

As the challenges of the 21st century beckon and threaten America and the West, it is more vital than ever that we understand the forces that move the world's—and thus our own—affairs. Are these motive forces always as they

The ZIONIST FACTOR

are reported in our newspapers and taught in our schools? Or are such recent, earth-shaking events as the collapse of Soviet Communism, the Gulf War, and the never-ending Middle East crisis linked by a common, invisible thread?

In *The Zionist Factor*, veteran British journalist Ivor Benson uncovers long-suppressed evidence of the dynamic, critical Jewish role in events as diverse, and as momentous, as the Bolshevik Revolution, the formation of the modern state of Israel, the dizzying ascent of both Communism and capitalism, and the anti-colonial and post-colonial upheavals throughout the Third World.

The Zionist Factor crackles like an espionage thriller with drama and revelation; it explains and instructs like a golden-tongued orator; and it seeks neither to blame nor to condone, only to understand.

After gaining—thanks to Mr. Benson's probing and unflinching analysis—a clear-eyed glimpse through the sham and artifice of today's "information managers," no one need ever look at world politics through the false spectacles of the media and the diploma mills again.



IVOR BENSON, a journalist and political analyst, wrote for the *Daily Express* and *Daily Telegraph* in London, and later was chief assistant editor of the *Rand Daily Mail* in Johannesburg, and assistant editor of the *Sunday Tribune* in Durban. From 1964 to 1966 he served as Information Advisor to Ian Smith, Prime Minister of Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe). Mr. Benson has lectured on four continents, is the author of several books, and produces a monthly newsletter, *Behind the News* (P.O. Box 1564, Krugersdorp, 1740, South Africa).

ISBN 0-939482-32-0
THE NOONTIDE PRESS



The ZIONIST FACTOR

The Jewish Impact on Twentieth Century History

IVOR BENSON

TABLE OF CONTENTS

*The Zionist Factor:
The Jewish Impact on Twentieth Century History*

Copyright ©1986, 1992 by Ivor Benson.

All rights reserved.

This revised Noontide Press edition published February 1992.

Noontide Press
1822½ Newport Blvd., Suite 183
Costa Mesa, CA 92627
U.S.A.

Manufactured in the United States of America.

ISBN: 0-939482-32-0

INTRODUCTION	i
CHAPTER 1: <i>Shakespeare and the Law of Equity</i>	1
CHAPTER 2: <i>The Russian Revolution</i>	17
CHAPTER 3: <i>The Identity Problem</i>	35
CHAPTER 4: <i>High Finance and a New World Order</i>	45
CHAPTER 5: <i>The Wall Street Struggle</i>	64
CHAPTER 6: <i>"Anti-Semitism" Examined</i>	81
CHAPTER 7: <i>Jewish Historiography</i>	91
CHAPTER 8: <i>Zionist-Communist Collusion in the Middle East</i>	109
CHAPTER 9: <i>Communist-Capital Nexus</i>	121
CHAPTER 10: <i>Some Reflections on "Mammon of Unrighteousness"</i>	125
CHAPTER 11: <i>Geography of the Intellect</i>	133
CHAPTER 12: <i>Dissecting A Racial Mystique</i>	143
CHAPTER 13: <i>Reform & Orthodox: Some Angles on Middle East</i> ..	151
CHAPTER 14: <i>Behind the Scenes With Dr. Goldmann</i>	157
CHAPTER 15: <i>Underground Big Business in the USSR</i>	165
CHAPTER 16: <i>The Zionist Role in Rhodesia</i>	173
CHAPTER 17: <i>The Genocide Convention</i>	183
CHAPTER 18: <i>George Orwell and the Zionist Factor</i>	197

INTRODUCTION

The need for an impartial, truthful treatment of Jewish history has recently become greater than it has ever been before," writes Professor Hannah Arendt. She goes on: "Twentieth century political developments have driven the Jewish people into the storm center of events . . . the Jewish question and anti-Semitism . . . became the catalytic agent for the rise of the Nazi movement and the establishment of the organizational structure of the Third Reich . . . then for a world war of unparalleled ferocity."¹

However great the need, the subject of the Jewish impact on twentieth century history has been studiously avoided by modern academics because, as another Jewish history professor remarks, "The Jewish presence . . . resists the tools and thwarts the assumptions of modern scholarship."² A roundabout way of saying that for establishment historians the subject is too hot to handle.

It goes without saying that there can be no investigation of the motives and actions of those in the "storm center of things" except in the context of a coherent total or unified interpretation of the history of this period. In other words, the Jewish role can have no meaning except as a factor of major importance in the history of a much troubled century.

In the handling of a subject so complex and multifaceted, the method used in this book is to present a series of separate studies, each of which, it is hoped, will contribute something to a deep and comprehensive understanding of the long troubled relationship of Jew and Gentile.

The word "Zionist" is preferred in the book's title as representing a much altered twentieth century Jewish presence in which the appetites of global power-politics have almost entirely superseded

religion as the main source for the motivation of Jewish unity and exclusiveness.

It is the main purpose of the writer to bring together and correctly interpret information that has always been available, rather than to uncover what was hitherto unknown.

So far from being hostile to persons of Jewish descent on the grounds of such descent, we have tried to give the clearest possible expression to an attitude that has always prevailed in the West, one of total nondiscrimination in terms of acceptance and assimilation. In other words, we say that assimilation has never been a problem for the West or for any Jew wishing to be assimilated and totally accepted—the Jew being, as Professor Sir Arthur Keith has pointed out, racially indistinguishable from other Caucasians who form the mainstream of the Western peoples.

It would, therefore, require a twisted logic to describe as “anti-Semitic” a book which advocates total and unconditional mutual acceptance, finding fault only with a Jewish attitude which complains of discrimination while continuing to spurn a standing offer of acceptance and assimilation.

Armed with such an insight, the Westerner finds himself in a morally invulnerable position in all his dealings with persons of Jewish descent. On the other hand, Jewish leaders, especially Zionist, when they decline an invitation to submit to full and frank discussion the whole question of Jewish separatism, confess the vulnerability of their position.

The twin sources of the sharp emotional responses which tend to discourage discussion of the Jewish question can be easily traced and identified: Jewish leaders who are bent on preserving separation react with fear and anger to any influences which operate in favor of assimilation; and gentiles, ever conscious of what they take to be an alien presence in their midst, are frequently disturbed by a superior Jewish smartness that appears to be unrestrained by the moral sentiment that normally regulates behaviour inside a homogeneous community. A situation is thus created in which hackles are liable to rise on both sides when any attempt is made to discuss the Jewish presence in the West.

If this book has another important message, it is this: The entire burden of responsibility for what Spengler calls “the decline of the West” must rest squarely on the shoulders of the peoples of the West, and not on the Jews, for the peoples of the West have

themselves created the morally unhygienic social and political conditions that render them susceptible to debilitating influences which hitherto they were able to resist quite easily. In other words, modern Jewish predominance is not the *cause* of Western decadence but only one of its more conspicuous symptoms.

Note:

Several of the chapters in this book have already appeared, wholly or in part, in my newsletter *Behind the News*. No attempt has been made to avoid the repetition of certain themes and ideas in different chapters, the writer's purpose being to bring these more clearly into relief by presenting them in different contexts. The validity of the general interpretations offered can be tested against unfolding history as reflected in the current news.

—Ivor Benson

Notes

1. H. Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, p. xiv; *This Age of Conflict*, Frank P. Chambers, Christian Phelps Harris and Charles C. Bayley. (Harcourt).
2. Prof. Henry L. Feingold, State University, New York.

CHAPTER ONE

Shakespeare and the Law of Equity

*To offend and judge are distinct offices,
And of opposed natures.*

—WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE

In undertaking to handle a subject to which there has been attached in our time a taboo as potent as any ever experienced in a primitive society, we find our position much strengthened by William Shakespeare's treatment of the same subject in his great play *The Merchant of Venice*.

Shakespeare does not analyze, rationalize and try to explain the relations of Jew and gentile, but gives us instead, as a form of instruction in depth, a brilliantly complete and accurate dramatic representation of what was then and remains to this day, for most people, a baffling portion of reality.

The difference between what happens in real life and what happens on the Shakespearean stage can be quite easily explained. In real life the subject of the relations of Jew and gentile is extremely complex, thrown out of intellectual focus by innumerable contradictions and ambiguities. In the play the antagonism of Jew and gentile is clearly discernible and intelligible; in real life the picture is very much harder to read as Jews and gentiles seek their mutual advantage in relationships of varying depth and durability, all this in circumstances and conditions infinite in their variability.

Shakespeare's play is an abstract of the enduring attitudes, motives and influences at work in the troubled relations of Jew and gentile, presented in the form of a simple narrative that leaves nothing of any consequence unsaid and is as true to life today as when it was written.

As W. Moelwyn Merchant remarks in the first paragraph of his scholarly introduction to the New Penguin edition,¹ any suggestion that *The Merchant of Venice* was meant only as entertainment "flatly contradicts our deepest intuitions concerning this strange and complex play." He adds: "It is clear that *The Merchant of Venice* is much preoccupied with two matters of Elizabethan concern: Jewry and usury."

It is, therefore, hardly surprising that Jewish influence has been heavily exerted in our century to prevent this play from being presented on the stage or on the cinema screen; it bears too close a relevance to the situation that prevails today. There is still widespread tension in the relations of Jew and gentile, no matter how strong the bonds that unite the two in the realm of mercantilism, and there is more anxiety than ever over the implications of a monetary system in which money is regarded more as a commodity and an instrument of policy than as a medium of exchange.

There can be no doubt that Shakespeare had read and thought deeply about the troubled relations of Jew and gentile, and that long before his play was entered in the Stationer's Register in 1598 there had been in progress a ferment of debate on this subject all over the Western World.

Raphael Holinshed's *History of England*, a source from which Shakespeare drew copiously in the writing of his major English historical plays, provides some factual evidence concerning the power of the Jews and their activities in Britain. We read, for example, in Holinshed's description of the scenes attending the coronation of Richard I:

Upon this day of King Richard's coronation, the Jews that dwelt in London and in other parts of the realm, being there assembled, had but sorry hap, as it chanced, for they meaning to honour the same coronation with their presence and to present to the King some honourable gift . . . King Richard, of a zealous mind to Christ's religion, abhorring their nation (and doubting some sorcery by then to be practiced) commanded that they should not come within the church when he should receive the crown, nor within the palace whilst he was at dinner.

The attitude of a king who "abhorred" the Jewish nation was expressed more robustly by the London populace at the time of Richard's coronation, the result being a series of riots which Holinshed describes as follows:

The king being advertised of this riotous attempt of the outrageous people . . . the rude sort of those that were about to spoil, rob and sack the houses and shops of the Jews . . . this wode rage of the furious and disordered people continued from the middle of the one day till two of the clock on the other, the commons all that while never ceasing their fury against that nation, but still killing them as they met with any of them, in most horrible, rash and unreasonable manner.

Holinshed says that the King put a quick stop to the rioting but made no attempt to round up and punish the offenders, since Richard's subjects hated the Jews for their "obstinate forwardness" and "so they were restored to peace after they had sustained infinite damage."

Shakespeare would also, almost certainly, have read Sir Thomas Wilson's *Discourse Upon Usury*, a work which remained for centuries a copious source of scornful invective on the subject of Jews and usury; he would also have read Francis Bacon's deeper and more restrained comments on the same subject.

Shakespeare, unlike Bacon and others, does not draw us into a deeply involved consideration of the problem of the Jews and their mercantile practices, but offers us instead a literary masterpiece in which the relations of Jew and gentile are represented as a living model of reality: instead of attempting the impossible task of fully explaining that relationship, he provides us with a *word picture conducive to insight and understanding*, as an aid to those already equipped with a penetrating intelligence and the will to discover the truth. The picture is presented from the point of view of his own community, with the interests of his own community at heart, hence the jubilation of a gentile audience when, in the trial scene, just as Shylock is advancing towards Antonio with a sharpened knife in one hand, and a pair of scales in the other, the tables are suddenly turned.²

Portia: Tarry a little, there is something else.
This bond doth give thee here no jot of blood;
The words expressly are 'a pound of flesh.'
Take then thy bond, take thou thy pound of flesh.
But in the cutting it if thou dost shed
One drop of Christian blood, thy lands and goods
Are by the laws of Venice confiscate
Unto the state of Venice.

Although it is a picture in which it is the interests of a gentile community that prevail in the end, Shakespeare lives up to the

motto he puts in the mouth of Portia: "To offend and judge are distinct offices and of opposed natures." There is offense given and taken in the play, but it is never Shakespeare who offends. On the contrary, by transposing himself imaginatively and sympathetically into Shylock's situation, he is able to echo with marvellous precision the sincerity of the Jew's statement of his own case:

Shylock: In the Rialto you have rated me
About my moneys and my usances.
Still have I borne it with a patient shrug,
For sufferance is the badge of all our tribe.
You call me misbeliever, cut-throat dog,
And spit upon my Jewish gaberdine,
And all for use of that which is mine own.
...

You spurned me such a day, another time
You called me dog, and for these courtesies
I'll lend you thus much money?

Antonio is clearly aware of an unbridgeable moral gulf separating him from the Jew, for he replies as follows to Shylock's eloquent speech:

Antonio: I am as like to call thee so again,
To spit on thee again, to spurn thee too.
If thou wilt lend this money, lend it not
As to thy friends, for when did friendship take
A breed of barren metal of his friend?

Antonio would thus also have been under no illusions about the intentions behind the pound-of-flesh bond subsequently offered by Shylock "in merry sport" and as a kindness.

Shakespeare has permitted Shylock to express himself in language which for centuries give the English theater moments of unforgettable grandeur and eloquence, as, when asked by Salerio how it would profit him to insist on having a pound of the flesh of the merchant he now has in his power, the Jew answers with deadly earnestness:

Shylock: To bait fish withal. If it will feed nothing else, it will feed my revenge. He has disgraced me and hindered me half a million, laughed at my losses, mocked at my gains, scorned my nation, thwarted my bargains, cooled my friends, heated mine enemies, and what's his reason? I am a Jew. Hath not a Jew eyes? Hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? Fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same

means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer as a Christian is? If you prick us, do we not bleed? If you tickle us, do we not laugh? If you poison us, do we not die? And if you wrong us, shall we not revenge? If you are like us in the rest, we will resemble you in that. If a Jew wrong a Christian, what is his humility? Revenge. If a Christian wrong a Jew, what should his sufferance be by Christian example? Why, revenge! The villainy you teach me, I will execute, and it shall go hard but I will better the instruction.

Shakespeare could write such a speech because, as an artist of exceptional power and sensibility, he was able to transpose himself imaginatively into the Jew's situation and invoke the feelings which he would himself experience in such a situation. In other words, he has a complete sympathetic understanding of the Jew's situation. Shylock is no common criminal who "by direct or indirect attempts (seeks) . . . the life of a citizen." On the contrary, the attempt on Antonio's life is felt by Shylock to be just as free from any guilt as violence done by a soldier against his nation's enemy. Shylock gives expression to this attitude with this command to a fellow Jew when first informed that Antonio's ships have been wrecked:

Shylock: Go, Tubal, fee me an officer; bespeak him a fortnight before. I will have the heart of him if he forfeit, for were he out of Venice I can make what merchandise I will. Go, Tubal, and meet me at our synagogue . . .

Victor Hugo makes this comment on Shylock's motivation: "In entering his synagogue, Shylock entrusts his hatred to the safeguard of his faith. Henceforward his vengeance assumes a consecrated character. His bloodthirstiness against the Christian becomes sacerdotal."

Shakespeare is scrupulously obedient to the highest canons of poetic and dramatic art in *The Merchant of Venice*. The quarrel as represented in the play is not personal and private but *national and elemental*, a clash between two *separate self-contained moral systems*, each with its own sense of right and wrong and its own keenly felt sense of personal honor.

When the spendthrift Bassanio, already in debt to Antonio, asks for a further loan with which to finance himself as a suitor for the hand of fair Portia, there is no mention of any bond to be signed before a notary:

Bassanio: Tis not unknown to you, Antonio,
How much I have disabled mine estate
By something showing a more swelling port
Than my faint means would grant continuance.
Nor do I now make moan . . .

Antonio: I pray you good Bassanio, let me know it,
And if it stand as you yourself still do,
Within the eye of honor, be assured
My purse, my person, my extremest means
Lie all unlocked to your occasion.

Between Shylock and his "countrymen" likewise there is complete mutual trust. The Jew does not have the required three thousand ducats instantly available, but—

Shylock: . . . What of that?
Tubal, a wealthy Hebrew of my tribe,
Will furnish me . . .

This situation among the Jews persists to this day to a degree unequalled among other communities. Jews in all the countries of the West, although conspicuous as lawyers and sometimes even as judges, seldom avail themselves of the gentiles' courts in resolving their own disputes; what generally happens is that a dispute is dealt with by arbitration without any publicity whatever; and it is almost unthinkable for one Jew to appear as complainant against another in a criminal court.

One of the play's important lessons can be quickly and easily disposed of before we get to grips with Shakespeare's handling of the major theme of the exact relations of Jew and gentile: There never was in the West any antipathy to the Jews purely on grounds of race. Thus, it was only practices and attitudes which distinguished the Jews from the rest of the population which King Richard "abhorred" and which drove ignorant London street mobs into a frenzy of public violence—for how otherwise would it have been possible for Shakespeare to marry off the hated Shylock's daughter Jessica to Antonio's bosom friend Lorenzo? Jessica is only lightheartedly referred to as "infidel" and is apostrophized by Shylock's gentile servant Launcelot, with tears in his eyes, as "most beautiful pagan, most sweet Jew."

It is nowhere recorded that the "groundlings" in the pit of the London theatre, "the sort of those" who might even have helped to despoil the city's Jews, ever reacted with hoots of disapproval to this speech; on the contrary, Jessica has always been received by

audiences as one of the play's loved characters. Later in the play, with her husband Lorenzo, the Jew's daughter is entrusted by Portia with the "husbandry and management" of her palatial home at Belmont:

Portia (to *Lorenzo*): May people do already know my mind
And will acknowledge you and Jessica
In place of Lord Bassanio and myself.

The enforced conversion of Shylock to Christianity as a condition of the mitigation of sentence passed on him by the duke sounds harsh, yet clearly signifies the willingness of Venice's Christian community to receive a repentant Shylock as one of its own.

Shakespeare's penetrating study of the relations of Jew and gentile is at the same time essentially a study of the sources, operations and influences of law in general and, in particular, the relations of common law and equity. The poet is not known to have had more than a layman's book learning and experience of the jurisprudence of his day, but successive generations of scholars have expressed astonishment at the depth of his understanding of the operations of law, arising, we may be sure, from a marvellous understanding of human nature.

The legal structure of *The Merchant of Venice* is fallacious, as Moelwyn Merchant points out, since no system of law would permit a man to put his own life in jeopardy as one of the conditions of a contract; in other words, the legal framework of the drama is no more real than so much stage furniture and painted scenery. What is profoundly real is "Shakespeare's most elaborate statement of the relation of positive law to equity in the dealings of man and man."

Writes Moelwyn Merchant, an authority on the subject of law in literature: "Though he made elsewhere, in *Measure for Measure*, in *Hamlet*, in many of the *Sonnets*, in *King Lear* and in *the Winter's Tale*, pointed and mature references to the subject of law, the trial scene here focuses more aspects of the matter than any other dramatist or poet succeeded in uniting in one work. Indeed, it is remarkable that this relatively early play foreshadowed so many of the complex legal considerations which are so prominent in later, more mature plays; the personal factors in an apparently neutral matter of law, in *Measure for Measure*; the conflict of two systems of thought, of revenge and of charity within the law, in *Hamlet*; the involvement of the whole natural order in the process of law, in *King Lear*."

