American League for a Free Palestine.”
The World Jewish Congress submitted a “memorandum” to UNSCOP on August 6, 1947, demanding a Jewish State in Palestine. Affiliates of the Congress in Germany, Austria, Italy, Belgium—purporting to represent the refugee element—as well as Jewish organizations all over the world, bombarded the Special Committee with demands to dispossess the Arabs and give them their country.

The UNSCOP report of September 1st recommended that the British mandate should terminate and that the independence of Palestine should be achieved at the earliest possible date. A majority plan proposed that Palestine should be divided into an Arab and a Jewish state, with Jerusalem an international city, all combined under a scheme of economic unity. The minority plan advocated an independent federal state for the whole country.

The General Assembly, meeting at Flushing Meadows, New York, set up an ad hoc committee to discuss the problem. When a vote was taken in the General Assembly on November 29th the motion to establish separate Jewish and Arab states and an international city of Jerusalem was approved by 33 votes to 13 with 10 abstentions and one absentee.

The Jews were jubilant and the Arabs were bitter. Rioting flared anew in Palestine, particularly in Aden, where 75 Jews and 36 Arabs were killed. Never before in history had a group of foreigners voted to take a country away from its legal inhabitants and give it to an aggressive invader.

In February, 1948, the American Jewish Congress mobilized American Jewry to propagandize the American people in support of the immoral act of the United Nations. In the course of this campaign, 160,000 signatures were secured addressed to Norman R. Armour, Assistant Secretary of State for Political Affairs, demanding an international police for Palestine and protesting the United States arms embargo to the Palestine Jews.

The United Nations, in partitioning Palestine, acted beyond any legal authority contained in its Charter. Partition of a land is an act of sovereignty—in this case, world sovereignty! International justice was violated by the world organization created to uphold international justice!

It is easier to imagine what went on behind the scenes of the United Nations than it is to explain it. The world’s masters of “back-stair” diplomacy brought all of their talents into play. James Forrestal, United States Secretary of Defense, said, “the methods that had been used to bring coercion and duress on other nations in the General Assembly bordered closely onto scandal.” Belgium’s Foreign Minister Van Langenhove, commenting on the action of the United Nations stated: “We are not certain that it is
completely just; we doubt whether it is practical; and we are afraid that it involves great risks . . . ”

The Christian Church in Jerusalem was shocked and bitterly disappointed with the unjust action of the United Nations. Christian leaders of all denominations met together on March 3, 1948, and, in a written document, condemned the partition scheme. They said, in part: “The Christian Union wishes to declare, in unequivocal terms, that they denounce the Partition Plan, being of the conviction that this plan involves a violation of the sacredness of the Holy Land, which, by its nature and history, is indivisible and represents an encroachment on the natural rights of the Arabs, the people of the country. The Christian Union wishes further to declare that any attempt to enforce the erroneous policy by force will inevitably be doomed to failure, for ‘right’ is a stronger weapon than ‘might’.

It must be remembered that the Arabs had warned the United Nations that partitioning Palestine into two states would bring perpetual war to the area. The Arabs had demanded a democratic independent Palestine with equal rights for all its inhabitants.

The Jews were horrified to learn that their new “State”, as designated by the United Nations, contained approximately an equal number of Arab inhabitants. How would it be possible to have a “democratic” Jewish State if half of the state was Arab? The terrorists went to work. They blew up the Semiramis Hotel in Jerusalem January 5, 1948, burying twenty-two Arabs beneath the rubble. Large quantities of dynamite were exploded in the public square of the city of Jaffa, killing thirty Arabs and injuring ninety-eight others. The main Jewish attack was against the numerous isolated villages. At Dair Yasin the Jews massacred the entire population of 250 men, women and children. It was ruthless, cold-blooded murder. The assassins boasted of the exploit as a masterpiece of military tactics. “All the Jewish forces,” they wrote, “proceeded to advance through Haifa like a knife through butter. The Arabs began fleeing in panic shouting Dair Yasin.”

The Jews are talking about an unarmed defenseless people—men, women and children—not about an army. Menahim Begin, leader of the “Irgun” terrorists, who wrote the above quotation, became a member of the Israeli Parliament!

Arnold Toynbee, referring to these Jewish atrocities, declared:

“In A. D. 1948, the Jews knew from personal experience what they were doing; and it was their supreme tragedy that the lesson learned by them from their encounter with Nazi Gentiles should have been not to eschew but to imitate some of the evil deeds that the Nazis committed against the Jews.”

As the date for the termination of the British Mandate grew
nearer the Jews intensified their attacks and began occupying the towns of Palestine, driving the Arabs and Christians from their homes. Tiberias and Samakh were attacked and occupied on April 19, 1948; Haifa on April 22nd; Jaffa on April 29th; the Arab Quarter of Katamon in Jerusalem on April 30th; Safed on May 10th; Beisan on May 11th; and Acre on May 14th.

It again should be emphasized that these “military” operations of the Jewish armies were against a peaceful, unarmed, defenseless people. And all of these “conquests” and “occupations” took place before the British withdrawal on May 15th, 1948—at a time when there was not a single soldier from any Arab State on the soil of Palestine! The British not only failed to protect the Arab inhabitants, but actually took part in evacuating the Moslem and Christian populations from Tiberias and Samakh, and supplied means of transport for those fleeing from Jaffa and Haifa.

The Jews, not content with the territory allotted them by the United Nations, attacked the Arab populations in other districts. The entire territory of Galilee was occupied, as was Lydda, Ramleh, Majdal and Beersheba. As a result of this “expansionist” maneuver, the Jews grabbed most of the fertile land out of which the Arabs were to have carved their “state” under the partition plan of the United Nations. On May 15, 1948, the date of the creation of the State of Israel, the Jews owned less than six percent of the land of Palestine. Today they control over eighty percent.