It is the relation of common law to equity which, more than any other aspect of law, comes into question in the quarrel between the moneylender and the merchant of Venice.

"Equity is a highly ambiguous term," writes Moelwyn Merchant in a footnote to his *Introduction*: "At its most general it is the quality of 'equitable dealing' between men or nations, governed by the principles of natural law 'written in the hearts of men'."

In England it was early realized that under common law grave injury could go unredressed, to the detriment of civil order and national unity. We read in *Chambers' Encyclopaedia*: "When aggrieved persons found themselves denied a remedy in the common law courts, they petitioned the king in council for redress, and their petitions were remitted by the council to the Lord Chancellor as 'keeper of the King's conscience' for investigation."

Out of this original procedure there evolved "equity jurisdiction" in the Chancery Court, hardening with the passage of time into a form of jurisprudence that relies less and less on metaphysical influences like "the conscient of the king" and increasingly precedent, as in the common law courts.

Shakespeare handles this theme in a minor key in Act I where borrower and lender exchange a few words on the subject of usury, a theme to be played on a major key in the trial scene in Act IV:

Shylock: . . . And let me see; but hear you,
Methoughts you said you neither lend nor borrow
Upon advantage.

Antonio: I do never use it.

Shylock: When Jacob grazed his uncle Laban's sheep—
this Jacob from our holy Abram was,
As his wise mother wrought in his behalf,
The third possessor; ay, he was the third—

Antonio: And what of him? Did he take interest?

Shylock: No, not take interest, not as you would say
Direct interest. Mark what Jacob did:

When Laban and himself were compromised
that all the eanlings which were streaked and pied
Should fall as Jacob's hire, the ewes being rank,
In end of autumn turned to the rams;
And when the work of generation was
Between these woolly breeders in the act,
The skilful shepherd peeled me certain wands,
And in the doing of the deed of kind
He stuck them up before the fulsome ewes,

Who then conceiving, did in eaning time
Fall parti-coloured lambs, and those were Jacob's.
This was a way to thrive, and he was blest,
And thrift is blessing if men steal it not.

There we have a classic example of common law *unsupported with equity*, a hostile exercise of craftiness by Jacob against his uncle Laban, an injury inflicted in violation of moral law but not of common law. It is precisely the possibility of the frequent occurrence of this form of evil that explains the evolution of equity law as a concept and juridicial practice in all civilized nations.

Legality without equity is thus clearly indentifiable as an ingenious form of warfare in which moral violence is cunningly substituted for physical violence without incurring any risk of retribution under common law.

The main theme of evil perpetrated or purposed under the protection of common law while in contravention of equity law is played out in a major key in the famous trial scene in Act IV, Scene 1, with Shylock's plea for "justice" to the Duke:

Shylock: I have possessed your grace of what I purpose,
And by our holy Sabbath have I sworn
To have the due and forfeit of my bond.
If you deny it, let the danger light
Upon your charter and your city's freedom!

This is only a small sample of Shylock's eloquence from one of the longest and most powerful speeches in the play. The Jew is offered twice the amount borrowed by Antonio, but he will not yield:

Shylock: If every ducat in six thousand ducats
Were in six parts, and every part a ducat,
I would not draw them. I would have my bond.

Portia, having been invited by the Duke to examine Shylock's suit and pass judgement according to the law, makes a plea for equity in one of the most moving speeches in English drama:

Portia: The quality of mercy is not strained,
It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven
Upon the place beneath. It is twice blest,
It blesseth him that gives and him that takes . . .
It is an attribute to God himself;
And earthly power doth then show likest God's
When mercy seasons justice. Therefore, Jew,
Though justice be thy plea, consider this:

That in the course of justice none of us
Should see salvation. We do pray for mercy
And that same prayer doth teach us all to render
The deeds of mercy. I have spoke thus much
To mitigate the justice of thy plea,
Which, if thou follow, this strict court of Venice
Must needs give sentence 'gainst the merchant there.

It should be remembered, however, that "mercy," which is the essence of Portia's pleas, is only one aspect of equity, both in its broadest sense as "law written in the hearts of men" and in its narrowest sense as "equity jurisdiction" in the chancery courts, other aspects of equity being imperfectly contained in concepts like "fair dealing," "truthfulness," "honesty," "trust," "loyalty," "honor," etc.

While in Shylock's speech the main emphasis is on the danger that must always attend any suspension of statutory law—"Let the danger light upon your charter and your city's freedom!"—in Portia's speech the argument is that there can be no true justice where the exercise of power is not "seasoned" with mercy. Mercy in this sense is not a softening and undermining of the law, but an exercise of sympathetic understanding which *enhances the power of the law* by freeing it of defects which must attend a written law that cannot take into account an infinite variety of circumstances.

Portia's speech makes no impression whatever on Shylock. His conscience is safe, his vengeance "consecrated" on behalf of his own community, his hardness "sacerdotal," all obedient to a law of enmity in which it is equity that calls for suspension—"Hates any man the thing he would not kill?", and again, "What, wouldst thou have a serpent sting thee twice?"

What we are shown in *The Merchant of Venice* is an enmity in nature, involving two nations, each with its own legal and moral code, which cannot be resolved by any mutually acceptable law; the only question to be determined is which side must win and which lose.

The effect of Shakespeare's play, whatever his intentions may have been, is to draw attention to the vulnerability of the people of the West, far more pronounced today than when he wrote, to an infinite variety of Jewish practices which correspond in moral terms with the device used by Jacob to acquire for himself more than his fair share of the increase of Laban's flock.

The story about Jacob and Laban drawn from *Genesis*, Chapter 30 *et seq.*, could have been supplemented with references to usury

in *Deuteronomy*, Chapter 15—*thou shalt lend unto many nations but thou shalt not borrow, and thou shalt reign over many nations and they shall not reign over thee.* Shakespeare would have been familiar with this and other references to usury in *Deuteronomy* but could not have introduced them without disturbing the structure and continuity of the drama. It is also perhaps significant that Jessica's theft of the property of her father in *The Merchant of Venice* has a parallel in Rachel's theft of her father's sacred images before she, her sister Leah and Jacob departed secretly from Laban's house.

In the *Genesis* story, too, evil perpetrated against a supposed enemy acquires a consecrated character: *And an angel of God spake unto me in a dream, saying, Jacob! And I said, here I am. And he said, lift up now thine eyes, and see all the rams which leap upon the cattle are ringstraked and grised; for I have seen all that Laban doeth unto thee.*

* * * * *

It remains, for the purposes of this introductory chapter, to enquire briefly into the psychology of the concept of equity and the innumerable other concepts with which it can be assimilated.

Equity, like all the others, did not originate as a concept, but only as a feeling, an instinctive prompting, what C.G. Jung has described as an "irrational factor" deeply planted in human nature. The different concepts, like "love," "trust," "mercy," "honor," "altruism" and "chivalry" all represent one and the same feeling, coloured and modified by circumstances.

We refer here to the root feeling of *care* or *concern*, shared universally by all creatures that live and breathe; it is something deeply encoded in life, most often exerting its influence blindly and automatically; only in the human species is it modifiable by the intervention of conscious intelligence.

The root feeling of *care* and *concern* is exercised powerfully between man and his mate, by parents towards their children; thereafter with diminishing force within ever widening social circles of family, friends and community. Within still wider circles of felt and perceived common interest, as between nations, the influence of *care* or *concern* is ephemeral and entirely at the mercy of circumstances. On the other hand, even in war, where the parties are divided only by a temporary opposition of interests, and exercise of the care feeling takes the form of chivalry, where the victor stops short of destroying his opponent, influenced often

quite unconsciously by awareness of a kinship that transcends present differences.

The root feeling of care depends for its meaning and significance on the existence of another root feeling, its polar opposite, which likewise gives rise to a range of seemingly dissimilar concepts, like "hate," "enmity," "danger," "antipathy," "jealousy," "suspicion," "distrust," etc.

The two are, in fact, inseparable, like the positive and negative poles in an electric circuit, the force of the one nearly always directly proportional to the force of the other—as in war or some other situation of peril, it is the danger which excites the maximum exercise of the root feeling of care in the form of self-sacrificing heroism, a pattern of behavior that is found throughout the animal kingdom.

This root feeling of care or concern is associated throughout nature with an awareness of varying degree of kinship, in man also with an awareness of common interest in innumerable other forms, such awareness always accentuated by an apprehension of shared danger.

It is against this background of ideas that we can discern more clearly a vital difference of phase which characterizes the relations of Jew and gentile in the West.

The Jews, totally committed to the preservation of a separate kinship system as a minority geographically dispersed and thinly distributed in a gentile world, are exposed continuously to the promptings of a feeling of insecurity, often sharpening into a sense of peril. There is thus excited among them feelings of *care* or *concern and of fear* or *hatred* of an intensity not experienced by other people, the first having the effect of binding them more closely together in an emotional climate of mutual support, the other having the effect of sharpening their animosity towards all who exist outside their kinship system, whose unity and consciousness of kinship represent for the Jews the greatest possible danger.

Western societies have provided the Jews with an ideal environment for an exploitation of the secret advantages to be derived from the dual-code relationship, advantages heavily compounded in our century by a prodigious increase in quantity and complexity of mercantile transactions, a form of "thrif" in which the Jews have always specialized. This preference for "transactions" rather than production is not fortuitous or one forced

on the Jews; it was ever one of the necessary conditions for separation, since an undifferentiated sharing of all economic activity would make it impossible for the Jews to resist assimilation.

In this free-for-all economic environment, in which Westerners are naturally inclined to exercise their energies competitively *against each other*, the Jews found added stimulus and advantage in exercising their powers collectively *against the host population*.

Another important factor favoring the Jews was a system of values which has always distinguished the Western nations from the rest of the world and was, in fact, the secret of what could be called "the might of the West." Interfacing both as cause and effect in the West was a liberal tradition (liberal in the true and original meaning of that word) in which the maximization of the freedom of the individual was found to be rewarded with a corresponding release of energy, inventiveness and enterprise and in which *some injustice* as a by-product of competitiveness was considered not too high a price to have to pay for benefits shared by all.

Professor Norman Cohn states correctly that anti-Semitism is almost exclusively a Western phenomenon; he writes: "For some 2000 years Jewish settlements existed in India and China without attracting any particular attention; to this day the Jewish artisans and peasants of India are regarded simply as one of the innumerable religious communities of the sub-continent, with nothing in the least odd about them."³ The only explanation Professor Cohn can find is that the people of the West have been afflicted down the centuries with a form of insanity he calls "a paranoiac schizophrenia," from which other peoples are, presumably, immune.

There is a far simpler explanation: These other peoples did not have an open competitive environment nor did they have an exuberant economic environment in which the poison vine of usury could take root and extend its tentacles without restraint.

We could hardly better conclude this introductory chapter than by drawing on the wisdom of one of the most famous and revered of Jewish savants, Asher Ginsburg, better known by his pen-name Ahad ha-Am, of whom the Jewish historian Richard J.H. Gottheil wrote in his book *Zionism*:

Ahad ha-Am is a student of philosophy, and his historical ken has a philosophic depth entirely wanting in his predecessors. In addition, he is in perfect sympathy with the people for whose ills he is seeking a solution, and the causes of whose ills he proposed to study. In his own soul he has felt all that his people has suffered; yet he has sufficient detachment to study its ills with a severity that does honor to his acumen, as his feeling does to his character. (Richard J.H. Gottehil, *Zionism*, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1914).

Ahad ha-Am's explanation of the hardships experienced by the Jews down the centuries, therefore also of the troubled relations of Jew and gentile, differs in no way from that which forms the underlying theme of this book. Here is the opening paragraph of Ahad ha-Am's book *The Way of Life* in which emphasis is given to the spiritual requirements of human natures, in contrast with the material and political:

The vicissitudes of Israel throughout the Dispersion, but particularly during these latter days of ours, make it plain that we Jews cannot hope to lead the life of a separate nation among strange peoples, and yet be as one of them taking part in all the activity about us as though we were full-blooded natives of the lands of our sojourn, and at the same time remain a nation peculiar in views and distinct in character . . . Misfortunes maim our manhood, favorable circumstances our national spirit. Therefore make of us men despicable in the eyes of our fellows, the latter a nation despicable in our own sight . . .

Asher Ginsburg (Ahad ha-Am) could see no future for the Jews as a nation except as "exemplars of righteousness," a role only possible in "a house for themselves only," where they could "develop along their own lines as one of the social units of mankind." He could see only one place where this might be possible, the "land of our forefathers"—meaning of course, Palestine.

Most Jews today realize, however, that Palestine offers no possibilities as a future homeland. Besides, as Arthur Koestler and others have shown, only a small minority of modern Jews have any lineal connection with the Jews of the Bible.⁴

Notes

1. William Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice* with an Introduction by W. Moelwyn Merchant (Penguin, 1911).

2. Norman Marshall, writing on "Shakespeare Abroad," in *Talking of Shakespeare* (Hodder & Stroughton, London 1954), says: "I doubt if there is any other country where reaction of the audience to *The Merchant of Venice* could be more Elizabethan than it is in India. The reason for this is that the moneylender is a dominating figure in Indian life . . . So audiences have no sympathy for Shylock. Whenever we played *The Merchant of Venice* there was invariably a roar of applause at the turning point of the trial scene when Shylock advances with drawn knife toward Antonio to claim his pound of flesh and Portia halts him . . ."
3. Professor Norman Cohn, *Warrant for Genocide* (Harper & Row, New York, 1967).
4. Arthur Koestler, *The Thirteenth Tribe*, (Devin-Adair) and Douglas Reed, *The Controversy of Zion* (Dolphin Press).

CHAPTER TWO

The Russian Revolution

The thesis presented in this chapter can be summarized as follows:

- Establishment historians are fully agreed that the twentieth century, as an age of conflict without any precedent in recorded history, must be regarded as an historical whole; in other words, it all belongs together, the product of a single set of influences and forces.¹
- This age of conflict can be seen to have unfolded out of what happened in Russia in the Revolution period, as Marxist-Leninist agitation and subversion spread all over the world.
- Just as the Russian Revolution epitomizes an age of conflict that was to follow, so does the drama of the assassination of the Tsarist family epitomize the entire Revolution period. In other words, the same powers, motives and other influences were present in all three.
- Russian Jewish nationalism, supported by Jews living in other countries, especially the United States, was the major factor at the "storm center of events" in Russia in 1917.
- Bolshevism in Russia and Zionism in the countries of the West emerged simultaneously as major historical forces in the same week in September 1917, always thereafter working in close unison.

So how much do we know about the Russian Revolution, and how much *can we know* about it?

Most people in the West still do not know exactly what happened—not because the information was not available and accessible but only because persons in positions of great power

had a vested interest in suppressing the facts and discouraging, virtually to the point of prohibition, genuine debate on the subject.

Revisionism on the subject of the Russian Revolution has made far more progress in the Soviet Union, and especially in Russia, than anywhere else in the world. The people of that vast empire think more about it because they have suffered most and have strong feelings on the subject, and because they can no longer be prevented by a disintegrating Marxist-Socialist regime from saying and writing what they think.

In the so-called "free world" a rigorous informal censorship continues to be applied. Britain's Cambridge University in April 1989 cancelled plans to award an honorary degree to Soviet mathematician Igor Shafarevich after it became known that he had publicly expressed views which were still unacceptable in Western academic circles. And in the United States there was an outcry in the media when it was discovered that a group of Soviet editors and writers on a state-sponsored visit included three who had appended their signatures—along with those of 70 other leading intellectuals—to a letter about the Revolution published in the respected journal *Literaturnaya Rossiya*.

A major phenomenon of recent times for which an explanation must be sought in the past is a massive Jewish exodus from the Soviet Union—the exact opposite of what happened in the Revolution period when Jews from all over the world were streaming into Russia.

"Anti-Semitism is forcing the biggest exodus in 500 years," cried a headline in the London *Financial Times*. According to Nathan Sharansky, a much publicized Soviet dissident, Jewish families had been applying for permits to leave at the rate of 2000 a day and the queue of would-be emigrants could be as long as one million. Others put the figure at between two million and four million.

Comments Sharansky: "This is something quite different from the street-level anti-Semitism of the past. For the first time the Russian people have realized what an awful history they have had. It is no longer just Solzhenitsyn saying there were 60 million victims of state terror; now conservative Soviet historians are estimating 40 million."

What Jewish leaders like Sharansky find so disturbing about this new anti-Semitism is the fact that it is found among the intellectuals and takes the form, as he put it, of a debate on "the question of Jewish responsibility for the years of Bolshevism."

Meanwhile Moscow's Maly Theatre had been drawing packed houses, standing room only, with a play by Sergei Kuznetsov entitled "I Will Repay"—a variation of God's "Vengeance is Mine"—in which the last moments of the Royal Family at Ekaterinburg [Sverdlovsk] are movingly reenacted.

But the Russians did not have to wait for the play to find out what happened to their former monarch. Months earlier one newspaper, *Soviet Press*, had published a grisly account of events at Ekaterinburg in which the local Cheka chief, Yankel Yurovsky, is described as he finished off the moaning Tzarevich, the heir to the throne, with two revolver shots.

It is, therefore, not without reason that many Jews in the Soviet Union feel endangered. The former Moscow correspondent of the London *Jewish Chronicle*, on her way to settle in the United States, declared that the only help Soviet Jews would appreciate was that which would enable them to leave the country.

Of the great migration in the opposite direction, Robert Wilton, the London *Times* correspondent at Petrograd had this to say: "Every shipload that came from America, England or France, gave trouble. They all considered themselves entitled to a share in the spoils and had to be provided with fat places in the Food, Agrarian and other Committees. With few exceptions, these immigrants were Jews."²

How, where and when the professional revolutionaries, led by Lenin, were set in motion, can be pinpointed exactly; it was in Vienna in the autumn of 1915 when the German and Austrian General Staffs came together to plan an operation designed to knock Russia out of the war as an ally of Britain and France. If that could be done not only would many more troops be available on the hard-pressed Western Front, but the German and Austrian people, threatened with starvation by the Allied blockade, would gain access to Ukraine's vast food supplies. It was at this meeting that the broad outlines of the final stages of the Revolution were worked out and the leading actors chosen—Lenin, Yankel Sverdlov, and other experienced Jewish activists, many of whom had fled from Russia during the preceding decade to escape arrest by the Tzar's secret police, the Okhrana. About one hundred of these were permitted to travel through Austria and Germany in a sealed train and to infiltrate Petrograd when the revolutionary process was already well advanced. Leon Trotsky (his real name Bronstein), came with a boatload of other professional revolutionaries from the United States.

The available facts about the Revolution period can be compared with the pieces of a great jigsaw puzzle which mean very little until correctly assembled; the main difference of course, is that the facts about the Revolution must be assembled in the mind.

However, in much the same way as with a jigsaw puzzle, if some of the facts can be put together to form a vividly clear picture it will be easier to put together and make sense of the rest of them. One portion of the Revolution period which can be studied in this way is that which surrounds the assassination of the Royal Family and all the other Romanovs who fell into the hands of the Bolsheviks.

These events are of supreme historical importance, for reasons that can be stated quite simply: For this period we have a more exact and complete account of what happened, and of the identity and motives of those involved, than for any other period of the revolution period.

The assassination drama can thus be described as the Bolshevik Revolution in miniature and, therefore, also as the twentieth century age of conflict in miniature, the same main influences and forces being present in all three.

On April 5, 1991, Sotheby's London, offered for sale by public auction what the press described as "dynamite papers." They were referring to a copy of the Sokolov Archive, an almost complete record of an investigation carried out after Admiral Kolchak's White Army had recaptured Ekaterinburg and the surrounding area of Western Siberia.

One copy of the complete dossier with all its sworn statements had been given to the London *Times* correspondent Robert Wilton who was present at every stage in the investigation and formed the basis of his book *The Last Days of the Romanovs*, published in London in 1920.

When the White forces took possession of Ekaterinburg their leader, Admiral Kolchak at once tried to find out what had happened to the Tsar and his family who were known to have been held captive in that town. The task was given to M. Starynkevich, a lawyer who had been exiled by the Moscow regime and was therefore regarded as trustworthy, but as investigations were only proceeding in a half-hearted way he was replaced on the direct order of Admiral Kolchak by Nicolai Sokolov, a young examining magistrate from Penza.

The most complete compilation about the assassination of the Royal Family and about the reign of terror elsewhere, much of it

drawn from the Sokolov Archive, was prepared by Nicolai Ross and published in two volumes in Germany in 1987.

What this means is that a vitally important chapter of Russian history, including a detailed account of the actual killing, supported with the sworn depositions of key witnesses as well as copies of crucial message recovered from the post office at Ekaterinburg was rescued from oblivion and is no doubt already in circulation among Russia's anti-Socialist intellectuals.

The Sokolov Archive also uncovers completely the elaborate measures taken by the Bolsheviks to conceal their crime, including the burning of the bodies, the dissolution of the remaining bones with sulphuric acid and the dumping of the entire residue in a disused iron ore shaft in the forest outside Ekaterinburg.

If any doubt remained about final responsibility for the crime, this would have been dispelled by a telegram in code addressed to Yankel Sverdlov, supreme head of the Cheka secret police and then probably more powerful than his close associate Lenin.

A fact of major importance emerges: The Tsar and his family were not killed by Russian revolutionaries.

Wilton says that at the beginning of July (1918) suspicion must have arisen among "the Jewish camarilla" that the Russian soldiers guarding the Imperial Family were undergoing a change of attitude. Coarse, drunken and rabidly revolutionary as they were, they were beginning to show signs of feeling sorry for their charges. So Avdeiev, the Russian who had been in charge in the house, was dismissed and the Russian soldiers moved to quarters on the other side of the lane.

These changes were made by Yankel Yurovsky, son of a local Jew ex-convict and head of the Ekaterinburg section of the Cheka. Yurovsky brought with him a squad of 10 soldiers believed to be of mixed German-Magyar descent, possibly imported from Hungary, as their scribbles on the walls of the house seemed to indicate.

The Russian soldiers were given the task of mounting guard outside the house until the evening of July 16 when all their weapons, Nagan pistols, were collected and handed over to Yurovsky.

Wilton has provided a detailed account of the last moments of the Imperial Family and their trusted servants drawn from the sworn testimony of several of those who were present in the death chamber and others who were immediately outside. One Medvedev, the only Russian who remained with Yurovsky, after-

wards told his wife exactly what had happened, boasting that he was the only Russian workman who participated, the others being, as he put it, "not ours."

Leon Trotsky in his diary, now at Harvard, records that on a visit to Moscow immediately after the fall of Ekaterinburg to the White Army, he asked Sverdlov: "And where is the Tsar?" Sverdlov replied that he had been shot. "And the family?" "Also shot," replied Sverdlov, "What of it?" "Who decided it?" asked Trotsky. Sverdlov's reply: "We decided it here. Ilyich (Lenin) said that we should not allow them to have a living banner."

The Jewish character of the regicide was masked only by the figure of one Beloborodov. This man, the leader of the Urals mineworkers, had been arrested for an offense for which, under Soviet law, he could have been executed. Goloshchekin, the Urals Cheka chief, instead of shooting him, installed him as President of the Urals Regional Soviet. In this way he deceived the local workers, a self-willed lot who were averse to being ruled from Moscow and even more keenly averse to being ruled by Jews. Beloborodov, an ardent revolutionary, thus made the perfect puppet; and it was in his name that the crucial coded telegram was sent informing Sverdlov and Lenin that the entire family, and not only the Tsar, had been killed.

By this time the Provisional Government to which the Tsar had handed over power on his abdication had been taken over entirely by the Bolsheviks. And the Germans had begun to realize that they were losing their control over the revolutionaries they had sent in to topple the old regime. One sign of this was the assassination in Moscow of their chief representative, the Ambassador Mirbach.

A confused situation had developed. There is good reason to believe that the Germans, now distrusting the Provisional Government, had been secretly planning to bring the Royal Family back from Tobolsk where they had been exiled since the year before, dislodge the Bolsheviks, and set up a new government under Alexis, the Tsar's son, or some other member of the Romanov clan. The plan failed. The Tsar, while being brought from Tobolsk, was stopped by the Bolsheviks at Ekaterinburg and held prisoner with the rest of his retinue.

The Bolsheviks were naturally most anxious to conceal from the Russian people, and from the whole world, the truth about what had happened at Ekaterinburg; and it was only by a wholly unexpected combination of circumstances that they did not

succeed. One factor was the recapture of the town by the White Army only nine days after the crime was committed, and another was the availability of so gifted and dedicated an investigator as Nicolai Sokolov. One of the first things found when a layer of ice and other debris had been removed from the iron ore shaft was the body of Jemmy, the little King Charles spaniel which had accompanied its young master the Tsarevich to the death chamber.

Meanwhile the Bolshevik version of what had happened has already been accepted in the West. In the London *Times* of July 22, 1918, it was reported that there had been a conspiracy to rescue "the tyrant Romanov," and that the Central Committee in Moscow had accepted the decision of the local Urals Committee to shoot him. The rest of the family, the *Times* reported, had been moved to a place of safety.

This report, virtually every word of it untrue, reveals what was to be the attitude of the entire "capitalist" West towards a supposedly anticapitalist revolutionary movement which had recently robbed Britain and France of a loyal ally in their war against Germany.

An altogether new story had to be improvised by the Bolsheviks when they realized that the White Army had proof that the entire Royal Family had perished. So a year later, disregarding their own previous official statement, they announced that the Soviet authorities at Perm had brought to trial 28 persons accused of murdering the Royal Family and its retinue, eleven in all. One Yakhonov was said to have admitted that they had arranged the murder to bring discredit on the Soviet authorities.

In a further attempt to suppress the truth or confuse the issue, the Jewish Board of Deputies and the Anglo-Jewish Association in London published a statement by the first man who had been asked by Admiral Kolchak to investigate the fate of the Tsarist family. Starnykevich, who, as it turned out, was himself a Jew, declared that no trace of Jewish involvement had been found. As Wilton points out, Starnykevich would have known perfectly well that the Urals Regional Council of Deputies responsible for the fate of the Royal Family consisted of five members: Beloborodov, the Russian dummy as president, Goloshchekin, Safarov, Volkov and Syromolotov, all four Jews; and that the Cheka was run by Goloshchekin, Efremov, Chustkevich and three other Jews. It was these men who were entrusted with the task of wiping out the Royal Family. The local Council, "representatives of the people,"

were only told four days later that the Tsar has been shot.

So there can be no doubt whatsoever about the *identity* of those responsible for the regicide. Moreover, by some strange irresistible impulse, the killers left their racial and national signature in the death chamber in the form of two lines from the Jewish poet Heine about the fate of the King of the Chaldeans, replacing "Belshazzar" with "Belsatza" to suit the occasion. The words had been written in pencil on the wallpaper.

Since it was Russian nationhood itself that was marked down for destruction, anything that could arm the Russian people with a sense of identity and historical continuity, anything that could serve as a "banner," as Lenin called it, had to be eliminated.

Hence the hunting down of the rest of the Romanovs. First to go was the Tsar's brother, the Grand Duke Michael, whom Nicholas had nominated as his successor when he abdicated. Michael had vanished from the hotel in Perm a month earlier never to be seen again. Six other Romanovs, including the Empress's sister, who had been detained at Perm, died 24 hours after the Ekaterinburg killing. They were told they had to be moved, left the town in small horse-drawn carriages, driven a few miles through the forest and bludgeoned to death. The site had been well chosen—quite close to some disused iron ore shafts down which their bodies were flung.

It was clearly established, too, that the order for these killings came from Sverdlov in Moscow, and was carried out by the local Commissar for Justice, the Jews Soloviev and Goloshchekin and their Russian puppet Beloborodov.

Another group of prisoners, all of them members of the Royal household, who had been transferred from the jail at Ekaterinburg, were also slaughtered. The Tsar's former valet, Volkov, managed to escape into the forest as the killing began and was able to give Sokolov an exact account of what happened. On January 29, 1919, half a year later, four more Romanovs, long held in captivity at Petrograd were transferred to the Fortress of SS Peter and Paul and shot.

The Tragedy that befell the Romanovs epitomizes the greater tragedy which engulfed all the people of the Russian Empire, as the history of the Revolution period epitomizes the global tragedy of an age of conflict and suffering unprecedented in recorded history.

The total meaning of it all can be compressed into four words—the destruction of nations. And even into one word: genocide.

The Red Terror which, in one form or another, was to cost the lives of millions was proclaimed on September 1, 1918, less than two months after the Ekaterinburg massacre. The immediate excuse for it was the murder of one of the Petrograd Cheka chiefs Uritsky—by another Jew, as it turned out—and an attempt on the life of Lenin. One of Lenin's closest associates, Zinoviev (real name Apfelbaum) declared that 90 million of the Russian people would be "won over, and the rest annihilated."

There had been too many signs that the Russian people were emerging from the stupor into which they had been plunged by the Revolution. At Perm, for example, a large crowd had turned out to pay their last respects at a public burial of the Romanovs recovered from the iron ore shafts by the White Army authorities. More and more people had begun to realize that the Revolution—their Revolution—had been taken over by a leadership which they would describe as "not ours."

There was no way in which honest common purpose could be established between the Bolsheviks and the people. Only by violence and terror could the new leaders hope to remain in power.

Robert Wilton sums up as follows: "The whole record of Bolshevism in Russia is indelibly impressed with the stamp of alien invasion. The murder of the Tsar, deliberately planned by the Jew Sverdlov and carried out by the Jews Goloshchekin, Syromolotov, Safarov, Voikov and Yurvsky, is the act, not of the Russian people, but of this hostile invader."

There can be only one valid reason for retrieving information about the past which could excite strong feelings of animosity or fear: When it is the knowledge we need and must have if we are to understand what is happening today, inside and outside the Soviet Union. It is not enough to know that the Russian Revolution had all the characteristics of a foreign invasion; we need to find out how the seemingly impossible was accomplished, the overthrow by so tiny a foe of one of the world's great empires.

The short explanation to be found in the Sokolov Archive is that the Russian leaders did not understand what was happening. Their thinking was fatally flawed. They couldn't tell friend from foe. Those who find the Jewish hand everywhere in the assassination of the Royal Family, says Sokolov, must bear in mind the formidable numerical preponderance of the Jews in the Soviet administration.

Lists of the family names and cognomens of all the members of the ruling bodies of the Soviet Administration in 1917-18 is included in Sokolov's book *Les Derniers Jours des Romanov* published in

Paris in 1921 and also in the French edition of Wilton's book. Sokolov found that out of 556 of the most important functionaries of the Bolshevik state in 1918-19 there were 457 Jews. Of the 99 others there were only 19 Russians, the rest being Letts (35), Germans (15), Armenians (11), Georgians (10), plus smaller numbers of Poles, Finns, Czechs, etc.

What is equally significant is that out of 61 individuals at the head of the leftist or progressive "opposition" parties, there were 55 Jews and only six Russians. These parties, all supposedly anti-Bolshevist, had the effect of preempting any serious attempt by the Russians to pull themselves together and mount an effective opposition. We see also how use was made of members of minority groups within the Russian empire, most of them traditionally hostile to the Russians, to mask the essentially Jewish character which the Revolution finally assumed.

The actual Jewish preponderance may have been even greater, since it is highly likely that many of those described as Russians, Letts, Ukrainians, etc. were in fact Jews.

Was Lenin a Jew? What has been the role of the Jews in the conduct of affairs in the Soviet Union in the 70 years and more following the Revolution? Jewish identity and the way in which it has been manipulated for political purposes is explored more thoroughly in Chapter 3.

Any account of what happened in Petrograd and Moscow in 1917 would be incomplete without some reference to what happened outside Russia as Zionism and Communism triumphed simultaneously. In the same week early in September 1917 power passed finally into the hands of Lenin and his fellow conspirators; and British and American leaders, yielding to enormous pressure, committed themselves to the recognition of a future state of Israel and of its people as a nation—the Balfour Declaration.

There was thus created, almost at the same moment, what Douglas Reed, another London *Times* European correspondent, described as "a bicephalous monster, one head being the power of Communism advancing from captive Russia."³

There must be few periods of great historical change—if any—for which we have a more trustworthy and detailed account than that which witnessed the overthrow of the monarchy in Russia and its replacement with an alien reign of tyranny and terror.

Robert Wilton had spent 40 years in Russia, had perfect command of the language and a scholar's knowledge of the empire's

history; he was personally acquainted with all the principal personalities, including the Imperial Family, and enjoyed unusual freedom of movement as London *Times* special correspondent. His story of what happened is told in his book *Russia's Agony*, published in London in 1918 before he left to join up with Admiral Kolchak's White Army advancing westward in Siberia.

There had been revolutionary activity in Russia long before the events of 1917-18 as in all the countries of the West, one example of this being the conspiracy of army officers who had borne the brunt of the disaster and humiliation of Napoleon's invasion of 1812. Such revolution, however, was only part of an essentially evolutionary process, aimed at reform rather than at an overthrow of the entire existing order.

One of the main features of this natural evolutionary process was the efflorescence of a wonderful literature, now recognized as one of the great treasures of Western culture, with writers like Pushkin, Dostoevsky, Gogol, Chekhov, Gorky and Tolstoy. These writers did not concern themselves with campaigning for any particular political creed but illuminate the general intelligence with marvellously exact portrayals of the existing reality.

There was considerable evolutionary development after the first semipopular Socialist revolution of 1905, one of the changes it produced being the setting up of the first parliament or Duma, elected by a wide peasant suffrage, with Stolypin as Prime Minister. Underground revolutionary activity, however, continued apace, with three ministers in a row being assassinated. Many of the assassins were young Jews who also carried out hundreds of murders of policemen and the robbing of banks to gain funds for the revolution. Terrorist crimes, in turn, gave rise to a succession of pogroms.

After the assassination of Stolypin, progress continued at much the same rate under his successor Kokovtsov, and Russia enjoyed an unprecedented decade of material progress and prosperity in which the new local authorities or *Zemstvos* and the Cooperative Movement played a main part. Thousands of miles of main railway line with hundreds of miles of line on both sides, opened up vast areas for settlement and agrarian development, especially in Siberia.

But there always remained the ulcer of a seemingly insoluble political problem—the presence of a resolutely unassimilable Jewish minority, widely distributed but closely knit by their own

lines of communication which also kept them in continuous touch with Jews living in all the Western countries, the so-called Ashkenazim, Jews of southeast Russian ancestry.

In a word, the Russians were yearning for change and improvement. The newly emerging educated class became infatuated with Marxism, both as a life philosophy and a program for political change, and therefore welcomed to their ranks their Jewish fellow citizens who seemed to have embraced the same utopian faith.

One of the keys to the Revolution riddle was the conference of Russia's Social Democrats in Stockholm in 1908, where the word "Bolshevik" first came into use.

All the delegates were agreed in their attachment to the teachings of Karl Marx, but were divided, or so it seemed, on the question of ways and means for putting them into effect. One lot, led by Lenin, insisted on radical activism, including sanguinary conflict, and were called the Bolsheviki because they formed a majority. The others argued for the elimination of capitalism by means of propaganda and organization. These being the minority were called the "Mensheviki." More precisely in Russian, they were the "larger" and "lesser."

So it is the Stockholm conference, a riddle within a riddle, that needs to be unravelled first.

Before all else, we need to clarify our minds about the meanings of the words used. Those whom Wilton calls "pseudo-Jews," presumably to distinguish them from "religious Jews," could also be called "pseudo-Russians," concealing their identity behind Russian names, like Trotsky for Bronstein, Stekhov for Nahamkez, etc. They were of the leadership class, Jewish nationalists, better educated and in constant touch with the Jewish leadership abroad, nearly all of them atheists.

We also need to take a closer look at the word "socialists" *in this context*. We find that it has two radically different meanings: 1. those who believe in socialism as a philosophy and as a program for political change, and; 2. those who don't believe in it, but recognize it as a valuable device to be used in the conduct of political warfare.

The "Bolsheviki" were no doubt the "larger" group at the Stockholm conference, but certainly not in Russia.

And a new dimension in the science of dissimulation was established as pseudo-Russians, really Jewish nationalists, gained

control of all the socialist and progressive parties set up *to oppose the Bolsheviki*.

Strictly speaking, therefore, there was no such thing as a Bolshevik Revolution. There was a Jewish war of national aggression carried out under cover of a Russian socialist revolution.

What really happened was that the reformist Duma representatives, supported by Russian socialists, and with the backing of the discontented population, succeeded in overthrowing the old order—only to have victory snatched from their hands in the appalling disorder that ensued by a highly organized and well funded Jewish nationalist minority.

As words and names are defined or explained, we get a clear and coherent mind-picture of what happened in Petrograd; and we are saved from having our minds swamped by a huge superfluity of facts.

For the purposes of this chapter all that needs to be said about Marxist Socialism is that it had the effect of an acquired immune deficiency syndrome, depriving many of the Russian educated of spiritual resource with which to combat the virulent infection of a covert Jewish nationalism. In a word, Marxist Socialism, a new brand of utopianism, like a "lie in the soul," reduced the Russian educated to a condition of political disablement. (See Chapter 18, A Disabled Intellect.)

Conditions in Russia in early 1917 met all the requirements of revolutionary change. Discontent had long been fermenting. The country had been involved for two and a half years in an unsuccessful and badly mismanaged war. The monarchy had been brought into disrepute by the combined influence of a thoroughly neurotic Empress and a well-meaning but weak Tsar, culminating in the appalling Rasputin scandal. Hence the Revolution had a great army of adherents among civilians and soldiers.

Generalizations about what happened would be of little historical value unless supported with a vast quantity of factual eyewitness evidence of the kind supplied by Robert Wilton and the Sokolov Archive.

The story of what happened from March 1917 onward cannot be told consecutively because so many things were being made to happen simultaneously by three quite different sets of people, each with its own ideas and objectives. These were: 1. the elected Duma representatives under the leadership of the Duma president

Rodzianko, 2. various opposition groups outside the Duma, and 3. the Jewish nationalists who can be labeled the Bolsheviks.

The scene present in Petrograd was thus like a vast stage on which three dramas were unfolding simultaneously, their scenarios interconnected in a bewildering variety of ways.

Since the Bolsheviks were *deliberately* creating a state of chaos and confusion which they would be able to exploit to their own advantage, only they knew all the time exactly what was happening.

The procedure can be defined as follows: The creation of chaos and its reformulation into substance and order.

The power of the Bolsheviks, therefore, depended at first entirely on their power to incite the masses, including some of the military, and bring them onto the streets. This power they were able to exercise at will because, 1. they already had a vast network of trained and experienced subversive activists under their command, and 2. they dominated the printing trade, including the newspapers.

After Rodzianko had failed in his attempt to secure the cooperation of members of the government who had their base at the Marie Palace, he returned to the Tauris Palace which housed the Duma; and a Provisional Government was constituted on Thursday, March 15, with Prince Lvov as Prime Minister and Minister of the Interior, and a cabinet of ten others, not all of them former Duma members.

On Tuesday night, March 20 Petrograd was entirely in the hands of the revolutionaries and nominally under the control of the reconstructed Duma. Moscow had joined in the movement and the police and other representatives of the old regime dispossessed of power with little or no bloodshed. The railways were working again, the fires had been put out and the entire population was exulting in the supposed triumph of representative rule over a failed autocracy.