The Arab armies entered Palestine after May 15, 1948 at the urgent request of the Arab inhabitants. They came to protect the Arabs and Christians from the Jewish expulsions and atrocities. Says Toynbee:

"The evil deeds committed by the Zionist Jews against the Palestinian Arabs that were comparable to crimes committed against the Jews by the Nazis, were the massacre of men, women and children at Dair Yasin on the 9th of April, 1948, which precipitated a flight of the Arab population in large number from districts within range of the Jewish armed forces and the subsequent deliberate expulsion of the Arab population from districts conquered by the Jewish forces . . . The Arab blood on the 9th of April, 1948, at Dair Yasin was on the head of Irgun; the expulsions after the 15th of May, 1948, were on the heads of all Israel."

Mrs. Emmons McCormick Blaine, the daughter of Cyrus Hall McCormick, inventor of the reaper, donated a million dollars to finance a Foundation for World Government. Dr. Stringfellow Barr, a Rhodes Scholar with a decided leftist orientation, became president of the Foundation. In addition to some activity in behalf of the Communist Sam Darcy and the communist front, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, Dr. Barr found time to

Left-wing organizations immediately went on record for World Government. The Congress for Industrial Organization (C.I.O.), the Liberal Party, the Socialist Party, the Communist Party, the Student League for Industrial Democracy, the Social Democratic Federation, Americans for Democratic Action—all advocated a new world power. Joseph P. Kamp, in his most important book “We Must Abolish the United States” lists 178 leaders in the World Government Crusade, along with 1696 Communist fronts with which they are, or have been, affiliated. Mr. Kamp also traces the interlocking links and ties between the many organizations seeking the destruction of United States sovereignty. As a typical example he points out that fifteen of the officers, executive committee men, and sponsors of the World Citizenship Movement, Inc., also hold, or held, positions of leadership in Federal Union, Atlantic Union Committee, World Republic, Americans United for World Organizations, World Federalists, World Government News, People's Convention for a Federal World Constitution, Students for Federal World Government, Action for World Federation, American Association for the United Nations, United World Federalists, World Federalists, World Citizens Association, Foundation for World Government, Student Federalist's Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists (for World Government), Committee to Frame a World Constitution, and the World Movement for World Federal Government.

The British Mandate over Palestine terminated May 15, 1948. The new Jewish state of Israel was proclaimed by the Jewish National Council in Palestine.

The Arabs nations and the Arab inhabitants of Palestine, as might well have been expected, rejected the United Nations' theft of their country and refused to recognize the Jewish state. In order to work out the anticipated difficulties between the Jews and the Arabs, the five great powers of the Security Council of the United Nations named Count Folke Bernadotte to act as mediator.

To do justice to the Arabs, of course, is a sin against the “Chosen People.” Count Bernadotte possessed courage and a high sense of fairness, and believed in doing justice. His recommendations to the United Nations is a memorial to both his honesty and his high courage. Among other things, he proposed that “Jerusalem be placed under United Nations' control,” and “that the political, economic, social and religious rights of Arab and Jewish minorities be fully guaranteed and respected.” He called upon the United Nations to affirm the right of the Arab refugees to return to their
homes in Jewish controlled territory at the earliest possible date, and that “their resettlement, and the compensation of those not choosing to return, should be supervised and assisted by the Conciliation Commission.”

The Count’s recommendations were submitted to the United Nations September 16, 1948, and the Jews murdered him and his aide, Colonel Serot, on September 17, 1948. His proposals for peace were not acted upon by the United Nations. Instead, on December 11th a commission of three was appointed in Bernadotte’s place. It was decided that the frontiers of the state of Israel would remain undefined until peace was achieved.

“Mivrach,” the publication of the terrorist organization known as the “Stern Gang,” announced shortly before the murder of Count Bernadotte: “We know how to take care of Bernadotte, and blessed be the hand that does it.”

The civilized world was shocked at the brutal and defiant crime. The Provisional Israeli Government, forced to making some showing of conscience, arrested 226 members of the Stern Gang. They were placed in a camp from which they were permitted to escape. Nathan Friedman-Yellin, Commander-in-Chief of the Gang, and his chief aide, Matyahn Shmulevitz, Polish Jews, were finally brought to trial and found guilty of terrorist activities. Yellin was sentenced to eight years imprisonment, and Shmulevitz to five years. Twelve days later, they were both released following a “proclamation” of general amnesty. Yellin was then elected to the Knesset, Israel’s Parliament.

The Jews, supported by money and arms from world Jewry, turned on the ill-prepared Palestinian Arabs with fanatical fury. In the Israeli successes that followed the Jews pressed into territories not assigned to them by the United Nations. Among these territories were the Arab cities of Jaffa, Lydda, Ramie, western Galilee and modern parts of the city of Jerusalem and a corridor connecting Jerusalem with the coastal plain. Israel placed the territories under its administration. Most of the Arabs living in the Israel controlled territories fled from their homes, groves and fields. Their numbers nearly reached a million.

At a time when the Arab refugees numbered only a little over three hundred thousand, Sir Raphael Gilento, United Nations relief official, declared:

“I don’t regard this an incident of war. I look upon it as a disaster comparable to an earthquake, flood or tidal wave. Three hundred thousand persons, more helpless than anywhere else in the world except China, are thrown on the mercy of the world.”

These helpless victims of Jewish aggression are still on “the mercy of the world”—over nine hundred thousand of them!
Driven from their homes, their olive groves, their orange groves, their farms—they subsist in the desert, supported by the United Nations at a cost of seven cents a day per person! And when it is said they are supported by the United Nations, that means by the taxpayers of the United States!

Father Ralph Gorman, writing in “The Sign” (National Catholic Magazine) for April, 1957, under the significant title “Tears That Cry To Heaven,” tells of the terrible plight of the Arab refugees:

“Readers often ask why I am so interested in the Near East and especially the Holy Land. If I may be excused for the injection of the personal on this page, I would like to answer that question.