"It was an inspiring sight," says Wilton, "to watch regiment after regiment marching to present its homage to the Duma . . . Inside the Duma I watched a stirring spectacle. Hundreds of the Preobrazhensky were lined up inside the huge lobby and presented arms to President Rodzianko."

The purpose of the new Duma was not the abolition of the monarchy, but just *reform* in which the monarchy as symbol of nationhood would still have a part to play.

It was at this stage, after the Tsar had abdicated, formally handing over power to a Provisional Government, that Lenin and his comrades found it safe to reveal their presence and take over full control of the revolution; plans for this operation had been concerted on an international scale at a conference at Berne, Switzerland.

How much actual power Lenin exercised at this stage is arguable, for there is some reason to believe that even after the Bolsheviks had captured the government, most power was in the hands of Yankel Sverdlov as "Red Tsar" or head of the Cheka secret police.

Shortly before the Provisional Government was set up, there had come into existence a "Soviet," or council, to which soldiers and workers had been invited to send their representatives—all this under the control of the Socialists outside the Duma, nearly all of them *Russian* Socialists, and with a Russian leader, one Chkheidze. This Soviet, volubly supportive of the Provisional Government, had moved into the great Hall of Sessions at the Tauris Palace. As was only to be expected, this development had the blessing of Rodzianko and the members of the new Duma who welcomed all the support they could get during this period of general upheaval. Significantly, too, the Soviet was at first broadly patriotic and in favor of a continuation of the war against Germany.

And so, there could have been no overthrow of the old regime and no setting up of a Provisional Government without the activities of the Socialists outside the Duma; and these Socialists could have achieved little or nothing without the Bolsheviks who, working in secret, had brought the mobs onto the streets and precipitated mutiny in some of the Guards units.

The Duma and the Russian-dominated Soviet could try to create a new order, but all in vain, for the real power remained with the Bolsheviks and their ability of bringing mobs into the streets and create unmanageable situations at will. For this purpose all that was needed was the quick dissemination of some message warning of another attempt by the old regime to stage a counter-revolutionary coup.

On the other hand, the Bolsheviks needed both the Russian-dominated Soviet and the Provisional Government in order to hold things together until they could maneuver themselves into a position to take over entirely.

In retrospect, the plan of action can be clearly perceived: as the Duma became increasingly dependent on the support of the Soviet, so the center of gravity of authority shifted from the Duma to the Soviet; while, at the same time, by means of a succession of secret moves, the center of gravity of power in the Soviet shifted towards the Bolsheviks in their midst.

What happened is now history: The Soviet gained full control of the Duma, and the Bolsheviks gained full control of the Soviet. The key to the riddle was mob control; by mob control and disorder, the Duma could be made more dependent on the Soviet, and by mob control, those Russians still exercising some patriotic or moderating influence in the Soviet could be edged out and replaced with Bolsheviks, or Russians totally under Bolshevik control. All very simple when understood, but utterly baffling to political leaders not privy to the plan.

One of the early signs that the Provisional Government was yielding to pressure from the Soviet came only a few days after it had been inaugurated with the public pronouncement that soldiers must enjoy the same right to go on strike as workmen.

The Duma was allowed to go on believing that it was in control because it represented legitimacy and enjoyed popular support as the country's "savior"; and the Soviet, with its Russian leadership and majority was allowed to go on believing that Russia's imagined glorious new future was in its hands.

The Jewish nationalists were exhibiting a bewildering superiority in the art and science of the exercise of political power, a skill which the nations of the West, living as homogeneous communities within territorial boundaries, have never needed to acquire, a kind of warfare conducted almost exclusively on the battleground of the mind.

Seditious literature, distributed among the soldiers and sailors promising grants of land and other benefits to those who quit the armed forces, had the desired effect and greatly hampered the war effort. Agents of the Soviet had set up "committees" among the soldiers at the front, like those already in existence at Petrograd, Moscow and elsewhere. Worse still, the Provisional Government, yielding to Soviet persuasion, then passed a law abolishing capital punishment; the result was a fast-spreading disciplinary paralysis which the General Staff was powerless to check. Some generals had even been dismissed for daring to interfere with these "soldiers' committees."

* * * * *

From Russia, after the end of the Second World War, the terrorism and tyranny of Jewish nationalism spread like colonies of cancer cells all over Eastern Europe.

In Communist Poland, U.S. Ambassador Bliss Lane recorded the predominance of Jews in the key posts of population control.

In Hungary, Matyas Rakosi (born Roth) was installed as Prime Minister with Red Army support, his cabinet "predominantly Jewish," as the *London Times* reported.

In Czechoslovakia, as the *New Statesman* magazine commented, "both the party intellectuals and the key men in the secret police are Jewish in origin."

Of Romania, the *New York Times* reported in 1953: "Romania, together with Hungary, has probably the greatest number of Jews in its administration." There the terror raged under Anna Pauker, the daughter of a rabbi.

In East Germany the Communist reign of terror was presided over by the dreaded Hilde Benjamin, first as vice-president of the Supreme Court, than as Minister of Justice.

Everywhere the same revolutionary pattern has been seen: population control as a means of creating disorder and of undermining the status quo; the creation of chaos and its reformulation as order by an alliance of Money and Jewish nationalism to meet the requirements of a planned "New World Order."

An excellent summary of history was provided in 1920 by Winston Churchill, then Secretary of War and Air in the British Government, who had at his service the entire investigative resources of his government's military intelligence and diplomatic corps. He wrote in an article in the *London Illustrated Sunday Herald*: "This movement among the Jews is not new. From the days of Spartacus-Weishaupt to those of Karl Marx, down to Trotsky (Russia), Bela Kun (Hungary), Rosa Luxembourg (Germany) and Emma Goldman (United States) this worldwide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilization and for the reconstruction of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence and impossible equality, has been steadily growing."

Churchill, however, had fallen into an error of profound importance: he had allowed himself to be persuaded that Zionism

was meant by Western Jews to serve as a bulwark against an atheistic Russian Communism, when the two were, in fact, only two arms of the same conspiracy.

Notes

1. *This Age of Conflict*, F.P. Chambers, C.P. Harris, and C.G. Bayley (Harcourt Brace & Co.).
2. Robert Wilton, *Russia's Agony* and *The Last Days of the Romanovs*.
3. Douglas Reed, *Far and Wide* and *The Controversy of Zion*.

CHAPTER THREE

The Identity Problem

The first requirement is to trace back to its source that vast historical phenomenon which we call "the Jews." Are they a people which has persisted down the ages, like the Chinese, or are the Jewish people only the vehicle of an idea capable of being carried by people of many different kinds?

Douglas Reed, in his monumental work *The Controversy of Zion* is emphatic about the time and place "where it all began":

The true start of this affair occurred on a day in 459 BC which this narrative will reach in its sixth chapter. On the day the petty Palestinian tribe of Judah (earlier disowned by the Israelites) produced a racial creed, the disruptive effect of which on subsequent human affairs may have exceeded that of explosives or epidemics. This was the day on which the theory of the master-race was set up as "the law." At the time Judah was a small tribe among the subject people of the Persian king, and what today is known as the "West" could not even be imagined. Now the Christian era is nearly two thousand years old and "Western civilization," which grew out of it, is threatened with disintegration.

There can be no doubt that the "small tribe" of which Reed writes has been dissipated to as near vanishing point as makes no difference by centuries of cross-breeding with host populations. As the anthropologists would say, "of the Judaic gene pool of 459 BC virtually nothing remains."

But, a Judaism traceable all the way back to 459 BC persists to this day.

However, as we now know with equal certainty, there is an even wider genealogical gulf than that caused by the progressive dilution of the decendants of the Jews of the Bible: the vast majority of those who today call themselves Jews are the much diluted

decendants of a people called the Khazars, a people of Turkik origin who once held sway over a vast empire extending from the Black Sea to the Caspian and from the Caucasus to the Volga and whose rulers about 740 AD decided to accept Judaism as a state religion.¹

It goes without saying that there can be no clarity of thought about the Jewish or Zionist presence in 20th century history unless we are clear in our minds about the meaning of the primary component of our field of inquiry, namely the concept "Jew." What is a Jew, and who are the Jewish people? What is "Judaism"?

Dr. Nahum Goldmann, who, for some years, was president of both the World Jewish Congress and World Zionist Organization, remarks in his book *The Jewish Paradox*: "I remember giving a lecture when I was a student during which I offered more than twenty definitions: Judaism is a religion, a people, a nation, a cultural community, etc. None of them was absolutely correct."²

None of these definitions could be "absolutely correct" because all of them were aspects of a single reality—the Jewish reality. Dr. Goldmann admits that he ceased to be "orthodox in a religious sense" when he was 17 and that many modern Jews have ceased to be "believers." In fact "orthodox" or believing Jews today form only a small minority.

Dr. Goldmann rejects a definition by one of Jewry's most staunch defenders, Jean-Paul Sartre: "A Jew is anyone whom other people designate as such." Sartre, was a living contradiction of his own definition, himself a Jew, though not generally recognized as such.

So how is the puzzle to be resolved? Short answer: Among the Jews themselves the identity problem is of minor significance; Jews can be of innumerable different kinds, some of them believers, most of them unbelievers, of different appearance, speaking different languages, and yet all mutually recognizable as Jews. And the authority that decides unhesitatingly in all local communities is an organization or group called Beth Din.

Today's Jews thus fall into two main divisions: the Sephardim and the Ashkenazim. The Sephardim can claim descent from those Jews of the "dispersion" who settled in North Africa, Spain and elsewhere around the Mediterranean, and the Ashkenazim are of East European origin. The Sephardim spoke a Spanish-Hebrew dialect called Ladino and the Ashkenazim a German-Hebrew dialect known as Yiddish.

The best modern summary of all the historical, anthropological and linguistic information on this subject is that provided by Arthur Koestler in his book *The Thirteenth Tribe*. He tells us that in the 1960s it was estimated that the Sephardim numbered 500,000, the rest of the Jewish population, numbered in millions, being Ashkenazim. Since it would have needed some Jews of Palestinian origin to effect the conversion of the Khazar upper classes, it can be taken for granted that these could have made some slight contribution to the Khazar genetic inheritance.

The implications of the long-suppressed truth are of paramount importance: there is no such thing as a "Jewish race," and all except a tiny minority of today's Jews have no ancestral connection with the Jews of the Bible. Hence the word "anti-Semitism" has no meaning except as a weapon in modern political warfare. There can be no hostility towards Jews on grounds of race because they have no separate *Western* racial identity and certainly are *not* "Semites." There are Jews continuously disappearing into host populations never to be indentified again as Jews, a process of assimilation which produces very different results where a genuine difference of race exists.

It was because Shakespeare fully understood this that, in his play *The Merchant of Venice*, he was able to marry off Shylock's daughter Jessica to one of Antonio's companions without any risk of offending the susceptibilities of an English audience.

It is the writer's purpose in this book to explore and explain a Jewish "identity" which is not of race, but which throughout history has been liable to evoke among host populations reactions of antagonism and even hostility.

So how does Judaism relate to Zionism? There can be no more authoritative answer to that question than one provided by Dr. Chaim Weizmann who was present at the birth of Zionism, was for many years its principal spokesman and protagonist in the Western world, and who became the first president of the Zionist state of Israel.

Dr. Weizmann in his autobiography *Trial and Error* says that the Jews in Russia were divided into three groups. The first of these, whom he describes as "renegades," were the few who only wanted to be able to live in peace as Russian citizens. The rest, who formed a substantial majority, were split down the center, one half of them Communist activists bent on getting a world revolution started in Russia and the others Zionists who insisted on the

setting up of a Jewish nation state as the first priority. Jewish households, including Dr. Weizmann's own, could be sharply divided on this issue.

The apparent mutual antagonism of the two groups had an important part to play in the grand revolutionary drama, for it enabled Dr. Weizmann and his henchmen to persuade Western political leaders, Winston Churchill included, that support for Zionism was the best way of halting the threatened march of revolutionary Communism. We can now see more clearly that the two were directed from *a single source* and were designed to converge. It stands to reason that the destruction of nations, leaving only one to survive and rule, requires pressure from below (Communist revolution) and from above (Zionist exercise of the "power of the purse").

Zionism can also be defined as a form of Talmudic Judaism transformed into a chauvinistic secular nationalism, with the religious factor excluded except for what use can be made of it in the conduct of modern political warfare. Like Dr. Weizmann, nearly all Zionist leaders have been "unbelievers."

So much for the identity of Jews in general and of Zionism as a modern Jewish nationalist movement; what now needs to be explored, if history is to be rendered intelligible, is the issue of personal or individual Jewish identity.

The subject has been deliberately shrouded with mystification, for a reason which can be stated quite simply: a nationalism which lacks a substantial territorial base, a nationalism which largely exists and is promoted by a people thinly dispersed among other populations, must operate in secrecy. It only needs Zionism to be clearly identified and its long-term aims known, and that would be the end of the great Communist-Zionist twentieth century adventure. Therefore always a pressing need to conceal the identity of those who have their hands on the levers of great power.

* * * * *

So let us begin with Lenin and Stalin, two of the most influential figures in twentieth century power politics.

How genuine was the non-Jewish image which these two men bore and which proved so advantageous in masking the essentially Jewish character of the Bolshevik Revolution and of Communism in general?

What we do know for sure is that while the Soviet government and Communist spokesmen abroad have continued to exhibit both leaders as Russians, it has always been the policy to discourage any exploration of their antecedents. Consequently, we have no thoroughly trustworthy source material about the parentage of either man, but must depend on information acquired from persons who might reasonably have been expected to know the truth, supported by inferences to be drawn from these leaders' own actions and utterances.

What information we have about Lenin can be summed up as follows: he was born and christened at Simbirsk in 1870; his father Elias (or Ilya) Ulyanov was a Russian with some Tatar or Kalmuck blood, a mixture not uncommon in the Volga region in those days; his mother, born Marie Blank, was certainly Jewish on her father's side and may have been Jewish on her mother's side as well.

There has been complete frankness about Lenin's father, possibly because here there was nothing to hide. Lenin's paternal grandfather Nicholas was smart enough, like many others in his situation, to buy himself out of serfdom and set himself up as a tailor in the Volga town of Astrakhan. Nicholas's eldest son also did well in commerce, making it possible for a younger brother, Elias (Lenin's father), to gain a good education and graduate in mathematics and natural sciences at the Kazan University; this son of a former serf had a brilliant career in the public service, attaining the rank of "actual state councillor," equivalent to the rank of major-general in the army, and access to the ranks of the hereditary nobility.

It is over Lenin's mother, born Maria Blank, that a heavy fog of official reticence has fallen. There is evidence to support the statement that Maria's father, Alexander Blank, was a Jew from Odessa who prospered considerably after his conversion to Christianity.³

Here is a sample of the kind of evidence about Alexander Blank that is now available in the West: The French monthly *Lectures Francaise* (No. 163, November 1970) cited from the Jewish periodical *Review de Fonds Social Juif* (No. 161, 1970) a report to the effect that Marietta Shaguinian, a well known Soviet novelist of Armenian descent, has been prevented from publishing some new material about one Alexander Blank which she had come upon by chance while carrying out research at the archives at Simbirsk about the early days of the famous annual trade fair at Nizhni-

Novgorod (Gorky); named among the entrepreneurs involved in the fair, including her own grandfather, she found mention of one Sender Blank, a Jewish merchant, who later appeared as Alexander Blank after having accepted conversion to Christianity, together with his family. This Blank had a daughter Miriam, born at Simbirsk in 1835, whose name on conversion was changed to Maria. There has never been any secret about the place and date of the birth of Lenin's mother: Simbirsk, 1835.

The statement that Alexander Blank, *together with his family* accepted conversion and that the name of their daughter was then changed from Miriam to Maria implies that both parents were Jewish.

Marietta Shaguinian prepared all her findings for publication in the Soviet historical monthly *Veprosy Istorii* (Problems of History) in the summer of 1964. But then the local Soviet censorship "considering the matter of serious importance, alerted the Politbureau which requested the Russian Patriarchy to present information about Blank's conversion. Having examined the file, the Politbureau refused permission for the publication of Marietta Shaguinian's discoveries."

Stalin's Jewish biographer, Isaac Deutscher, described Lenin as "a slightly Russified German or Balt," but Jewish biographer David Shub (*Lenin: a Biography*, New York, 1948) declared emphatically in a letter to the Russian emigre paper *Novyi Zhurnal* (No. 63, 1961) that Alexander Blank was a baptized Jew from Odessa. Shub wrote further that a Soviet Jewish historian, Saul Ginsburg, found the Alexander Blank file in the archives of the former Holy Synod and that it was promptly taken away from him, after which one of his research colleagues told him that this "Alexander Blank" was Lenin's grandfather.

That document would, of course, have settled the question of the identity of Lenin's maternal grandmother. What is known is that her maiden name was Anna Grosschopf and that she was the daughter of a wealthy Petersburg merchant. Professor Georg von Rauch of Munich wrote in *Osteuropa* (No. 4, 1970) that Anna's father was a German, Johann Gottlieb Grosschopf, born in Lubeck in 1766 who went to St. Petersburg in 1790 where he became a prosperous merchant. On the other hand, Lenin's wife Krupskaya, of Russified Polish descent, wrote in 1938 in the Soviet party monthly *Bolshevik* that Anna's father was a German born in Ukraine.

The question, then, is whether or not Lenin's maternal grandmother, Anna Grosschopf, was also of Jewish parentage like her husband. Certainly she brought a good deal of money into the marriage, making it possible for Alexander Blank, her husband, to buy an estate at Kokushkine and to be received into the lesser nobility.

Lenin's friend, N. Valentinov, who wrote in friendly tones about Lenin in emigré periodicals after his own break with the Bolsheviks, makes a statement which may throw some light on this question, remarking that Lenin's father, *in contrast with his wife Maria*, was deeply religious and attended church regularly, accompanied by his children; in other words, it would seem that Lenin's mother, Maria Blank, *avoided going to church*. And Lenin claimed to have been an atheist from the age of 16 years.

If Lenin's genealogical background was of such kind that he could be received and accepted as a Jew and yet retain all the outward appearance and known background of a Russian, that would have made him most valuable political property, all the more so because of his great skill as a proponent of the doctrines of Karl Marx.

Stalin, real name Joseph Vissarionovich Djugashvili, falls into another category. The son of a shoemaker, born in Tiflis, his identity as an ethnic Georgian has never been questioned and he has been castigated ever since his death as an ardent anti-Semite. However, his Jewish wife Rosa Kaganovich, was the sister of Lazar Kaganovich, for many years the second most powerful man in the Soviet Union, whose three brothers were commissars. His son married a Jewess and his daughter married a Jew. What effect all this has in turning Stalin into some kind of "Jew" will be explained below.

Those who are most securely harnessed to Jewish political, and especially revolutionary, purposes fall into three main classes:

1. The person with mother and father, both Jewish.
2. The product of a mixed marriage, *but only where the mother is Jewish*.
3. The surrogate Jew, a gentile married to a Jewish woman and whose children are brought up as Jews.

The only kind of concealment of identity available to those in the first category was name-changing; and so Apfelbaum became the more Russian-sounding Zinoviev; Sobelsohn became Radek; Helphand, Parvus; Finkelstein, Litvinov; Rosenfeld, Kamenev;

Bronstein, Trotsky; Sennenschein, Malik; Ulbricht, Ustinov; Katz, Gromyko; and so on. It is only the last two categories which call for any explanation.