“For three years I did postgraduate studies at the famous Ecole Biblique in Jerusalem under Pere Lagrange and other great masters of Sacred Scripture as well as of the archeology, geography, and history of Palestine. We students studied every nook and corner of the city of Jerusalem. Afoot, on horseback, and by car, we traveled back and forth over every mile of the Holy Land.

“That was from 1925 to 1928. Palestine was an Arab country. You could travel from Gaza or Beersheba in the south to the borders of Syria on the north, or from Jaffa or Haifa on the Mediterranean you could journey eastward beyond the Sea of Galilee or to the Mountains of Moab and scarcely meet a Jew. There were a few. Tel Aviv was hardly more than a village. Some Jews had congregated in sections of cities like Jerusalem, Haifa, and Jaffa. A few agricultural colonies of Zionists were scattered here and there on the fertile plains.

“But the people of the country were Arabs, the people who owned and cultivated the land were Arabs, the people of the towns and cities were Arabs. It was an Arab country, unquestionably and unreservedly.

“Editorial business for the magazine brought me back to the Holy Land in the Spring of 1953. The southern, western, and northern parts of the country had been taken over by strangers from Eastern Europe whose only claim to the territory was that their ancestors had lived there 2000 years before. The plains along the Mediterranean and from Haifa to the Sea of Galilee, the only really fertile areas, covered formerly by Arab farms and gardens and vineyards and orange groves, were all occupied by these strangers. In the cities, the homes, the shops, the public services, everything had been taken over by the invaders.

“Where were the Arabs who had been born here, whose ancestors had come into this land over a thousand years before, who had lived and worked and worshipped all their lives in this once peaceful part of the Holy Land?

“They were gone. They were now huddled in forlorn refugee camps in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and Gaza. I visited the refugees. Not all, to be sure, because there are nearly a million of them. Whole families—men, women, and children—were huddled together in the single room of a miserable hut or in tents. Many of them had been fairly well off. Now they were without property, without money, without work, living a day-to-day existence on a miserable dole from the U. N.
“For nearly ten years now they have suffered this inhuman fate. The spirit seems gone out of them except when you mention their homes, or lands, or vineyards, or shops, and they look over the hills to where they once lived, and their eyes burn with hatred and a thirst for revenge.

“The Near East is important to the survival of the West because of its oil and its strategic position. But it is important to the West too because here an awful wrong has been done—almost comparable to Hitler’s treatment of the Jews—and it has been with our connivance and co-operation. If the blood of Abel cried to God from the earth, no less do the tears of these hopeless people. They know that our leaders helped to sell them into this misery, partly from ignorance but also for Jewish votes and for Jewish dollars in the coffers of the party treasury.

“Statesmen can talk as much as they like about the Gaza Strip and Aqaba, about the Aswan Dam and the Suez Canal and oil and strategy. It will all be to no avail unless we do something really effective to right this awful wrong, to make reparation for this crime that is almost genocide. This must be a first step toward real peace in the Near East.

“If we fail, if we haven’t the moral courage to expiate the sin we share with the Zionist invaders, we may share their punishment too. We could lose the Near East to the Russians and make war, possibly a losing war, almost inevitable. The anti-Semitism that would result would be a disaster not only for Israel but for Jews all over the world.

“The blood of Abel didn’t cry to God in vain nor; will the tears of the Arab refugees.”

It must not be believed that all Jews share the Nazi-like characters of the Israelis—and no doubt there are Jews in Israel who are completely disillusioned by the reality as they look back on the dream. The American Council for Judaism is a group of American Jews who are not ashamed of being American, and who adhere to the finest principles, ideals and morality of their religion. Rabbi Elmer Berger is a member of this organization. His voice, like the voice of so many others, is silenced by the over-powering influence of the Zionist Jewish organizations. He visited Israel and the Holy Land in 1955. His impressions, in a series of letters, have been published under the title “Who Knows Better Must Say So.” His frank and honest statement concerning the Arab refugees is of great importance. “But the condition of the refugees,” he writes, “is not the whole tragedy. No less appalling and depressing is the frame of mind of those charged with ‘solving’ or ‘alleviating’ this problem. It is difficult to suppress the overpowering surge of moral outrage one feels as he looks at the refugees, hears the story of impartial people like those of UNRWA (let alone the refugee spokesmen themselves) and sees in his mind Mr. Eban’s glib advice that the Arab states have a lot of land and let them absorb these people. It is another thing to look at a fraction of ‘these people’ and see them—and their children—
as living human beings offered Mr. Eban's glib solution. And I could not stand in these places—remember that I am a Jew—and not cringe with shame and disgrace and—I do not hesitate to say it—a hatred of 'Jewish' racism that created a state which now says these people cannot live in it because they are not Jews."

David Ben-Gurion became prime minister. Moshe Shertok was made minister of foreign affairs and Chaim Weizmann became president.

Moshe Sneh, Haganah leader and Israeli delegate to the World Jewish Congress in Switzerland, declared in July, 1948, that the Soviet Union was the “real friend” of Israel. Who was it, of the three great world powers, he cried “which set itself with steel-like firmness in favor of Jewish independence in Israel? Is there one Jew who in his heart will not confess that it is the Soviet Union?” In 1950 this same Jewish leader called for “closer relations with the Soviet Union and the popular democracies” in order to “free ourselves from economic, political and military dependence on the United States.”

E. Shomornik, Secretary of the Young Communist League of Israel, writing to the Secretary of the Communist World Federation of Youth (Paris), June 20, 1948, reported: “The whole of Palestine Young Communist League is mobilized, and our comrades are in all parts of Palestine in the forefront of the battle . . .”