The London *Jewish Chronicle* of December 22, 1989, reported under the heading "New Jew Checks In" that Nigel Davies, a well known chess player, had recently discovered that he was Jewish, and was off to a new start in Israel. He had evidently mentioned to some Jewish acquaintance that his maternal grandmother was Jewish; that meant that his mother and her children were technically Jewish, in spite of the fact that both his father and maternal grandfather were not. In a word, all that matters is having a Jewish mother; a Jewish father otherwise counts for nothing, as many of the products of mixed marriage have discovered to their chagrin. It is therefore possible, nay, even probable, that many of those apparent "non-Jews" who figured prominently in the Russian revolution, and afterwards down the years in the Soviet regime, listed as Russians, Latvians, Finns, Georgians, Poles, etc, were in fact Jews hiding their identity behind that of their fathers.

Even harder to detect is the surrogate Jew, the gentile who acquires a Jewish wife and, although himself never accepted as a Jew, is tied to the Jewish interest through children who are accepted as Jews. There are good reasons to believe that very many Soviet leaders up to recent times have belonged to this category. Stalin is one of these, and he could hardly have promoted the Jewish nationalist cause with more zeal and consistency if he had belonged to the first category.

"To the end he was obviously not anti-Jewish," writes Douglas Reed of Stalin . . .

Mr. Kaganovich remained at his right hand. A few days before he died Stalin ordered one of the most pompous funerals ever seen in Soviet Moscow to be given to Lev Mechlis, one of the most feared and hated Jewish commissars of the 35 years. Mechlis's coffin was carried by all the surviving grandees of the Bolshevik revolution, who also shared the watch at his lying in state so that this was plainly a warning to the captive Russian masses, if any were still needed, that the law against "anti-Semitism" was still in full force. Immediately after Mechlis's funeral (Jan. 27, 1953) the "Stalin Peace Prize" was with great public ostentation presented to the apostle of Talmudic vengeance, Mr. Ilya Ehrenburg, whose broadcasts to the Red armies as they advanced into Europe incited them not to spare "even unborn Fascists."³

It was for being unable to see eye-to-eye with the Kremlin leadership over the role of Zionism that Stalin fell into disfavor. As a leading American correspondent, Harrison Salisbury remarked at the time, "If Stalin just happened to be struck down by a ruptured artery on March 2nd, it must be recorded as one of the most fortuitous occurrences in history." The release of the Jewish doctors who had been accused of trying to poison him, followed immediately afterwards. Moreover, as recorded in the chapter on the Russian Revolution, the Stalinist regime was responsible for the spread of the Jewish nationalist revolutionary plague all over Eastern Europe and elsewhere after the end of World War II.

The list of Soviet leaders who can be described as crypto-Jews is interminable. *Time* magazine on May 5, 1958, reported that Nikita Krushchev admitted to the Israeli ambassador, Joseph Avidar, that Soviet President Klementi Voroshilov and half of the Presidium had Jewish wives. *Time* magazine stated that Krushchev had a Jewish daughter-in-law and the *Canadian Jewish Press* said that Leonid Brezhnev was married to a Jewess. "Andropov speaks fluent Yiddish," reported the London *Times* in November 1982.

This would indicate that in a European context the Jews do not feel themselves to be of separate race and cheerfully marry some of their daughters into the upper echelons of the host population, gathering the offspring, if they can, into the Jewish community. It is only the Jew who marries a gentile and produces children who cannot be accepted as Jew who is wholly written off.

The Jews discriminate on grounds of race only in respect of populations which are obviously of different race; their daughters keep clear of the newly emerging "upper classes" in most parts of the so-called Third World—in Africa or India, for example—nor are they offered as marriage partners to Black politicians in the United States.

The subject of race is, of course, very complex. The fact that all the peoples of Europe are of the so-called Caucasian race does not mean that there are no perceptible "racial" differences among them. Broadly speaking, for example, the Sephardim are noticeably different from the Ashkenazim, as the English are different from the Irish. The concept of race has another connotation: any inbreeding or endogamous community acquires some of the characteristics of an evolving race, as Professor Keith had explained.⁴ In this sense the Jews, even if they have no heritage of race purity to preserve, are inclined to behave like an

evolving race, evoking a racial response from host populations which are not permitted to assimilate them.

Notes

1. See Arthur Koestler, *The Thirteenth Tribe*; Douglas Reed, *The Controversy of Zion*; R. Gayre, *The Syro-Mesopotamian Ethnology*.
2. Nahum Goldmann, *The Jewish Paradox*.
3. According to a report in the London *Jewish Chronicle* of July 26, 1991, the Moscow weekly *Ogonyok* confirmed that a grandfather of Lenin was Israel Blank, a Ukrainian Jew who converted to the Russian Orthodox Church.
4. Douglas Reed, *The Controversy of Zion*.
5. Sir Arthur Keith, *A New Theory of Human Evolution*.

CHAPTER FOUR

High Finance and a New World Order

The West has been crippled by a corrosive and corrupt ideology-morality that causes our political-intellectual elites to declare themselves in sympathy with, and in support of, the very elements that boldly proclaim their goal to be the destruction of the West.

Richard Clark,
Technological Terrorism

The Jewish role in the West is for most people just as much "a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma" as in the Soviet Union after the Russian Revolution, an enigma rendered virtually impenetrable by a sophisticated system of intellectual terrorism which excludes the subject from public debate.

The consequences, however, are everywhere to be seen, and have been chronicled from time to time, as by Wilmot Robertson in his book *The Dispossessed Majority*, the "majority" being, of course, the "White Anglo-Saxon Protestants" who pioneered and created America.

* * * * *

Two facts of major importance have been established beyond reasonable doubt:

1. The "ideal" of a "new world order" promoted in the Soviet Union ever since the overthrow of the Tsarist regime in Russia in 1917, has had an almost exact counterpart in the West, the two together being like wheels at the opposite ends of one and the same axle shaft.
2. The Jewish presence in the West everywhere exhibits a marvellous unity and continuity of purpose in the promotion of a Jewish national or Zionist ideal, symbolized by and geographically centered in, the state of Israel.

The question to be answered is this: What role, if any, does Zionism play in helping to turn the Western wheel of a one-world ambition?

There can be no answer to that question except one that can be drawn out of a unified interpretation of the history of our country; for how can the Jewish role be properly examined and discussed except in the context of that "storm center of events" of which Professor Arendt writes?¹

Knowledge can be of two kinds: knowledge of the world outside ourselves, the macrocosm, and knowledge of the kingdom within, the microcosm, both of them boundless.

The better we know ourselves, the easier it will be to know the world; alternatively, the better we know the world, so much easier it will be to know ourselves and our deepest and most enduring needs.

It is not more and more knowledge that we need for the purposes of strengthening our position as individuals, but only knowledge of a kind that holds together and makes sense. We need a coherent interpretation of the history of the age in which we live and an insight into what it is that we must have if we are to be physically well and in good spirits.

The following paragraph from a book by three university historians, published in 1949, will serve as a starting point for an exploration of what they describe as "this age of conflict":

Two world wars and their intervening wars, revolutions, and crises are now generally recognized to be episodes in a single age of conflict which began in 1914 and has not yet run its course. It is an age that has brought to the world more change and tragedy than any other in recorded history. Yet, whatever may be its ultimate meaning and consequence, we can already think of it and write of it as *a historic whole*.² (Emphasis added).

An age of conflict that must be thought of "as a whole" must also be capable of being explained and understood as a whole; therefore, it is a highly condensed and simplified synopsis of the history of our century that we must have if the seemingly interminable succession of "episodes" of conflict and tragedy is to be seen as a whole and understood.

The method I have chosen is to begin with a list of categorical statements which can be developed and expanded and supported with an extensive bibliography; here they are:

1. Our century of conflict is the product of an alliance of money and intellect, with intellect almost invariably subordinate to, and at the service of, money; money being in the 20th century the primary source of great power.

2. We need to find and identify the changes which have occurred in the realms of money and of intellect, changes which have made this century so different from all others in recorded history.

3. The change which has occurred in the realm of money is this: Constellations of finance-capitalism which had been separate and nationally oriented were absorbed into a greater constellation of finance-capitalism serving a different set of long-term interests.

4. The change which occurred in the realm of intellect is this: Christian orthodoxy was replaced by an ideology of socialism at the basis of a consensus intellectual frame of reference and system of values. This socialism or secular religion has given rise to what the psychologist Carl Gustav Jung has described as a "psychic epidemic" now afflicting the educated classes in the West.

5. The changes which heralded our century of conflict were first clearly visible in South Africa in the late 1890s, producing the Anglo-Boer War (the first of three great fratricidal wars in the West), the beginning of the end of the British Empire, and the beginning of a new and unprecedented kind of world imperium—money-powered, race-oriented, Zionist national-socialist.

6. These changes in money and intellect have drawn the peoples of the West into a dialectical trap, with money as thesis, socialism as antithesis, and the new imperium as synthesis; money incessantly concentrates power, socialism promises the total dispersal and distribution of power; the resolution of this contradiction supplies the new imperium with its dynamic.

7. The process of the transference of financial power to the new imperium was only completed in the 1930s when J.P. Morgan and the great American pioneering families lost their dominance in Wall Street.

8. The immediate cause of the great increase in conflict all over the world: External interference with the natural hierarchical system or "pecking order" *within and among* ethnic groups, as everywhere states were set up, and regimes established, which have no local or *natural* right to exist. This interference by third parties is what makes episodes of conflict in the 20th century quite different from conflicts in other ages, conferring on all of them a shared meaning.

9. All these developments are linked to the further evil of a system of money creation and debt in which the nations of the West are at the same time offenders and victims.

We can think of our age of conflict as a historic whole, but what reason do we have to believe that it is the product of a uniform and continuous set of identifiable causes?

Students of history can provide innumerable examples of major influences, baffling to all at the time of their occurrence, which yielded finally to quite simple elucidation and explanation.

It is not only in history that events widely separated in space and time can be found to have a combined meaning; for example, a few years ago when over a period of many months there were visitations of freak weather all around the world, in many cases with disastrous consequences, the meteorologists were soon able to trace them all to a single cause or set of causes: they were able at least to show that the storms, floods, hurricanes, droughts, etc. belonged together and had an intelligible combined meaning. Needless to say, the meteorologists were not hindered in their investigations by "no-go" areas of inquiry of the kind to be expected by those who seek to understand worldwide visitations of freak political weather.

We have no reason to suppose that we shall find an explanation of our age of conflict as easy to present and understand as spells of freak weather, but we are encouraged to hope that where we see in many parts of the globe, over many decades, a recognizable pattern of evil consequences, we can expect to find evidence of a uniform pattern of causes.

What is required is an interpretation of the history of our century which will explain and render mutually intelligible the major changes which have occurred—those changes which brought more conflict and tragedy than ever before in recorded history. Among the few books of history in which any attempt has been made to interpret the history of our century as a whole are Oswald Spengler's *The Decline of the West* and Carroll Quigley's *Tragedy and Hope*.

Spengler's main contribution to historiography is his theory of the morphology of history in which he assigns to our present civilization in the West a condition of irreversible decline. Paradoxically, he does not regard this as a pessimistic view. One fact emerges very clearly in Spengler's analysis: What has happened in the 20th century must be seen and studied as an alliance of money and intellect with money, rather than pure politics, as the main moving power in world affairs.

Quigley leaves many things unexplained—he may have done so intentionally—but he supports with a good deal of documentary evidence the thesis that much of what has happened in our century has been deliberately *made to happen*. What he offers is, in fact, a conspiratorial theory of history involving a number of secret and semisecret organizations like the Rhodes Scholarship Trust, the Round Table Movement, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, and the American Council on Foreign Relations, all under the umbrella of what he calls an "Anglo-American network" of businessmen, educationists, politicians, and journalists.

Quigley, who was Professor of History and of International Relations at the Georgetown Foreign Service School, Washington DC, supplies much other well documented information which no one has yet tried to fit into a general interpretation of the history of our century. *Tragedy and Hope* was hastily withdrawn by its publishers, the Macmillan Company, arguably because it was found to have contributed too much to a fully coherent interpretation of the history of our century—to the embarrassment of those who prefer to work under the cloak of secrecy. He writes in *Tragedy and Hope*:

I know of the operations of this network because I have studied it for 20 years and was permitted for two years, in the early 1960's, to examine its papers and secret records. I have no aversion to it or to most of its aims and have, for much of my life, been close to it and many of its instruments. I have objected, both in the past and recently, to a few of its policies . . . but in general my chief difference of opinion is that it wishes to remain unknown, and I believe its role in history is significant enough to be known.

The theory that much of what has happened has been made to happen is further endorsed by another consensus historian, Arnold Toynbee, not in his monumental *A Study of History*, but in his other public utterances, of which the following is an example, from a paper read at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Institute for the Scientific Study of International Relations at Copenhagen in June 1931 (published in *International Affairs*, December 1931):

We are at present working discreetly but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national states of our world. And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands, because to impugn the sovereignty of the local national states of the world is still a heresy for which a statesman or a publicist can be, perhaps not quite burnt at the stake, but certainly ostracized and discredited.

Quite clearly, the denudation of the national states of much of their sovereignty during the 20th century represented to Quigley and Toynbee part of the progressive fulfillment of their ideal of an elaborately planned "brave new world" to be raised on the flattened ruins of the old—for Quigley a world of "hope" with which to replace a world of "tragedy," a world of planned revolutionary change to replace a disorderly world of slow evolutionary change.

Where and when did this age of conflict begin? The three co-authors quoted above³ say that it began in 1914 with World War I; but there are good reasons to believe that it began with the Anglo-Boer War of 1898-1902, which we can now see quite clearly as the beginning of the end of the British world imperium and as marking the inauguration of another imperium of a mysterious kind.

If our century of conflict can be said to have begun with the Anglo-Boer War, then it is in South Africa that we may have the best chance of seeing more clearly the crucial historical change that was to spark off a great chain-reaction of change involving the whole world.

Until that time the record of the British Empire had been one of continuous progress, marred only by the hiving off of the American colonies. Britain had outpaced all rivals in last century's scramble for colonial possessions, and could boast by the turn of the century to possess an "empire on which the sun never set."

However, by a mere accident of history, Afrikaners—Boers, as they were called—who had trekked away from Britain's Cape Colony into South Africa's virtually unpopulated hinterland, suddenly found themselves to be the owners of the world's richest gold fields. The eagerness of race-nationalists like Cecil John Rhodes and Alfred Milner to add the new Boer Republic of the Transvaal to the British empire is understandable. In the climate of thought and sentiment then prevailing, not to have tried to grab so valuable a prize would have been virtually unthinkable.

After a war that proved unexpectedly costly both in lives and money, Britain succeeded in adding to its empire both the Transvaal and its ally in the struggle, the Orange Free State republic, but all this happened in circumstances mysteriously different from those that had attended all previous imperial conquests. It was a war over which the British people were themselves sharply divided until the first shots were fired by the Boers; it was a war against which the British Government had been sternly warned by one of the empire's most loyal servants,

General Sir William Butler, then Commander-in-Chief of British forces in South Africa; it was a war which gave rise to a greater outpouring of false communication than any other in British colonial history.³

There was something decidedly different about this tempting opportunity for further imperial expansion, which that prominent writer J.A. Hobson explained thus in his book, *The War in South Africa*, while that war was still in progress:

We are fighting in order to place a small international oligarchy of mine-owners and speculators in power in Pretoria. Englishmen would do well to recognize that the economic and political destinies of South Africa are, and seem likely to remain, in the hands of men most of whom are foreigners by origin whose trade is finance and whose trade interests are not British.

There can be no doubt today about the correctness of that assessment. Thomas Pakenham, in his book *The Boer War*, published in 1979, has this to say about the causes of that war:

First there is a thin golden thread woven by the "gold bugs," the Rand millionaires who controlled the richest mines in the world. It has been hitherto assumed by historians that none of the "gold bugs" was directly concerned in making the war. But directly concerned they were . . . I have found evidence of an informal alliance between Sir Alfred Milner, the High Commissioner, and the firm of Wernher-Beit, the dominant Rand mining house. *It was this alliance, I believe, that gave Milner the strength to precipitate the war.* (Emphasis added).

Hobson devotes an entire chapter of his book to mine-ownership in the Transvaal. A few of the financial pioneers were Englishmen; he names among these Rhodes, Rudd and J.B. Robinson. These had all made their fortunes in South Africa, but the others, "the small group of international financiers, chiefly German in origin and Jewish in race," were wealthy when they arrived in the country and had access to seemingly boundless funds in Europe, including the German Dresdner Bank, which Hobson believes to be largely owned by Wernher and Beit. Rhodes, too, had to go to an international banking dynasty, the London Rothschilds, for money with which to buy out his rivals and gain complete control of the diamond industry in Kimberley.

General Sir William Butler was even more emphatic about the sources of power and motivation which were decisive in precipitating the war, "the train-layers setting the political

gunpowder," as he called them. In a dispatch to the War Office in June 1899 he wrote:

If the Jews were out of the question, it would be easy enough to come to an agreement, but they are apparently intent upon plunging the country into civil strife . . . indications are too evident here to allow one to doubt the existence of strong undercurrents, the movers of which are bent upon war at all costs for their own selfish ends.

Noticed by few, and by even fewer understood, effective control of the British Empire at a decisive point in history had passed, if only momentarily, out of essentially British hands. Or, to put it differently, the center of gravity of real power in the world had shifted significantly. That was the mysterious change that was to inaugurate a chain reaction of more change, first for the British Empire and then for the whole world. More precisely, it was the first clear sign of the commencement of a process of change in the realm of finance-capitalism which was not to be completed before the middle of the 1930s.

Other changes are less readily noticeable, one of the most important of these being radical changes in the methodology of warfare—the human mind itself has become a battleground for warring interests as never before in recorded history. Political warfare—Von Clausewitz's "war by other means"—there has always been but never before on the scale practiced after the turn of the century. Persuasion there always was as a means of readying a population for war; but the world was to encounter in the late 1890s something unprecedented in the quantity and audacity of the lying propaganda that was used in drawing the British people into the Anglo-Boer War.

This new evil, or recurrence of an old evil on a gigantic scale, came as a great shock to General Butler, who wrote as follows to the Colonial Secretary on December 18, 1898:

All the political questions in South Africa and nearly all the information sent from Cape Town are being worked by what I have already described as a colossal syndicate for the spread of false information.

Hobson wrote in his book *The War in South Africa*:

South Africa presents a unique example of a large press, owned, controlled and operated by a small body of men with the direct aim of bringing about a conflict which shall serve their business interests.

With prophetic insight, Hobson wrote a book, *The Psychology of Jingoism* which, as an analysis of the dishonest uses of propaganda, bears comparison with George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

Only a few of the major historic changes which ensued need be mentioned for our present purposes: the Anglo-Boer War; two World Wars; the Bolshevik Revolution and setting up of the Soviet Union as an industrial and military superpower; the dismantling of the colonial empires and conversion of the former colonies into new nations, few of them economically viable; the delivery of mainland China and other vast areas in the Far East to totalitarian socialist rule; the setting up of the United Nations with its innumerable agencies as the prototype of some form of world government; and the progressive undermining of the national sovereignty of all the Western nations.

It is significant that the first years of the 20th century also ushered in a phenomenon that was to remain a conspicuous feature of the ensuing age of conflict, namely the concentration camp, symbol of an expanded barbarity in which civilians join the soldiers in the front line of every major conflict.

We need to know what were the deep-seated changes in human affairs which gave rise to a worldwide chain-reaction of conflict and tragedy. As we shall try to show, these deep-rooted changes occurred in two quite separate realms, *money* and *intellect*. So, let us begin with an examination of the great change which took place in the world of money.

Toward the end of the 19th century money began to acquire a new role and meaning in human affairs as economics began to prevail over politics. The two need to be clearly distinguished as sources of value, motivation, and control at the level of leadership.

Politics is a *social function* concerned with the total welfare of a community, long-term as well as short-term, in which the requirements of economics, although always important, have only a supportive or secondary role. Economic thinking, a mere department of political thinking, is concerned exclusively with the requirements of economic prosperity and progress. It assumes automatically that whatever is good for business is good for the community as a whole, an attitude of mind that excludes virtually all other considerations.