Said A. Raisky, French Jewish delegate to the 1948 World Jewish Congress: “I take the right to turn from this platform to the American delegation and through it to American Jewry: Beware of the consequences of war hysteria and of anti-communist incitation. If you participate in this kind of policy, you undermine the existence of the Jewish state . . .”

James Forrestal’s Diaries tell the shameful story of the United States’ participation in selling the Palestinian Arabs down the river in return for Jewish campaign contributions and votes. As Secretary of Defense, Forrestal learned that both major political parties were attempting to out-bid the other for Jewish favor. He discussed the problem with Senator J. Howard McGrath of Rhode Island, at that time Chairman of the Democratic National Committee. He writes that McGrath admitted that the situation was serious. Forrestal learned that “Jewish sources were responsible for a substantial part of the contributions to the Democratic National Committee, and many of these contributions were made with a distinct understanding on the part of the givers that they will have an opportunity to express their views and have them seriously considered on such questions as the Palestine question.” Forrestal comments: “I hoped Senator McGrath would give a lot of thought to this matter because it involved not only the Arabs of
the Middle East, but also might involve the whole Moslem world with its 400,000,000 of people—Egypt, North Africa, India, Afghanistan.”

Forrestal goes on to say (page 347) that Jimmy Byrnes told him that “Niles (David K. Niles), administrative assistant to the President (Truman), and Sam Rosenman were chiefly responsible for the President’s decision (to accept Jewry’s program); that both had told the President that Dewey was about to come out with a statement favoring the Zionist position on Palestine, and that they had insisted that unless the President anticipated this movement, New York State would be lost to the Democrats.”

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. discussed the matter with Forrestal “I had no power to make policy,” Forrestal writes (page 363), “but I would be derelict in my duty if I did not point out what I thought would be the consequences of any particular policy which would endanger the security of this country. I said that I was merely directing my efforts to lifting the question out of politics, that is, to have the two parties agree that they would not compete for votes on this issue. He (Roosevelt) said this was impossible, that the nation was too far committed and, furthermore, the Democratic party would be bound to lose and the Republicans to gain by such an agreement. I said I was forced to repeat to him what I had said to Senator McGrath in response to the latter’s observation that our failure to go along with the Zionists might lose the states of New York, Pennsylvania, and California—that I thought it was about time that somebody should pay some consideration to whether we might not lose the United States.”

The Secretary of Defense was no more successful with Byrnes than he had been with McGrath or Roosevelt. Byrnes reminded Forrestal that Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver was a close associate of Senator Taft and that Taft went along with the Rabbi on the Palestine-Haifa question. Forrestal writes (page 347): “I said I thought it was a most disastrous and regrettable fact that a foreign policy of this country was determined by the contributions a particular bloc of special interests might make to the party funds.”

In his discussion with Senator Vandenberg, Republican leader, he learned (page 347) that the Republicans felt that they were entitled to use the Palestine question politically, as the Democrats had been doing.

So it was that the United States joined hands with the Soviet Union in pressuring partition of the Holy Land in the United Nations. The venal politicians of the United States wanted public office. The sinister men in Russia’s Communist Politburo wanted to lay the foundation for unrest in the Middle East and sow the seeds for World War III.

Secretary Forrestal received the usual reward for his patriotism
and courage. He was smeared, villified and run out of office and to his death.

The Conference of the Allied Ministers of Education, formed in London during the war, was the nucleus of a United Nations' agency that ultimately became known as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). World Jewry had a special interest in this international brain-washing devise. It was to be used to make the victims of Jewish world aggression love their masters. In August, 1945, the European Conference of the World Jewish Congress adopted a resolution demanding that the Jews be represented on the various organs of the proposed propaganda agency. Subsequently a Jewish memorandum was submitted to the delegation of forty-two nations participating in the Assembly, proposing a series of amendments to the draft constitution so that the agency would more perfectly meet Jewish requirements. Dr. A. Steinberg attended the meetings of the Assembly as an “observer” for the Jews, and attended the sessions of its various committees. As a consequence, the final text of the constitution of UNESCO met most of the Jewish demands.

When the first General Assembly of UNESCO met in Paris in December, 1946, Mrs. A. Klausner, representing the World Jewish Congress, submitted the Jewish report. The continuous Jewish pressures brought to bear on the members of the agency convinced them of “the necessity for full support for the Jewish requests in the sphere of general and Jewish educational and cultural reconstruction.”

The UNESCO Secretariat was induced to “invite” Dr. Steinberg to participate in the first conference of TICER (Temporary International Council for Educational Reconstruction, held in February, 1947. At the session of TICER, held in Paris in March, 1948, Dr. N. Barou’s resolution to brain-wash the children of the world on behalf of the Jews, through UNESCO’S educational program, was adopted. Although Barou used the usual phrases—“to promote respect for human rights”—there is no doubt as to what group of “humans” he was referring.

UNESCO was of such great importance to the Jews that the World Jewish Congress worked incessantly for representation on its TICER Interim Committee of Experts. Dr. Steinberg, who apparently qualified as an “expert” by virtue of being a Jew, was elected a member of this Interim Committee. Dr. Barou became a member of the Committee of National Councils of TICER.

The World Jewish Congress and the other Jewish organizations saw to it that their people sat in important positions within UNESCO. Two members of the Executive Board were Jews—
Alf Somerfelt and Paul Carneiro. Somerfelt was also chairman of the Committee for External Relations. Among other Jews in key spots are the following: J. Eisenhardt, Director, Division of Temporary International Council for Education Reconstruction; Luffman, chief of the Division of Education for International Understanding; Dr. O. Klineberg, chief of Division of Tensions; H. Kaplan, chief of Bureau of Public Information UNESCO; C H. Weitz, chief of Bureau of Administrative Management and Budget; S. Samuel Selsky, chief of the Bureau of Personnel UNESCO; B. Abramski, chief of the Division of Housing and Travel; B. Wermiel, chief of the Division of Recruitment and Placement; and Dr. A. Welsky, director, South Asia, Field Science Cooperation Offices.