What happened towards the end of the 19th century was, therefore, not something of sudden occurrence; it must be seen rather as a crucial state having been reached in a process which had continued slowly during most of the preceding century. Not only did the Anglo-Boer War signalize the beginning of the end of the British Empire, it also signalized the beginning of the end of national financial sovereignties all over the Western world, a

process that was to reach its culmination only in the 1930s when the great American pioneering families, headed by J.P. Morgan, were finally edged out of their dominating position in Wall Street.

In the relations of politics and high finance there subsisted a very complex state of affairs until shortly before the commencement of World War II, which can be briefly explained as follows.

There had always existed within the national states of the Western world families or dynasties of bankers, like the Rothschilds, Warburgs, Montefiores, etc., who lent to governments and specialized in transactions across national frontiers, but these were never fully integrated as an international system capable of controlling politics on an international basis.

These concentrations of high finance, although always influential, lacked the power wholly to control the politics of the national states, but each remained an important part of a nationally oriented constellation of financial power. This was a situation that suited them well enough in the circumstances prevailing until the turn of the century. Enormous influence they could exert, both nationally and internationally, but not the dominating power they were later to acquire.

Paradoxically, in spite of the enormous lead which the Jewish banking dynasties had gained in international commerce, it was the gentile financiers with their ownership and access to the cornucopia of new wealth, plus their control of national politics, who first established high finance on a fully internationalized basis. The facts are supplied by Dr. Carroll Quigley:

The apex of the system was to be the Bank of International Settlements in Basle, Switzerland, a private bank owned and controlled by the world's central banks which were themselves private corporations. Each central bank, in the hands of men like Montagu Norman of the Bank of England, Benjamin Strong of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, Charles Rist of the Bank of France, and Hjalmar Schacht of the Reichbank, sought to dominate its government by its ability to control Treasury bonds, to manipulate foreign exchanges, to influence cooperative politicians by subsequent economic rewards in the business world. (*Tragedy and Hope*).

Quigley explains further that the Rothschilds had been pre-eminent during much of the 19th century, but at the end of that century "they were being replaced by J.P. Morgan," whose central office was in New York, although it operated as if it were in London "where it had indeed originated as George Peabody and Company in 1838."

The process by which the separate national concentrations of financial power were absorbed into a global concentration was only completed in the 1930s, producing among other historical consequences, the rise of the Third Reich in Germany, the outbreak of World War II and subsequent involvement of the United States and Japan, and the setting up of a Marxist-Leninist People's Republic of China.

Professor Quigley supplies many of the facts about the final shift in the center of gravity of financial power, and his story begins with these ominous words:

The third state of capitalism is of such overwhelming significance in the history of the twentieth century, and its ramifications and influences have been so subterranean and even occult, that we may be excused if we devote considerable attention to its organization and methods.

It is the story, assembled from a vast accumulation of documented facts, of a process of change in the United States, beginning before World War I, which Wilmot Robertson was later to describe as the "dispossession of the American majority," culminating in what Quigley calls "a shift on all levels, from changing tastes in newspaper comic strips . . . to profound change in the power nexus of the 'American Establishment'."

From the 1880s the United States had been ruled from behind the scenes by a plutocracy supported by the fortunes of the great American pioneering families—Rockefeller, Carnegie, Vanderbilt, Mellon, Duke, Whitney, Ford, DuPont, etc.—a power constellation with J.P. Morgan as its banking center. This "Eastern Establishment" is described by Quigley as "high Episcopalian, Anglophile, internationalist, Ivy League, and European-culture-conscious," and was matched with a similar establishment on the other side of the Atlantic with Montagu Norman as its banking head. The two worked closely together and came to be known as the "Anglo-American Establishment."

Quigley tells us of the . . .

. . . decline of J.P. Morgan itself from its deeply anonymous status as a partnership (founded in 1861) to its transformation into an incorporated public company in 1940 to its final disappearance by absorption into its chief banking subsidiary, the Guaranty Trust Company, in 1959.

Quigley says that the less obvious implication of the shift in Wall Street was the realization by the Morgan group that it no longer

had the votes on the Board of Trustees of Columbia University to nominate a successor to Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, the retiring president.

In a word, the control of American higher education had quietly been taken out of the hands of America's great pioneering families, described by Quigley as "high Episcopalian, Anglophile and European-culture-conscious"—a studiously discreet way of saying they were not Jewish.

Wall Street fell into the hands of the international financiers like a ripe plum, their real battle having been fought and won in the realm of parliamentary politics by methods which are still standard practice in the Western world; these include the financing of party politics, the manipulation of the public opinion through the medium of newspapers, radio, the cinema, the book trade, etc., plus the penetration, financing and manipulation of trade union movements.

This was a takeover exercise in which America's emerging secret rulers could draw on centuries of accumulated expertise and experience as a nation struggling to survive in dispersion.

The eclipse of the power of the great American families first took the form of taxation laws, beginning with the graduated income tax in 1913 and culminating in the inheritance tax, which drove all the great family fortunes into the refuge of tax-exempt foundations. Morgan and his circle lost control of the Federal Government as one money-and-intellect alliance was subtly replaced by another. And the fact that a money-and-intellect alliance behaves in much the same way no matter who controls it made the change hard to detect.

The Morgan groups dabbled in the politics of the radical left and lost no time in trying to get a foothold in Russia after the Bolshevik Revolution. But at this game they were no match for their Jewish rivals. The rival Wall Street elites were both fired by the ideal and ambition of a "new world order," but there the similarity ended.

The original American establishment, like its British opposite number, was for *containing* the Soviet Union with its socialist rulers with a view to the ultimate absorption of the Russian empire into a new world order to be raised on the foundations of the British Empire and which they, as inheritors of the Rhodes dream, would control. The other, the new Eastern Establishment, was for *building up* the Soviet Union as an industrial and military giant which would *replace* the British Empire as the foundation of a new world order.

These developments in the realm of finance capitalism and power politics came to a climax towards the end of the 1930s, coinciding with a considerable eruption all over the Western world of a social phenomenon misleadingly described as "anti-Semitism."

Professor Hannah Arendt, in her book *The Origins of Totalitarianism* puts it frankly and succinctly:

Twentieth century political developments have driven the Jewish people into the storm center of events . . . the Jewish question and anti-Semitism . . . became the catalytic agent first for the rise of the Nazi movement and the establishment of the organizational structure of the Third Reich . . . then for a world war of unparalleled ferocity.

Henry Ford, who for many years had roundly condemned all the big bankers as the natural enemies of private enterprise industry, now drew a clear distinction between the house of Morgan, which he described as "constructive," and its rivals, whom he described as "warmongers," Morgan himself, like his opposite number in London, Montagu Norman, was known to dislike the Jews. The radio talks of Father Coughlin and writings of Father Denis Fahey, the frantic efforts of Charles Lindbergh to keep America out of the war, and the activities of Oswald Mosley and his Blackshirts in Britain, were all reactions to the appearance of the Jewish people in "the storm center" of 20th century politics.

What all these alarming developments mean is that a highly concentrated Jewish financial power was suddenly seen to be gaining ascendancy in the West.

Another layer in the prevailing political reality during the last decades of the 19th century must now be studied separately—namely, the thoughts about the future that were then circulating in the English ruling classes.

Cecil John Rhodes was one of the most potent men of action in English history, but he was also a visionary and dreamer, pictured by friend and foe as a colossus bestriding the continent of Africa. His ability to inspire activity and loyalty in others was proverbial. In the realm of pure thought, however, the unifying and energizing agent was not Rhodes but John Ruskin, at one time Slade Professor of Fine Arts at Oxford University, who had armed a generation of young Englishmen with an ideology of service having as its object the creation of a better and happier world. This was to be imagined as an extended application of the civilizing and humanizing concept of the British Empire; it was to be a fellow-

ship of free and independent states held together by an abstract principle which came to be labelled the "English Idea."

The numinosity, or sense of magic, evoked by these ideas can be traced to a single cause: the ideology of a "brave new world," with order and welfare for all mankind, was offered as a replacement for a religious orthodoxy that had long since begun to crumble under the impact of a scientific "enlightenment"; here was something to restore to the existence of the educated and energetic a keen sense of meaning, purpose and direction, an ideology, moreover, which sanctified imperial expansion and the personal advancement of all its servants.

So potent was this ideology as a secular religion that it won converts all over the Western world; even former leaders of the conquered Boers, including General Louis Botha, who was to be South Africa's first Prime Minister, and General Jan Christian Smuts, yielded to its psychic charm.

Practical measures to give effect to this political idealism took the form of a range of operations including the Rhodes Scholarship Trust, the semisecret Round Table movement, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, the American Council on Foreign Relations, etc.

This was definitely a racial affair, invoking on both sides of the Atlantic a genteel racial response. Ralph Durand, in a book about Oxford University published in 1909, wrote of:

Cecil Rhodes of Oriel, the dreamer of great dreams . . . Believing that the preservation of the peace of the world lay in the hands of men of Teuton blood, he made provision in his will for the founding at Oxford of scholarships that would be open to citizens of the British Empire, the German Empire and the United States. (*Oxford: Its Buildings and Gardens*, published by Grant Richards, London).

The fatal flaw in this ideology does not belong to the art or science of politics, nor that of high finance, but to an area of knowledge less readily accessible to exploration and discussion, namely, metaphysics. Quigley puts his hand on the key to that riddle: each of the central banks in the different national states, he says, "sought to dominate its government" and to "influence co-operative politicians by subsequent rewards in the business world."

What this means is that something had already gone wrong in the West's different national power structures—all had incorporated a system of money creation and debt, a corrupting influence with implications of infinite complexity.

Money had become progressively the measure of all things, with a ruling elite drawn less and less from the land and more and more from the factory and the counting house. The nations had, in fact, become plutocracies, capable of maintaining themselves in power with a public opinion not sought and consulted as before but *created* as required by newspapers, patronage and other "rewards in the business world."

Such a conversion of money into public opinion and support was accomplished in Britain by Rhodes and Milner and their "gold bug" partners, with a total disregard for all moral considerations. Money had shown what money could do.

There was, thus, an iron inevitability about the outcome of a struggle which the gentile financiers did not even see as a struggle: *an alien high finance* firmly united by long-range political aims, increasingly influenced the politics of the different national states and finally *displaced the gentile financiers as managers of the new international banking structure*.

And educated minds, conditioned by John Ruskin's secular ideology calling for a "new world" to be raised on the foundations of the British Empire, seem to have had no difficulty in transferring their attachment and enthusiasm to a new ideology worked out by Marx and Engels.

Anthony Sutton's trilogy, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*, and *Wall Street and FDR*, contains a vast quantity of information but is more remarkable *for what it omits*. For that which is omitted is precisely what Professor Hannah Arendt correctly describes as the "catalytic agent" in the "storm center of events," namely, the role of the Jewish people in 20th century power politics.

So far as Sutton is concerned there is and always was only one "Wall Street Establishment," which is made to carry the main blame for the financing of the Bolshevik Revolution and later for the financing of Hitler's rise to power in Germany.

That is a misleading oversimplification of the story.

In fact, Wall Street during the two preceding decades has a sort of split personality, one half of it symbolized by Morgan and the other by Warburg. It is true, as alleged, that "Wall Street" helped to finance the Bolshevik Revolution, but in this exercise the Warburg faction (Jacob Schiff in particular) took the initiative, with the Morgan faction getting all the bad publicity as they belatedly tried to get a share of the action. There is much evidence also to support the contention that "Wall Street," this time clearly the

Morgan interests, supported Hitler's rise to power. But at the same time who, if not the internationalists, were funding the Communist Party in these crucial elections in Germany in 1930 in which the Communists gained spectacular successes?

The fiercest political struggles in the 1930s all over the West can now be more clearly seen as so many proxy battles on behalf of rival concentrations of financial power, culminating in World War II and the triumph of the internationalists.

In Britain opposition to World War II came from what remained of the British end of the original Anglo-American establishment, labeled the "Cliveden set" – Cliveden being the name of the home of Lord Astor.

This interpretation will also help to explain one of the weirdest and most mysterious episodes in American history – a reported attempt, with the assistance of the American Legion and armed forces, to set up a "fascist style" dictatorship in the White House.

News of the plot was given brief front-page treatment in the *New York Times* on November 21, 1934; a congressional committee was set up to investigate the allegations; but then all news of the plot faded out of the press. Those involved included a few leading personalities in the American Legion and another organization known as Liberty League, which together seem to have undertaken to make available a force of 500,000 men. Leadership of the operation was offered to Major-General Smedley D. Butler, a much decorated military hero, but there is no real evidence that he ever agreed to go along with the plotters.

Significantly, it is exclusively the gentile power-wielders of high finance and big business who were identified as the culprits behind the scene, all linked in one way or another with J.P. Morgan: Grayson Murphy, a director of the Guaranty Company; Jackson Martindell, associated with Stone and Webster, allied to the Morgans; the Du Pont Company; the Remington Arms Company, controlled by Du Pont; and the Morgan-Harriman financial interests. It would seem, therefore, that the Morganite financiers and industrialists, finding themselves at last outmaneuvered and outgunned in Wall Street, were tempted to take desperate measures against the international financiers – as has been done with some success in Italy and Germany.

As the rivalry of separate national constellations of financial power gave rise to last century's scramble for colonial possessions, so the consolidation of financial power on a global basis in the 20th

century required the dismantling of all colonial empires and their replacement with innumerable new states over which the separate nations of the West would be able to exercise little or no influence.

A clear distinction must thus be drawn between the pace and quantity of change and conflict in the world up until 1939, when the new imperium was still in the process of being established, and the pace and quantity of change and conflict after the new imperium had emerged as the only real victor in World War II.

So much for the revolutionary change which occurred in the realm of high finance.

Notes

1. Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*.
2. Chambers, Harris and Bayley, *This Age of Conflict*.
3. General Sir William Butler, *Autobiography*.

CHAPTER FIVE

The Wall Street Struggle

Tha-a-a-t Lenin understood very well! That bare ideas will get you no further forward, that you cannot make a revolution without power, that in our time the primary source of power is money, and that all other forms of power—organization, weapons, people capable of using those weapons to kill—are begotten of money.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn,
Lenin in Zurich

“**N**o one must lightly dismiss the question of race,” wrote Benjamin Disraeli, Queen Victoria’s Prime Minister. “It is the key to world history, and it is precisely for this reason that written history so often lacks clarity—it is written by people who do not understand the race question and what belongs to it.”

Before further use is made of the word “race,” a brief cautionary explanation is required.

Physical anthropology, the science of the study of race, has been heavily eclipsed during the twentieth century, as was astronomy in another age, because its findings were in conflict with the requirement of the prevailing great power. Technically, a race is an endogamous, or inbreeding, human unit. A race is not defined by the degree of homogeneity achieved but by the policies it pursues in resisting assimilation. Hence even a people of somewhat mixed race or genetic composition, like the Jews, can exhibit strong racial characteristics. “Race” and “nation” in Old Testament times were, therefore, virtually synonymous.

So it is now the subject of race or nation in the realm of high finance that now needs to be explored.

Professor Sir Arthur Keith, one-time President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, compressed into one sentence the contents of two chapters of his book. *A New Theory of Human Evolution*:

My deliberate opinion is that racial characters are more strongly developed in the Jews than in any other Caucasian people.

This statement Keith supports with quotes from many other authorities. His use of the expression "Caucasian people" should be noted; he dismisses the idea that the Jews are "Semites."

Those in whom racial characters are strongly developed have a keen awareness of kind, like the pigs in George Orwell's *Animal Farm* sometimes fight among themselves, even to the point of slaughter, but always drawing a clear distinction between themselves and the "other animals."

Dr. Carroll Quigley, late Professor of International Relations at the prestigious Georgetown Foreign Service School, Washington DC, in his monumental world history *Tragedy and Hope* makes no attempt overtly to explore the "catalytic" role of the Jews in the history of our century; indeed, in a book of some 1300 pages he has virtually nothing to say about the Jews except when writing about the inauguration of the state of Israel; and the 36-page index does not even contain the words "Zionism" or "Zionist."

Nevertheless, the publisher, the Macmillan Company, abruptly ceased distributing this book when it was realized in establishment circles that it contained a great deal of information, some of it from confidential sources, from which sound conclusions about the racial aspects of twentieth century history could be drawn by the perspicacious student. Whether it was by an exercise of cunning that Dr. Quigley managed to get his book accepted and launched by an important establishment publisher, or whether he was so naive as to suppose that he could safely throw so much light on the activities and policies of the great power-wielders of high finance, we may never know. But Quigley demonstrated, as others had done before him, that there prevails in the West a system of censorship not as obvious as that once exercised behind Communism's Iron Curtain, but equally effective.

And historiography most rigorously excluded from establishment bookshelves is precisely that in which some attempt has been

made to explore and explain that "catalytic" Jewish presence—in other words, the "racial" factor.

In this chapter, therefore, we propose to illustrate Disraeli's comment by examining and comparing two modern books of history covering the same period and handling the same subject: *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*, by Antony C. Sutton, and *Who Financed Hitler* by James Pool and Suzanne Pool.¹

Mention will be made to two other Sutton books: *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* and *Wall Street and FDR*.

1. THE PROFESSIONAL HISTORIAN

Dr. Sutton frankly admits that there is something missing from his Wall Street books, for in one of them, *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler* (p. 167) he writes: "Why did the Wall Street elite, the international bankers, want Roosevelt and Hitler in power? That is an aspect we have not explored;" and on page 174 he raised the question whether the New York elitist establishment is "a subversive force" deliberately trying to suppress the constitution and a free society, adding that a consideration of the question "will be a task ahead in the next decade."

It is precisely the "Why?" question which George Orwell in his *Nineteen Eighty-Four* regards as all-important, for he has Winston Smith write in his secret diary: "I can understand HOW: I do not understand WHY."

We can find out quite easily *what* happened and *how* it happened, but we are no better off if we cannot find out *what were the real motives* of those who made it happen.

In all three books, Sutton writes as if Jews as an ethnic entity are now of no more historical significance than Gypsies or Eskimos. Having thus excluded race, or ethnic identity, as a factor, Sutton does not feel called upon to try to explain why, after World War II, only Max Warburg was exempted when all the German bankers on the supervisory board of directors of the great I.G. Farben industrial empire were tried as "war criminals."

Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler is notable for another most significant omission: There is no mention of the financing of the other "extremist party" in Germany which won spectacular successes in the elections of September 1930; namely, the Communists, who had launched the internal revolution that brought World War I to an abrupt end and who subsequently operated on a massive scale as a legitimate political party. It is

reasonable to suppose that the identity and motives of those who financed Hitler might have had something to tell us about the identity and motives of those who were financing the Communists.

Without this information and the inferences to be drawn from it, we are left with a book like *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*, containing a great deal of painstakingly researched and documented information which could even be counter-productive, further confusing rather than clarifying all establishment versions of history "designed to hide a pervasive fabric of deceit and immoral conduct" (Sutton's words).

On the other hand, as we shall try to show, the information supplied by Sutton does have some value as being half of the truth — *but only if it can be brought into combination with the missing half*. The danger to be avoided is that of accepting Sutton's books about Wall Street as a balanced and objective account of the influences at work in modern politics promoting "deceit and immoral conduct."

Sutton remarks that "Quigley goes a long way to provide evidence for the existence of the power elite, but does not penetrate the operations of the elite," adding: "Possibly the papers used by Quigley had been vetted or did not include documentation on elitist manipulation of such events as the Bolshevik Revolution, Hitler's accession to power, and the election of Roosevelt in 1933."

Sutton had evidently failed to notice in Quigley's book a number of hard facts which provide a fairly complete answer to the question which he had decided to leave unexplored ("Why did the Wall Street elite want Roosevelt and Hitler in power?").

Sutton avoids the race question as such, but it is significant that the Wall Street financiers he most frequently names are all unmistakably gentiles, these forming part of a vast constellation of financial and industrial power with J.P. Morgan in the center of it. And it is this financial elite which he blames both for the success of the Bolshevik Revolution and for the precipitation of World War II.

What he does *not* tell us, and what we most of all need to know, is that the major revolutionary changes which have characterized our century of conflict can be traced to *two* financial elites, their separateness hard to detect because they so often operated in unison, who found themselves increasingly in a relationship of fierce antagonism from about 1930, the one a gentile elite and the other Jewish.

Sutton comes close to admitting the existence of two Wall Street elites when he says that Henry Ford divided financiers into two classes, the "constructive" and the "destructive," the first personified by J.P. Morgan, the others "the world's real warmakers." Thereafter, however, he continues to write about Wall Street financiers as a homogeneous species in which there is no need to draw any distinction between Jew and gentile.

To cut a long story short, it turns out that World War II was a struggle between *two* financial elites, the one, including a substantial sector of Wall Street, using the German people as its proxy and the other, also with a Wall Street segment, using Germany's enemies.

We need to know the truth about what happened because, as George Orwell succinctly put it, "Who controls the present controls the past, and who controls the past controls the future."

In other words, we cannot hope to be about to understand what is happening now unless we know what happened in the past, and if we do not know what is happening now, we have lost all control over what happens to us in the future.

We know that the Germans were defeated in World War II, but what were the consequences of the real struggle between the two financial elites? It is an answer to that question we must have, if we are to understand what is happening now and what perils are to be averted.

First of all, however, we need to know how a situation arose in which two financial power elites became involved as opponents in a world war. The following is a much abridged account of what happened, for which endorsement can be found in Quigley's *Tragedy and Hope*.

For several centuries international financial activity was largely monopolized by Jewish banking dynasties, the most powerful and best-known of these being the Rothschilds. However, financial capitalism was only *fully consolidated on an international basis* in the early years of the twentieth century.

During the second half of the 19th century the unprecedented economic development in the United States of America, nearly all of it under the direct control of pioneering families, including Rockefeller, Carnegie, Ford, Astor, etc., gave rise to a corresponding development of banking under the control of the same kind of people, the most conspicuous of these being J.P. Morgan. Much the same happened in Britain and Europe, where

gentile predominance in private-ownership capitalism and industrial enterprise produced national concentrations of finance capital which the Jewish banking families could exploit but could not dominate.

It should be remembered that industrialization in the West was *exclusively* a product of the inventiveness, energy and enterprise of ethnic Europeans; that is why no Jewish names are to be found among the names of those who founded the great industrial empires, whether in oil, coal, iron and steel, railways and shipping, automobiles, aircraft, electricity, chemicals or anything else. It was thus an explosive increase in the production of real wealth which conferred on the ethnic Europeans—the Christians, or gentiles—a short-lived supremacy in the realm of high finance.

So enormous was the new wealth generated that a newly created gentile financial power, in which personalities like J.P. Morgan and Montagu Norman figure most prominently, superseded the Jewish financial power of which the house of Rothschild formed the apex.

A very complex struggle ensued on many different planes. One major setback for the gentile financiers, engineered by their Jewish rivals through their growing influence in the media and their direct involvement in party politics and the trade union movement, was the inheritance tax and graduated income tax aimed at the powerful gentile families in particular and the middle class in general.

Then, when the gentile elite allowed themselves to be lured into complicity in establishing privately owned central banking systems in all the countries of the West, the tables were decisively turned and the gentile elite began to lose ground at an alarming rate in the competitive rivalry of the two elites. In the United States the instigator of central banking was Paul Warburg, a scion of the powerful German-Jewish banking family.

The Morganites realized at once that their rivals had stolen a march on them by masterminding and funding the Russian Revolution and lost no time trying to get a "piece of the action." But J.P. Morgan also supplied funds to the counter-revolutionary movement led by Admiral Kolchak and his White Army; it would have suited them very well to turn the tables on the Bolsheviks and those who were funding them.

In Germany it was different; although traditionally hostile to any form of German nationalism (hence World War II), here British and

American gentile bankers saw in the emergence of the National Socialist movement an opportunity to back a likely winner against their rivals who had given early financial and leadership backing to the Marxist revolutionaries.

Was there no other way in which the Morganites could defend or recover their top-dog position in international finance capitalism? The answer is *no!* The only possible way in which the battle against Jewish predominance could have been fought was closed to them because, as partners in the conduct and exploitation of a fraudulent centralized banking system, they had *abandoned the moral position* from which such a battle could have been fought. The Morganite bankers had been drawn too deeply into the dirtiest forms of financial power politics and had even tried to compete with Jewish rivals in buying their way into the control centers of radical leftist movements, including the Communist party, even in their own country.

Henry Ford, on the other hand, as a self-made and independent industrialist, came right out into the open and attacked those he regarded as his and his country's enemies, and he made no secret of his pro-German sympathies before World War II.

What the people of the West have not been permitted to know is that an "Anglo-American" establishment which Professor Quigley pointedly describes as "High Episcopalian, European-culture-conscious," sought first of all to prevent war against Germany, did what it could to strengthen the National-Socialist movement as a bulwark against a Jewish-sponsored Communist take-over bid and even helped to arm Germany when war seemed inevitable. The facts are all to be found in Quigley's massive "history of the world in our time," *Tragedy and Hope*, for those willing to dig for them and put them together.

Armed in our minds with a comprehensive picture provided by Quigley, we can give to Sutton's three books an interpretation quite different from that indicated by Sutton himself.

What happened in Wall Street in the 1930s was invisible and unnoticed except to those directly involved; but plainly visible quite soon were the consequences produced as a gentile usurocracy was superseded by a Jewish one. It is hard to believe that Quigley was not deliberately trying to expose the new kind of financial imperialism that had emerged when he wrote the following:

The shift occurred on all levels, from changing tastes in newspaper comic strips (from *Mutt and Jeff* or *Bringing Up Father*

to *Steve Canyon* or *Little Orphan Annie*) to profound changes in the power nexus of the "American Establishment." It was evident in the decline of J.P. Morgan itself, from its deeply anonymous status as a partnership (founded in 1861) to its transformation into an incorporated public company in 1940 and its final disappearance by absorption into its chief banking subsidiary Guaranty Trust Company in 1959.

One of the major cultural and sociological consequences of the shift of the nexus of power in Wall Street, if not the most important of all, was the stripping from that "Ivy League, Anglophile, high Episcopalian, European-culture-conscious" elite of the power to nominate the presidents of America's great universities (as recorded at page 937 of *Tragedy and Hope*). Quigley's elliptical references to "changing tastes in newspapers comic strips" and Morgan's inability to nominate a replacement for Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler as President of Columbia University can only mean that he was drawing attention to radical policy changes in American higher education and in the media which followed as a direct consequence of the shift in Wall Street. An extra dimension of meaning is thus given to Dr. Butler's oft-quoted remark, made at that time:

The world is divided into three classes of people: a very small group that makes things happen, a somewhat larger group that watches things happen, and the great multitude that never knows what happened.

In the three books forming Dr. Sutton's Wall Street trilogy we find a complete avoidance of the factor of "race and what belongs to it" (Disraeli's words) and a quite misleading concentration of attention on the actions of that Wall Street elite which Quigley describes as "high Episcopalian, European-culture-conscious," etc., these being exhibited throughout by Sutton as the destructive financiers, the world's real war makers. Anxious not to give offence to that other financial power elite, he remarks that the objective of all the financiers who launched the Bolshevik Revolution and continued thereafter to support the Soviet Union was "profit and not ideology," i.e. not political.

Sutton has been quoted as referring unflatteringly to what he calls "amateur historians, not fully trained in modern research techniques." It would seem, however, that there is some need for such "amateur historians" willing to undertake the dangerous and

thankless task of establishing new bridgeheads in revisionist history which the professionals can later occupy with safety.

2. THE AMATEUR HISTORIANS

Of James Pool and his sister Suzanne, joint authors of *Who Financed Hitler*, one cannot be sure whether they were very cunning or very naive in digging out and presenting so much of the embarrassing historical truth. All we know about them is that James Pool was an investment consultant operating out of Cincinnati, Ohio, and his sister was engaged in advanced study at an American university.

Their 500-page book was well received when first published, and was praised by the reviewers in several important establishment journals including the *New Yorker* ("One of the most illuminating studies of Nazism"), the *San Francisco Examiner and Chronicle* ("Revealing, well documented"), and *Newsday* ("Well written and copiously documented").

This book, with its rather unflattering picture of a top-hatted Adolf Hitler on the front cover, and its several derogatory remarks about Hitler, "anti-Semitism" etc., in the preface and then, more by implication, all through the book has the appearance of just another "history" designed to place the blame on the German people and their leaders for both world wars—but those who go on reading soon begin to realize that what they have before them is a thoroughly conscientious work of historical analysis that quietly disregards all the requirements of partisan propaganda and is also astonishingly frank.

To take one example at random: the chapter dealing with Henry Ford and the financial assistance he is supposed to have given to the Nazi party. There appears to be no proof of actual cash transfers, but Ford made no secret of the fact that he warmly admired Hitler and his party, and there is ample evidence of channels through which financial assistance to the Nazis could have been, and probably was, transmitted. And, as every American knows, no important figure outside Germany more vigorously displayed his dislike of the Jews than did Henry Ford with his newspaper the *Dearborn Independent*, his book *The International Jews*, and the aid and encouragement he gave to others in the United States who were hostile to the Jews. The Pools tell the Ford story in some 45 pages and in such a way that, were he alive

today, Ford could hardly find fault with it. We are told in considerable detail what it was that made him regard the Jews as enemies.

Ford's situation can be stated in one sentence: he found himself fighting tooth and nail to prevent himself being forced to operate on borrowed money like most other industrialists.

Write the Pools:

Ford clashed with the Wall Street financiers not only in the pages of his newspaper and books, but in reality as well. Authorities say that many of his ideas about Jewish financiers came from unpleasant personal experiences with bankers; one of the most violent conflicts between Ford and the financiers occurred early in 1921. At that time rumors circulating the nation claimed that Ford was in difficult financial straits. Reports varied but each represented some aspects of the truth. It was said that Wall street intended to foreclose on Ford and bring him to his knees. Many bankers were eager to supply him with capital. Some thought that General Motors would obtain financial control of the Ford Company. However, Ford was adamant in his refusal to part with one share of his stock. "Henry Ford has reached his limit," the Dow-Jones Financial Ticker Service informed its clients. "It is beyond the power of any one man to raise money and carry forward single-handed the manifold enterprises in which he has started."

The Denver Post announced in bright red ink on its front page: "Ford Battles Wall Street to Keep Control of Property." But Ford proceeded to outwit the bankers with a massive cutback in expenditure, by selling off some assets and by making the dealers pay cash for the cars they bought, thereby *forcing many of them to borrow* or lose the franchise.

Not only do the Pools reveal that Henry Ford was hostile to the Jews, but they go on to repeat many of the most provocative statements which Ford made at that time in his newspaper and in his books. Here is an example from a reported press interview: "When there's wrong in a country you'll find the Jews . . . the Jew is a huckster who doesn't work to produce but to make something of what someone else produces."

Nothing irritated Ford more than the idea of someone getting something for nothing. The Pools add:

In his autobiography Ford said he believed that a man should be permitted to take away from the community an equivalent of what he contributes to it, if he contributes nothing, he should take away nothing. In America he saw a "sinister element, made up of Jewish middlemen whose only aim was to get money." *The Dearborn*

Independent said a Jew "has no attachment for the things he makes, for he doesn't make any; he deals in the things which other men make and regards them solely on the side of their money-making value."

Not surprisingly, "the major role Jewish leaders played in the November (1918) revolution" which led to and followed the German surrender in World War I, convinced Henry Ford that what he was seeing in Germany was a repetition on a national scale of what he had himself experienced as an independent industrialist—a massive Jewish attempt to grab control.

Written history is seldom found to live up to the ethical requirements of genuine scholarship, for the obvious reason that most of it has been written by and for the victor in every major conflict, but the fact that most history, as Henry Ford put it, is "bunk" should not be allowed to obscure the all-important fact that there has always continued to exist in the Western world a scholarship which, when the emotions of partisanship have been allowed to subside, does try to set the record right for the better instruction of all mankind.

The Pools were smart enough to realize that the full meaning of the period between the two world wars, which was the subject of their investigation, must be sought in a much deeper and broader context of history; since, nearly always, it is the past which give meaning to the present, and no period of history is, as it were, written on a clean slate. Thus, we are sure to fall deeper into error and confusion if we begin a study of the emergence and growth of the National Socialist revolution in Germany before we have acquired clear ideas about World War I and its causes, and about the Versailles Treaty which the victorious nations imposed on a prostrate opponent. So, let us have a brief statement of the Pools' opinion on that subject:

The Treaty of Versailles was finally signed by the Germans on June 28, 1919, after the resignation of several German officials who refused to sign their names to such an "unjust" treaty. Territorially, Germany lost 25,000 square miles in Europe, inhabited by over six million, and all her colonies, totalling more than a million square miles. In raw materials she lost 65 per cent of her iron ore reserves, 45 per cent of her coal, 72 per cent of her zinc, 12 per cent of her principal agricultural areas . . . In addition to limiting Germany's potential to move into expanding overseas markets, the Allies obtained a virtual blank check from Germany in terms of reparations . . . *In retrospect it is clear that the Versailles Treaty*

was one of the primary causes of the failure of German democracy . . . Was the Versailles Treaty designed simply to protect the world from the threat of German militarism, or was the treaty deliberately planned to strangle Germany's militarism, or was the treaty deliberately planned to strangle Germany's economy and make her uncompetitive in world markets? To answer this question it is only necessary to look at the treatment of German nonmilitary shipping . . . The treaty called for the confiscation of Germany's entire ocean-going fleet . . . All German freighters and ocean liners were handed over to the Allies . . . (Emphasis added)

The Pools quote American economic writer Ludwell Denny to the effect that it was Germany's bid for industrial and commercial supremacy, based on a huge merchant fleet "that perhaps threatened British supremacy most and for which, had there been no other reason, Britain went to war."

In *Who Financed Hitler* we are presented with a horrifying picture of a crushed and humiliated nation:

The so-called "dismantling" demanded by the Versailles Treaty was a very bitter experience for many German industrialists and undoubtedly played a part in their later willingness to accept Hitler. Thyssen, Krupp, Kirdorf and other executives stood helpless as they watched the work of generations senselessly destroyed. The forges were shut down and the dismantling began. It was a grim business. Toiling in the summer heat of 1920, the workers were forced to destroy their own source of livelihood . . . They scarcely spoke a word to one another. The allied engineers paced the shop floors marking with colored chalk the machine tools, lathes and other equipment to be shipped abroad. Once the crates had been hoisted away, the dynamiting began . . .

The Pools show that Hitler would have had no chance of persuading the German people to accept a one-party and one-man dictatorship, and by none would he have been more strongly opposed than by the big industrialists, except in the dreadful circumstances that prevailed after the end of World War I.

One fact of history that has been played down in the West almost to the vanishing point is that the German people, the industrialists included, had to choose in the end between two forms of totalitarianism: a Nazi one (national socialism) or a Communist one (international socialism).

In the dramatic September 1930 elections, which came as a shock to the Brüning regime: "It was the extreme parties, the Nazis and the Communists, who had won the most spectacular successes at the polls." It was no part of the Pools' terms of

reference to find out who was financing the Communists, but the scale of their operations suggests that the Reds were never starved of funds. It is unlikely that Hitler would have found it necessary to go to the trouble and expense of setting up his own private SA and SS army if he and his followers had not encountered massive and well organized mob violence, which continued until he finally gained full control of the government.

On the subject of "anti-Semitism" the Pools have at least done the Germans the justice of permitting them, in the pages of this book, to make a statement of their case. One of those who early regarded the Communist revolutionary movement as Jewish-instigated and led was Fritz Thyssen, the industrial tycoon, who lived in daily dread of the "Red terror" after he had narrowly, as he believed, escaped assassination at the hands of a gang of armed revolutionaries who abducted him from his home. Thyssen wrote in his autobiography:

I have spent my life among workers. My father had worked with them at the beginning of his career. Never have the workers of our factory shown us any kind of hostility, still less of hatred . . . all disorders and excesses have almost always been due to foreigners.

Thyssen believed that the organizers of the strikes and riots were professional political agitators and agents of Moscow—"Radek . . . Levine . . . Axelred . . . these were the men responsible for the riots and murders."

All the revolutionary leaders Thyssen came in contact with or mentioned were Jewish.

It was not only big industrialists like Thyssen, Kirdorf and Stinnes who identified the Jews with their country's sufferings and the danger into which it was being drawn; others deeply concerned included the country's large farming community and peasantry. The Pools write:

This image of conflict between the Jew and the peasant was not just propaganda, but has some foundation, however slight in reality. Jews functioned as middlemen in many German agricultural communities. It was usually in the capacity of cattle trader or small merchant that the Jew came into contact with the peasants. As a money lender he was hated most when the peasants were in financial difficulty, such as after a bad harvest, and had to rely on his loans at high interest rates to tide them over.

As German agriculture fell increasingly into ruin from a variety of causes beyond the farmers' control, we read of families "driven from the soil which they and their ancestors had tilled for 300 years" by moneylenders who never seemed to be short of funds.

The Pools chronicle the dreadful hardships and injustices suffered by the German people in the decade following the end of World War I with innumerable personal stories which bring history to life and grip the attention of the reader from the first page to the last: runaway inflation which ruined "good solid middle class citizens who had saved for the future" and enabled speculators with foreign currency to grab property at giveaway prices; one third of the population out of work and many of the others working only part-time; all this comes to a climax in the winter of 1931-32, "the hardest winter in one hundred years," which struck Germany in the depths of the depression "when only a few people could afford warm clothes and coal for their furnaces."

"Hitler," say the Pools, "was one of the few politicians who correctly assessed the inflation as a deliberate campaign to defraud the middle class of their savings"—the middle class being then, as always, the main bulwark against Marxist totalitarianism.

Supporting their statements with quoted passages from many sources, the Pools reveal that, if only in the earlier years of Hitler's career, Germany's National Socialist movement had many powerfully placed sympathizers abroad, one of the best known of these, on account of his outspokenness, being Henry Ford. The others may not have donated much money if any at all, but their support was sometimes of a kind that money cannot buy, as when Lord Rothermere with his mass circulation *Daily Mail* came out openly in support of the Nazis and their British counterpart, Oswald Mosley's British Union of Fascists; and Montagu Norman, chairman of the Bank of England, of whom the Pools write:

. . . because he was pro-German one cannot jump to the conclusion that there was a connection between Norman and the Nazis; however, the fact that he also hated Jews arouses suspicion even more.

They add:

Naturally, Norman did not supply Hitler with money from the Bank of England, but there is evidence that he played a significant role in arranging the financing of the Nazis.

There is much more in the book about "powerful friends" in the United Kingdom: these included Lord Sydenham, author of the book *The Jewish World Problem*; the Duke of Northumberland, a big shareholder in the *Morning Post*; Geoffrey Dawson, editor of *The Times* of London; the Duke of Windsor (who abdicated as King Edward VIII); and Sir Henri Deterding, head of the giant Anglo-Dutch Shell conglomerate. Not only are these and other distinguished persons named, but we are permitted to gain some insight into their attitudes and thinking. Of the Duke of Windsor, the Pools write:

Legend has it that Edward was compelled to abdicate due to his refusal to give up "the woman he loved." However this issue was used as a facade to conceal the more critical objection which the government had with the King—namely, his pro-Nazi attitude . . . it was not certain whether, because of his views, he would cooperate in an anti-German policy.