The International Refugee Organization (IRO) was liberally staffed with Jews. Mayer Cohen became the Director General of the Department of Health, Care and Maintenance Division; Pierre Jacobsen, Director General, Department of Repatriation and Resettlement, and R. J. Youdin, Director of the Repatriation Division.

The Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) was not overlooked. Andre Mayer was made First Vice-Chairman. Other Jews in this United Nations arm were: A. P. Jacobsen, “Danish” representative; E. De Vries, “Netherlands” representative; M. M. Libman, Economist, Fertilizer Section; Gerda Kardos, Chief, Fibres Section; B. Kardos, Economist, Miscellaneous Commodities Section; M. Ezekiel, Chief, Economic Analysis Branch; J. P. Kagan, Technical Officer, Logging and Equipment Section; M. A. Hubermann, Technical Officer, Law, Policy and Organisation Section of Forestry and Forest Products Division; J. Mayer, Nutrition Officer, Nutrition Division; and F. Weisel, Director, Administrative Division.

Scattered in important posts were other Jews. Colonel A. G. Katzin was UNO Representative, and George Movshon, UNO Information Officer in Korea; Ernest A. Gross became U. S. Deputy Representative; and Isador Lubin was made a member of the Economic and Employment Commission. The Permanent Delegates from Poland and Yugoslavia were the Jews Julius Katz-Sochy and Dr. Alex Bebler, respectively.

Other Jews who are, or were, in important official United Nations positions, follow:

In the International Monetary Fund (IMF): Josef Goldmann (member, Board of Governors, and a representative of Czechoslovakia); P. Mendes-France (member, Board of Governors, and a representative of France); Camille Gutt (Chairman of the Executive Directors and managing Director of the Fund); Louis Rasminsky (Executive Director for Canada); W. Kaster (Alternate Director for the Netherlands); Louis Altaian (Assistant to Man-
The American Jewish Committee long ago embarked on a campaign of neutralizing Christianity. This Committee believes "that early attitudes of hostility... are often firmly implanted... through perpetuation of historical inaccuracies about Jesus in Christian teaching." The Jews, therefore, are determined to revise Christian teachings that are offensive to the Jews. In order to accomplish this amazing goal, representatives of the Committee, through the Drew Theological Seminary, conducted an exhaustive study of religious textbooks currently used in Protestant schools. Jewish objections to statements in these texts reflecting on Jews or Judaism "have been and will continue to be tabulated and brought to the attention of Protestant educators and textbook publishers." The American Jewish Committee reports "significant progress in the elimination" of material to which the Jews object.

On a more limited scale, the A. J. C. is working for the revision of Catholic Sunday and Parochial school material. A staff of the A. J. C. acted in "a consultative capacity" in the preparation of a Syllabus on Intercultural Education, experimentally developed in the Parochial classes of Greater New York by Catholic school authorities. The Committee "maintains close cooperation" with the Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference in Washington, D. C. The A. J. C. boasts that it has been successful in placing its own "educational material" in more than 150 Catholic high schools throughout the country, and has successfully launched "a teachers unit on the history of the Jews in America" in connection with teacher training in the Catholic University of America.

Jewish infiltration of Christian theological seminaries and teacher training institutes has been progressing steadily for several years. The American Jewish Committee reports that it has "introduced competent instruction" into the curricula of those institutions covering Jewish theology, ethics, history, and contemporary Jewish affairs. Through the clever device of "graduate fellowships," the Committee has been indoctrinating theological students in Jewish theological seminaries. In addition to these vigorous activities, the Jews continually prepare propaganda material for Christian religious publications.

The recently created Division of Christian Education of the...
National Council of Churches gave the American Jewish Committee
and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith "an unprecedented
opportunity" to inject propaganda into lesson materials, study
guides, audio-visual aides, etc., for use in educational activities
sponsored by Protestant Churches.

The A. J. C. completed its analysis of films depicting the Crucif-
xion Story in 1950 "and the results were made available to com-
mmunity councils through the National Community Relations Ad-
visory Council." Pressure has since been continuously exerted to
cerce "leading educators and film producers to modify those films
believed to affect adversely Jewish-Christian relationships." Re-
ports the A. J. C.: "Since over 300,000 Protestant Churches now
use film and film strips as part of their educational program, this
provides an important area in which corrective action is indicated."

The Jewish program to eradicate Christianity in the United
States is now extended to the international educational activities
of UNESCO. It is believed that another generation will find Chris-
tianity thoroughly Judaized and no longer a vital force in the
world. The few "fanatical" Christian sects will be dealt with by
Jewish psychiatrists. These remnants will be diagnosed as "men-
tally ill" and shipped to some far-off United Nations Institute for
the hopelessly insane.

* * * * * *

The Jewish organizations were particularly interested in the
United Nations' International Bank for Reconstruction and Develop-
ment (also known as the World Bank), and saw to it that Jews
filled important positions on its Board of Governors. Leopold
Chmela of Czechoslovakia, E. Polak of Czechoslovakia, A. M. De
Jong of the Netherlands, P. Mendes-France of France, D. Abram-
ovic of Yugoslavia, and C. M. Bernales, were successful in secur-
ing six of these seats. A Jew, Leonard B. Rist, became Economic
Director, and a Jew, M. M. Mendels, was made secretary.

The United States has subscribed to a greater portion of the
Bank's capital stock than any other member country, its subscrip-
tion totals running over three billion dollars by 1950.

Max Suetens, a Jew, was the Chairman of the International Trade
Organization (ITO); F. C. De Wolfe, of the United States, was
made a member of the Administrative Council of the International
Telecommunications Union (ITU), with Gerry C. Gross, Assistant
Secretary, and H. B. Rantzen, Director; and A. G. Berg was Chief
of the Airworthiness Section of the International Civil Aviation
Organization (ICAO)—all Jews.

At the close of World War II Jewish Communists moved into
positions of power in the war-wasted lands then held by the
Soviets. Minc, Skryeszewski, Modzelewski and Jacob Berman—
all Jews—took over the government of Poland. In Hungary the
Jews Matyas Rakosi, Erno Gero and Zoltan Vas became the Communist Commissars by virtue of Soviet bayonets. Rakosi and Gero had fled Hungary with the Jewish-Communist Dictator Bela Kun when their red government collapsed in 1919.

The ruthless Jewess Anna Pauker became the Communist dictator of Roumania. Rudolph Slansky, the Jewish secretary-general of the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia, became that country's leading Commissar. Nearly all of Soviet Russia's new satellites were headed by Jewish dictators and the bureaucracy of governments teemed with Communist Jews.

In the United States the names of Jewish Communists and fellow-travelers would make headlines in the nation's newspapers—although it would be a rare day when the word "Jew" was printed. Among these Jews would be Philip Jaffe, editor of Amerasia; Andrew Roth; Mark Gayn (Julius Ginsberg); Judith Coplin; Gerhart Eisler (Soviet Agent); Biberman, Trumbo, Lawson, Bessie, Maltz, Cole, of the "Hollywood Ten"; Jacob Stachel, John Gates (Israel Regenstreif), Gilbert Green (Greenberg), Gus Hall (Arvo Mike Halberg), Irving Potash, Carl Winter (Philip Carl Weissberg), members of the American Communist Politburo; Klaus Fuchs; Harry Gold; Abraham Brothman; David Greenglass; Robert Oppenheimer; Israel Weinbaum; Miriam Moscowitz; Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, Morton Sobell, and many others.

In addition to these Jews the investigating committees of the state legislatures would list many, many more. When the second American politburo came to trial the overwhelming Jewishness of Communist leadership was again evident. Of these nineteen leaders of American Communists, Israel Amter, Marian Maxwell, Isidore Begun, Alexander Bittelman, George B. Charney, Betty Gannett, Victor J. Jerome, Jacob Mindel, Alexander Trachtenberg, Louis Weinstock, William Wold Weinstone, Fred Fine, William Norman Marron and Sidney Steinberg, are Jews.

The Jews were the particular victors in World War II. While the Soviet Union shared that victory, the over-all triumph must be considered a Jewish family affair, because the Soviet Union was as much the creation of the Jews as is the State of Israel. Although Communist Russia added nearly a billion Gentiles to her slave battalions, Jews sat in the seats of power over them. Where the United Nations furnished the money and Gentile troops for the occupation of Germany and other conquered Axis territories, the Jews moved in and regained economic control of the country and domination over the vanquished peoples.

History (if the Jews are not successful in rewriting and distorting its facts) will clearly reveal that it was Jewish propaganda that brought the United States into World War II against Germany, just as had been done in 1917. If the United States had not inter-
vend Communist Russia would have been crushed by Germany, and, of course, the Jews would not now be in possession of the ancient land of the Palestinian Arabs.

If the Jews had had their way, defeated Germany would have been starved to death within a few years. Fearing the inventive, mechanical and chemical genius of the scientific Germans, Jewry sought a scheme that would forever eliminate them from the competitive world. The Morgenthau Plan, if it had been carried into full effect, would eventually have reduced Germany to an agricultural existence and doomed her to an eternally inconsequential place among nations. This Jewish plan contemplated an austere program that meant virtual starvation for Germany's new generation. "Vengeance for the Jews" was justified by the widely circulated lie that the Germans had slaughtered six million Jews! This remarkable falsehood gained world-wide credence in spite of the fact that the Jewish population of the world was greater at the end of the war than it had ever been—and the figures are based on Jewish statistics!

The "big lie" technique, attributed to Hitler by the Jews, is a graphic illustration of its effective application. Jewish propagandists, using their particular translation of the passage from "Mein Kampf," wanted the Gentile world to believe that Hitler recommended, or frankly adopted, this psychological ruse for Nationalist Socialist purposes. The Jewish distortion of what Hitler said about the Jews may be properly termed the "big lie" technique in reverse. Hitler, speaking of the cause of the collapse of Germany after World War I, writes as follows ("Mein Kampf," Reynal & Hitchcock, New York, 1941; pages 312-313):

"But it took the entire bottomless lying of Jewry and its Marxist fighting organization to burden with the guilt of the collapse just that man, the only one who tried, with superhuman will power and energy, to prevent the catastrophe he saw approaching and to spare the nation the time of the deepest degradation and dishonor. By stamping Ludendorff as the culprit of the loss of the World War, one took away from the hand of the only dangerous accuser, who was able to stand up against the traitors to the fatherland, the weapon of moral right. Therewith one started out with the very correct assumption that in the size of the lie there is always contained a certain factor of credibility, since the great masses of a people may be more corrupt in the bottom of their hearts than they will be consciously and intentionally bad, therefore with the primitive simplicity of their minds they will more easily fall victims to a great lie than to a small one, since they themselves perhaps also lie sometimes in little things, but would certainly still be too much ashamed of too great lies. Thus such an untruth will not at all enter their heads, and therefore they will be unable to believe in the possibility of the enormous impudence of the most infamous distortion in others; indeed, they may doubt and hesitate even when being enlightened, and they accept any cause at least as
nevertheless being true; therefore, just for this reason some part of the most impudent lie will remain and stick; a fact which all great lying artists and societies of this world know only too well and therefore also villainously employ.

"Those who know best this truth about the possibilities of the application of untruth and defamation, however, were at all times the Jews; for their entire existence is built on one single great lie, namely, that here one had to deal with a religious brotherhood, while in fact one has to do with a race—what a race! As such they have been nailed down forever, in an eternally correct sentence of fundamental truth, by one of the greatest minds of mankind; He called them 'the great masters of lying.' He who does not realize this or does not want to believe this will never be able to help truth to victory in this world."

Hence, the "big lie" that six million Jews perished as a result of Germany's policy of extermination gains credulity among many people. Because of its very impudent enormity, some of it "will remain and stick" long after most people have learned the truth.

"They answered and said unto Him, Abraham is our father. Jesus saith unto them, If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham. But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God: this did not Abraham . . . Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word. Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it. (St. John, 8:39, 43, 44)

* * * * * * *

Once the "big lie"—"six million Jewish victims of Hitler"—had been accepted, the United Nations forced Germany to pay "rep­arations" to all the Jews who had ever passed over German soil. The money, of course, is paid to Israel, so that the Jews are empowered to exterminate the Arabs.

Israel is the only "country" in the Near East that officially recognizes the Communist Party and seats its successful candidates in high public office. Communism is outlawed in all of the Arab States. The Arab countries, betrayed and offended by the West, are driven to seek assistance where they may find it. The Jewish propaganda mills have ground out "hate Nasser" material on a twenty-four hour basis ever since his rise as a unifying force in the Arab world. In consolidating the peoples of the Arab nations for the defense of Arab interests, Nasser is merely following the approved example of the West in its formation of NATO and similar organizations. Had the Arabs been unified the United Nations might have thought twice before illegally giving Palestine to the Jews. If anything at all serves to unify a people, it is the
consciousness of having suffered a great injustice. There have been many injustices throughout the centuries, but few were so callously devoid of morality as the theft of Palestine from the Arabs—and the Arabs are well aware of it. Moreover, Nasser and other informed Arabs know how and why it happened. Islam is as familiar with Jewish tactics as is Christendom, and it knows that the Jews bribed and cajoled the several powerful governments in the United Nations to exchange principles and morals for Jewish favors and political support. Jewish propaganda, nevertheless, continues to paint Nasser as a threat to world peace. The language of the Jews is easily understood when Jewish interests are substituted for the generalizations which purport to include humanity, Christianity and the world. Nasser, after all, is only a threat to Israel!

The fact of the matter is that Ben-Gurion and the other Khazer masterminds of Jewry intended to enlarge the stolen territories of Israel—and if it takes World War III to do it, it will be done. Meanwhile Jewry uses every device in its ancient bag of tricks to stop Arab unification.

On July 15, 1958 a news item from Jerusalem stated: “Israel appealed today for quick and firm action by the United States to prevent the rest of the Arab world from falling to President Nasser’s United Arab Republic. The Israeli government made no attempt to hide its concern over the seizure of power in Iraq.”

On the same day the New York Journal American, in an article headed “‘Annihilate Israel’ Aim of Nasser Bloc,” stated: “Unless something is done now, the Arabs will gang up to jump on Israel and then we will be in it up to our necks. This summed up the official feeling today of the grim world crisis.”

The United States has now fought two great wars for the Jews at enormous cost in Christian blood and Christian wealth. Can the United States afford another world conflict for the Jews? The landing of United States Marines in Lebanon indicates that the White House and Congress were willing to risk it in an election year. When Eisenhower asked Congress to delegate its war-powers to him as far as the Middle East was concerned, the voice was the voice of Jacob. Eisenhower said he wanted “to give military aid to any nation resisting aggression from a nation controlled by international communism.” There was no aggression whatever against Lebanon. President Chamoun, who requested United States’ intervention, was faced by a pro-Nasser rebellion of his own people! United States intervention, therefore, was for the purpose of protecting Israel—not Lebanon. Should the pro-Nasser Lebanese forces take over the government, the robber-nation Israel would be further imperiled. And, of course, British troops occupied Jordan for the same reasons and as a result of the same Jewish pressures.
Comparisons are said to be odious, but they are illustrative nevertheless. When the communists took over Spain and communist volunteer armies from twenty-two nations poured into the unfortunate country, Jew-ridden Washington did not raise a finger—nor an eyebrow—to stop the communist aggression. Of course the world now knows that the Jews, under the leadership of Soviet Ambassador Rosenberg, were directing the attack on Spain. American Communist Jews in the so-called George Washington and Abraham Lincoln Brigades, who had gone to Spain to engage in an orgy of Christian massacres, encountered no interference from official Washington. When Franco proved too much for the communists, Bernard Baruch contributed $10,000.00 toward the cost of the return of the American Jewish contingents to the United States. Washington could not find it in its heart to even criticize—let alone intervene—and Baruch remained the "elder statesman" and "the advisor of presidents."

Forty-five Americans were kidnapped by Cuban rebels. The United States Marines were conspicuous by their absence on the beaches of Cuba. American soldiers numbering several hundred are said to be languishing in Red Chinese prisons but Washington is more interested in Jewish campaign contributions than the protection of its soldiers. The Marines will not land in China for the sake of mere Gentile Americans.

As a result of the revolt in Hungary in October of 1956, more than 75,000 Christians were shipped to Siberia. Another 40,000 are still rotting in Red Hungarian prison camps. Five thousand were sent to Red China to swell the slave-labor battalions working Chinese mines. The first "Hungarian refugees" to reach the United States turned out to be communist Jews. During the Hungarian revolt Soviet Russia sent in an army backed by thousands of tanks. This was "communist aggressions"—but Eisenhower was not moved to intervene. The Jews were safe!

Communist Yugoslavia is on the Washington pay-roll (American tax-payer's payroll) for billions of dollars. Communist Poland has received $513,678,000 from the people of the United States since 1945. With one hand Washington passes out billions to bolster tottering Communist regimes; with the other it rushes to any part of the world to save the Jews, using "communist aggression" as an excuse.

World War III will probably be fought to make the Arab world safe for the Jews, and to make the Arab countries satellites of Israel. Dr. Nahum Goldman, president of the World Jewish Congress, speaking before the Canadian Jewish Congress May 31, 1947, may have had this probability in mind when he told Canada's Jews that Israel is the "most strategic area in the world." He said (Congress Bulletin):
“Twenty-five years ago Palestine didn’t have a tenth the importance in world political action it has today. This world has become one global world and there are a great many strategists who believe that the most important strategic area in the world is the Middle East. There are great historians of the Second World War who believe that the decisive battle of the Second World War was the battle of El Alamein, because if the Nazis had broken into the Middle East they would have won the war. This may be exaggeration or it may not be. But they are convinced that if there are any future wars that they will be global wars and they will concentrate in this part of the world. The Middle East, between the three Continents, the link between Europe and Asia and Africa, is perhaps the most strategic area in the world.

“In one of the talks I had last summer with Mr. Bevin where he spoke up very frankly, he said to me, ‘You know, doctor, what you want me to do by establishing a Jewish State? You want me to deliver into your hands the keys to the most important strategic area in the world. You will allow me to think once and twice before I give you this key.’ There was something in this remark.

“In addition to this, oil has been found in the Middle East. I remember Mr. Ickes, who was in charge of oil administration in America during the war, told me that experts report that there is more oil in the Middle East than in all of North and Central America, together, ten to twenty times as much. And you know what oil means in this world. Once We have established a Jewish State in Palestine all this will be in our favor. But until we do establish it this is an obstacle, because people are very reluctant to allow Jews, with their zeal and intelligence, to establish themselves in an area of such importance.

“If we would have wanted to establish Jews on Madagascar we could have done so already. Nobody cares what is being done on Madagascar. It is outside of world politics. But Palestine is today the center of strategy and of world power politics, and statesmen who approach Zionism today think in those terms. I would like Zionists to understand it. It is not always the things that appeal to justice and fairness that count in the world. The countries and the governments of the world will determine their positions from the viewpoint of their realistic interests. These will be the decisive considerations. All the humanitarian aspects of the problem, which may play a certain role, will not be decisive and we have to adjust our policies to such a realistic approach to the problem.”

* * * * *

It had taken nearly two thousand years for the Jews to vanquish the civilization that Christianity had wrought. By the middle of the twentieth century they virtually controlled all of it. Jewish ideas now prevail everywhere. The conquest of Palestine and the establishment of the State of Israel mark the beginning of the Jewish Neo-Messianic Age. Jewish Communism has smashed Christianity in Russia, and World War II has elevated that Marxist state to a world power. Germany and the Central
Powers are prostrate, slowly digging out of the rubble of the most disastrous conflict in history. Ancient enemy states of the Jews are now pitiful satellites of the Soviet Union. The great British Empire is broken, and its colonies are gradually being absorbed into the vortex of Jewish Communism. The Red Banner of Revolution flutters over teeming Chinese millions, while the brown and black man, goaded by their Jewish masters, gird themselves for a final test of color-supremacy. Communist parties everywhere press hard against the cracked and broken walls of Capitalism, while venal politicians and demagogues welcome Communist Fifth Columns in the courtyard. The Jewish revolutionary proletariat has done its work well!

Jewish international finance has emerged stronger than ever before, so that the terrible power of the Jewish purse remains dominant throughout the world.

The machinery for world control—the United Nations—is in existence; imperfect as yet for the complete subjugation of the nations of the world, but thoroughly potential in its essence. The Jewish masters of propaganda are everywhere—in the governments, in the press, on radio and television, in the Churches—no power appears capable of halting the measured tread of the Jewish march to World dominion. They no longer work alone. Everywhere—on the floors of Congresses and Parliaments; in the churches, the schools, the universities, in the clubs and on the street corners—the brain-washed Gentiles parrot Jewish propaganda with breathless enthusiasm.

The only power that might yet stop the rush to disaster appears paralyzed and inert. Christianity, which had valiantly met the rapacious onslaught of Jew, Arab and pagan, now seems to sleep, devoid of vitality and strength. One by one the Crosses have fallen as the atheist hordes of Marxism sweep out of Russia; one by one the candles on the altars of Christ flicker and are snuffed out. For the first time in the history of Christianity, the Prince of Peace and His Cross are barred from the sinister sanctuary of a coalition of nations ostensibly dedicated to peace!

To late? Many sincere and honest statesmen would right the wrong if they were able. Few who know will forget the tragic yet courageous words of one of America's great—Senator Pat McCarran. Observing the chaos that was sweeping over the United States as a result of the power of the United Nations, Senator McCarran stated:

"I am sure I will regret to my dying day that I voted for the U. N. Charter."

Congressman John T. Wood, a courageous fighter against this alien body, on American soil, urged the people of the United States to get out while there was yet time. "I call this treasonable
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organization before the great bar of American justice," the Congress­man declared, "and again demand that we rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations and the specialized agencies thereof."

Senator Jack B. Tenney, whose fight against the United Nations aroused the Jews of California against him, stated:

“Our task to abolish the United Nations is, in fact, a crusade to regain American independence. It is a sacred and hallowed cause and we march in the steps of the father of our country. It is an American campaign. The United Nations, no matter how you look at it, is an un-American institution. And God will be with us—because He never attended a session of the United Nations.”

There were some who had not received the mark of the beast in their right hand, or in their foreheads, and they had no standing in the market place. But their names were written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. And St. John had consolation for those who might not buy nor sell: “These things saith the First and the Last, which was dead, and is alive; I know thy works, and tribulations, and poverty, (but thou art rich) and I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan.”

“And I saw heaven opened, and beheld a white horse; and He that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness He doth judge and make war . . . and His name is called The Word of God . . . And I saw the beast, and the Kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against Him that sat on the white horse, and against His army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of Him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of His mouth . . . ”

THE END

* * * * *
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