So, where did all the money come from that put the National Socialist movement in Germany on its feet and kept it going? Very little came from the German industrial magnates, except towards the end under threat of civil war and a Communist takeover; substantial donations were made from time to time by a number of wealthy individuals who had been fascinated by Hitler's oratory, typical of these being Frau Helen Bechstein, wife of the piano manufacturer; but most of the financing came from the German masses, some as party membership dues and much more as unpaid services.

The American writer on economics and business, Peter Drucker, is quoted as follows:

The really decisive backing came from sections of the lower middle classes, the farmers and working class, who were hardest hit . . . as far as the Nazi party is concerned, there is good reason to believe that at least three-quarters of its funds, even after 1930, came from the weekly dues . . . and from the entrance fees to the mass meetings from which members of the upper classes were always conspicuously absent.

The Pools make no attempt to place their story in world-historical perspective but, unlike Antony Sutton, they present a rounded and balanced account of what happened and what was said; it is a story that conforms with the requirements of scholarship and strongly endorses Quigley's version of the history of the world in our century.

3. HISTORY IN A NUTSHELL

What happened in Germany between 1918 and 1932 is not a complete historical drama in its own right, but only an episode in a much bigger world revolutionary drama which includes the Bolshevik Revolution, the dispossession of the nations of Europe of their colonial empires and the setting up of a spurious "world parliament" in the form of the United Nations, a drama now hastening towards some fearful denouement.

Therefore, we can only grasp the full meaning of the historical story so conscientiously and excitingly told by James Pool and Suzanne Pool if we can place it, like a piece of mosaic, in its correct position in the history of our century, for all the major changes in our "century of conflict" *belong together and cannot be understood separately*. This bigger, more comprehensive history can be compressed into a few words without any loss of essential meaning.

Last century finance capitalism existed in separate *national* concentrations, all in eager competition—hence the keen industrial and commercial rivalry, culminating in World War I, and last century's "scramble" for colonial possessions. Early in the twentieth century the great banking families or dynasties (Rothschild, Baring, Erlanger, Schroder, Seligman, Speyers, Mirabaud, Mallet, Warburg, Oppenheimer, and Schiff, etc.), which had increasingly dominated the different national concentrations of high finance, were able to join hands and bring about a revolutionary change, drawing these national concentrations into coalescence to form a single integrated *international* financial system which they planned to control.

This revolutionary change in the realm of high finance called for a corresponding revolutionary change in the realm of politics, since a fully internationalized high finance cannot coexist in harmony with innumerable national concentrations of political power.

Zionism in this composite picture is the chauvinist nationalism of those who control high finance at the highest level, and Communism a kind of political high explosive to be used against all other nationalisms—two aspects of a global power political struggle which has given the world an age of conflict unprecedented in recorded history.

All the major changes which have occurred in the twentieth century can be easily explained in terms of the political

requirements of those who control high finance on an international basis—and all the great struggles of our time, whether that of Henry Ford to retain control of his own great company, or of Montagu Norman, Geoffrey Dawson and others to preserve the national integrity of British capitalism, or of Henri Deterding to keep control of Shell in genuine British and Dutch hands or of Germany to resist a Marxist revolutionary take-over bid, belong together as parts of Western civilization's struggle to survive an alien onslaught.

CHAPTER SIX

"Anti-Semitism" Examined

The failure of the powerful and wealthy Jewish American community to launch one objective scholarly study of the causes of anti-Semitism is significant. Neither the religious nor the lay leaders of the many Jewish organizations wish to lose this potent weapon. Remove prejudice and lose adherents to the faith . . . This is the conspiracy of the rabbinate, Jewish nationals and other leaders of organized Jewry to keep the problems of prejudice alive.

Alfred M. Lilienthal,
The Other Side of the Coin

Of all the great falsehoods which combine to form the modern "world of lies," there is none more powerful or more heavily charged with peril than that labelled "anti-Semitism."

It is most dangerous at this time because it is being used with great success as a weapon of psychological warfare to prevent the people of the West from discovering that they are in the process of being railroaded into a planned "New World Order." It can be described as most powerful because it is being used and backed up with a global network of organizations armed seemingly with unlimited resources in money and manpower.

This great lie is being used ruthlessly to suppress information and to veto all genuine debate on many issues, the most important of these being developments in the Middle East, where the setting-up of the state of Israel has produced a chain reaction of the most alarming consequences for Jew and gentile alike.

Dr. Alfred Lilienthal, the Jewish historian who sees in Zionism a great danger to the Jewish people and to the whole world, tells us how it is all done:

At critical moments in U.S. relations with the Arab world and Israel, there has invariably been some one person who has seen the problem in perspective, bestirred himself and attempted to tell the story to the American public. Equally invariably, like the wolf at

What upsets the Zionist leaders, as they have themselves admitted again and again, is not the fact that gentiles, especially Christians, scorn and reject persons of Jewish descent, but rather the opposite—*The readiness of the rest of mankind to receive and assimilate the Jews.*

Nothing, therefore, could be more typical of the prevailing Zionist sentiment than these remarks by Isi Leibler, President of the Executive Council of Australian Jews as reported in the *Australian Jewish Times* (December 30, 1979):

The principal threat to our survival is still the ever-increasing loss of numbers experienced as a result of assimilation and intermarriage. Our problem in Australia is compounded by the fact that, like most Western communities, nearly all our young people attend universities. This is to be welcomed but it also accentuates assimilatory forces, because universities have always represented a challenge to religious, ethnic and particularistic groups.

Mr. Leibler went on to urge "intensification of positive Jewish educational activity" as the best means of counteracting the acceptance and absorption of Jews by the non-Jewish community, adding: "We can take exceptional pride in the fact that well over 50 per cent of all Melbourne Jewish children of school-going age attend Jewish schools."

Isi Leibler's reaction to the "threat" of "assimilation and intermarriage" is typical of the reaction of Jewish leaders to what they have always seen as grave danger inherent in gentile liberalism and generosity. Here is an example, taken at random, from Howard Morely Sachar's *The Course of Modern Jewish History*:

Jewish nationalism emerged, too, during the Russian-Jewish "honeymoon" of Alexander II's regime, by way of reaction to the danger of assimilation. We recall the dismay expressed by Judah Leib Gordon and Perex Smolenskin as they suddenly recognized that *Haskalah* "modernism" was becoming a facade for the abandonment of Jewish loyalties. It was to stem the tide of this assimilation that Yehiel Michel Pines and Zeev Wolf Jawitz returned to a re-evaluation of the ghetto world, and discovered in that world a depth and tenderness they had not formerly recognized or appreciated. (Emphasis added).

Understandably, Tsar Alexander II cut short his liberal policy towards the Jews when he realized that it was not producing the expected results and that Jewish leaders were even using all the extra privileges to strengthen and harden the position of the Jews

as a separate nation, insensitive to the needs and wishes of the rest of the population.

There can be no doubt that Isi Leibler of the Executive Council of Australian Jews was speaking for organized Jewry worldwide, as even an occasional casual glance at Jewish newspapers and periodicals will confirm.

Dr. Josef Kastein, one of the most famous of Jewish historians, supports this view when he remarks: "Let us remember the great teaching of our history that anti-Semitism is not a Jewish but a foreign problem" (*History and Destiny of the Jews*).

Louis Golding, another famous writer, say the same: "Anti-Semitism is not a Jewish, but a foreign problem" (*The Jewish Problem*).

Thus, a secret or covert racism practiced by the Jews produces an open and apparent racist response among the offended "foreigners" among whom they dwell, and this is then castigated as "anti-Semitism."

Sir Arthur Keith summed it up with these words:

My anthropological colleagues, under the spell of ethical ideals, have done Jews and gentiles an ill-service by given euphonious names to vulgar things. They have assured the Jews that they are not a race but only "an ethnic group" kept together by having a religion in common. They also have assured all the other Caucasian people that they are raceless and that hence all the animosity which arises between gentiles and Jews is an artificially fomented form of hysteria. With the best intentions in the world professional anthropologists have succeeded in hiding from the world the nature of its running sores. (*A New Theory of Human Evolution*).

Does separation necessarily imply any antagonism? Here is Sir Arthur Keith's reply to that question:

Another mark of race possessed by the Jews must be mentioned. Their conduct is regulated by a "dual code"; their conduct towards their fellows is based on one code (amity) and that towards all who are outside their circle on another (enmity). The use of the dual code, as we have seen, is a mark of an evolving race.

The Jewish scholar Bernard Lazare was, therefore, only stating the obvious when he wrote:

Inasmuch as the enemies of the Jews belonged to divers races, as they dwelt far apart from one another, were ruled by different laws and governed by opposite principles; as they had not the same customs and differed in spirit from one another, so that they could

not possibly judge alike of any subject, it must needs be that the general causes of anti-Semitism have always resided in Israel itself and not in those antagonistic to it. (*Anti-Semitism*, Bernard Lazare).

Such, then, is the blinding and stupefying effect of egalitarian fanaticism that modern leftist intellectuals in the West, in their eagerness to promote the egalitarian creed, have always welcomed the cooperation and even the leadership of the world's most dedicated race separatists and race supremacists! The racially etiolated gentile intellectuals yearn for an imagined world in which all the supposed causes of antagonism and tension have been eliminated, while their Jewish comrades just as eagerly seek in the ethnic disarmament of others ideal conditions for the triumph of their own group consciousness and nationalism.

Dr. Nahum Goldmann put it with astonishing frankness: "We are at one and the same time the most separatist and most universalist people in the world" (*The Jewish Paradox*), and he makes it quite clear that the separatism is for "us," the Jews, and the universalism for "them," the gentiles — another version of the Pigs' doctrine in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*: "All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others."

The covert antagonism of a tightly knit unassimilable minority has been expressed in innumerable different forms, but the general effect sought is nearly always the same — that of making the "foreigners" weak in the very things that make the minority strong, confusing group consciousness and attenuating the vitality, self-confidence and will of the host population. Setting aside the question of authorship, the so-called *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* contains as complete a compendium of the means employed as will be found anywhere in print.

One of the major factors in this process of culture distortion, without which the rest would have been impossible, has been the falsification of all those academic disciplines which have to do with the study of man, like anthropology, psychology, ethnology, human genetics, political science and history.

The malevolent corruption of scientific doctrine is nowhere better exemplified than in psychology, that science which by definition concerns itself with the operations of the psyche; and it is precisely where most damage can be done that the anti-Semitic smear, or the fear of it, has exerted a major influence in our century. Writes Dr. Thomas Szasz in his book *The Myth of Psychotherapy*:

The inconsistency between Freud's passionate antireligious tirades and his profound commitment to Jewishness significantly highlights an important aspect of Freud's personality and production, namely his anti-gentilism. The popular image of Freud as an enlightened, emancipated, irreligious person, who, with the aid of psychoanalysis "discovered" that religion is mental illness is pure fiction . . . he was sympathetic to Zionism from the first days and was acquainted with and respected Herzl; he had once sent Herzl a copy of one of his works with a personal dedication. Freud's son was a member of the Kadimah, a Zionist organization, and Freud himself was an honorary member of it.

Dr. Szasz remarks that Freud's vengefulness towards personal enemies in particular and gentiles in general, as well as the "potential destructiveness of psychoanalysis as a rhetoric of execration and invalidation" was heavily protected by the notion, current in those times, that "if it is Jewish it is liberal, progressive and scientific"; hence it was hard for anyone to criticize the teachings of Freud without laying himself open to accusations of being influenced by anti-Semitic sentiments.

What always disturbed Freud most, therefore, was criticism which came from Jewish sources, like the courageous and penetrating analysis by the Viennese writer Karl Kraus, who described psychoanalysis as "the disease of which it pretends to be the cure," and the description of psychoanalysis by another Jewish writer, Theodor Lessing, as "a monstrosity of the Jewish spirit."

Dr. Szasz, himself born a Jew, one time professor of Psychiatry at the State University of New York, discussed a book by Frank Field in which an attempt is made to disvalue Karl Kraus's seemingly harsh judgment:

Field's remarks epitomize an intellectual-scientific attitude towards Freud and his work that developed in the early days of psychoanalysis before the First World War, and one which Freud did everything he could to cultivate. I refer here to the view that it was in bad taste to point out that *psychoanalysis was not a matter of science but of Jewishness*, or that it was, especially in its actual use by Freud and his lackeys, *an immoral and ugly enterprise*. If such a charge was made by a Christian — so held the supporters of this position — it revealed the critic's anti-Semitism; and if it was made by a Jew it revealed a lapse of his judgment, or grew out of his self-hatred as a Jew. Since there were few Mohammedans in Freud's Vienna and fewer still who cared a whit about psychoanalysis, this attitude in effect exempted psychoanalysis from effective intellectual or scientific criticism. (Emphasis added).

There is a whole world of meaning in Dr. Szasz's description of psychoanalysis as "not a matter of science but of Jewishness," for the same comment applies, and with equal cogency, to other Jewish scholars and their scientific doctrines, like Professor Franz Boas and his school of egalitarian anthropology which insists that there are no mental differences corresponding with all the obvious physical differences among human races.

As in the case of psychoanalysis, all the persons most prominently involved in launching and promoting this egalitarian anthropology were Jewish: Boas himself, born of Russian Jewish parents; Ruth Benedict, born in New York, later Professor of Anthropology at Columbia University; Isador Chein, born in New York, one of the Supreme Court authorities on the segregation issue; Theodosius Dobzhansky, born in Russia, Professor of Zoology, Columbia University; Melville Herskovits, Professor of Anthropology at Northwestern University; Otto Klineberg, lecturer in anthropology and psychology, Columbia University; Ashley Montagu (not his original name), Professor of Anthropology at Rutgers University; Gene Weltfish, lecturer in anthropology at Columbia University; etc.

Gentile critics of the Boas doctrine who extend to their opponents the traditional courtesies of academic discourse which naturally presupposes a shared honesty of purpose, surrender their one winning card, which is to show, as can be so easily done, that the Boas doctrine is *not a matter of science at all but of Jewishness*, being primarily an exercise aimed at promoting Jewish, and especially Zionist, political purposes. Moreover, it could be shown quite easily that all these Jewish proponents of the egalitarian dogma *themselves do not believe it*, since it is the exact opposite of what is practiced by the community to which they adhere so loyally and uncritically.

It is precisely because the Boas school of anthropology is *not a matter of science* that, in all those universities where Jewish authority prevails, there can be no genuine debate on the subject, and any arguments against it are dealt with at once in the language of "execration and invalidation," including expressions like "racism," "fascism," "nazism" and even "mental illness."

With history, especially that covering the period of World War II, it is precisely the same. The story of the alleged gas chamber killing of six million Jews by the Germans is *not a matter of history but of Jewishness*; hence it cannot be exposed to the normal

processes of academic investigation and discussion; and, since Jewish geopolitical interests and security are involved, any attempt to refute it can only be countered by non-academic means, namely "execration and invalidation," supported sometimes even with physical violence.

There are many signs that the instrument of intimidation is today used mainly against gentiles, whereas in the past, when the Jews were less powerful in the world, it was used frequently and effectively among themselves as a means of preserving group solidarity.

Bernard Lazare remarks, that modern Jews have forgotten the meaning of the religious ceremonies, and that rabbinical Judaism has been transformed into what he calls "a religion of rationalism." What now holds the Jews together, he says, is "national consciousness"; the Jew practices his faith no longer, he is irreligious, even an atheist, "but he continues to be a Jew because he believes in his race." These remarks Lazare supports with quotations from other Jewish sources.

The transformation that has taken place in this century amounts to this: *fear* has been largely replaced by *appetite* as the major motivational source of Zionist cohesion. Thus, modern Jews are not so much afraid of stepping out of line as they are *enchanted* by the prospects of personal enrichment and advancement which loyalty to the group offers. In a Western world atomized by a spirit of bourgeois money-making and competitiveness, the Jews' own fervent unity-in-dispersion with its infinitely variable twin code of ethics is a veritable *open sesame* to success in both business and the professions.

Bernard Lazare even boasts of it: "The Jew who, personally, is better endowed than his competitors, increases his advantage by uniting with his co-religionists . . . and thus augments his power by acting in common with his brethren."

But, is the Jew "personally, better endowed than his competitors?"

Jewish leaders were stung to the quick by Boris Pasternak's comment that it is only the mediocre who find it necessary to seek advantage for themselves by banding together within a society—and Pasternak presently found himself branded as "an anti-Semitic Jew."

Another enormous advantage accruing to the Jews in a modern bourgeois environment, where only personal success counts, is that their own success is massively compounded by the power of a patronage which they can exercise, with gentiles almost falling over each other in their eagerness to gain Jewish favor—in business, the professions, and, most significantly, in politics, which thus fall largely under Jewish control.

Finally, what can the gentile “foreigners” do about the “problem” which has been planted in their midst?

The first requirement, obviously, is *to understand the problem* and to define it correctly—which is what we have tried to do in this chapter. What we, the “foreigners,” need is something that only sympathetic comprehension of the problem can supply: namely, an attitude in which intelligence prevails over blind emotional responses.

After all, it is an attenuation of the problem and, hopefully, its final disappearance that we want, and not only an occasional discharge of the tension of resentment which only makes the problem more intractable.

Leading Australian Jew Isi Leibler himself gives us the answer we seek: We must accentuate and intensify those “assimilatory forces.” What is to him the “principle threat” is to us the best hope.

The peoples of the West, both as nations and as individuals, have a duty to arm themselves in their minds against any dual code practiced in their midst, thereby robbing it of most of its power.

Simultaneously, however, if they are wise, they will accentuate those assimilatory forces by extending to Jewish citizens, in all their personal contacts, unflinching courtesy, consideration and kindness—at the same time *taking great care not to expose themselves to the risks of unwarranted trustfulness.*

The experience of 2000 years should surely have taught us that the problem of what the Jews call “anti-Semitism,” but which we call anti-gentilism, is never going to be solved by rabble-rousing and persecution.

Meanwhile, however, we would do well never to forget that it is a chauvinist Zionist ambition that is edging mankind towards the brink of another global catastrophe, and that its most potent weapon is the mind-paralyzing lie of “anti-Semitism.”

CHAPTER SEVEN

Jewish Historiography

A book published in 1980 provides as good a starting point as any for a general exploration of the almost infinitely complex subject of Jewish historiography; its title: *Jews and Zionism: the South African Experience 1910-1967*; its author: Dr. Gideon Shimoni, Lecturer in Contemporary Jewry at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem; the publisher: Oxford University Press, Cape Town.¹

This book is an excellent example of Jewish historiography, painstakingly researched and well written, from which it is possible to draw valid conclusions that are equally applicable to the works of most other Jewish writers in this field.

Here we have a history of the Jewish people in South Africa covering a period of close on 60 years which is also a history of South Africa. But it is addressed to the Jews and, with a few exceptions, will be read only by Jews. What distinguishes it from all other histories of South Africa is the fact that it is concerned exclusively with the interests of a tiny minority of the population of the country—indeed, in all its 364 pages there is not to be found any expression of genuine sympathetic concern with the interests of any other section of the population, except only where the grievances of one section can be used for the furtherance of the Jewish interest.

Professor Henry L. Feingold, Professor of History at the University of New York, has put it in a nutshell:

Is it possible that there is something so idiosyncratic about the Jewish presence in history, considering the fact that it is a community based on an idea and on history itself, that it resists the tools and thwarts the assumptions of modern scholarship?²

Part of an answer to Professor Feingold's question is supplied by the French Jewish writer, James Darmesteter in his book *Camp d'Oeil sur l'Histoire du Peuple Juif* (Paris, 1892):

Not all those engaged in these studies (i.e., history of religion etc.) reached that degree of serene impartiality where facts are studied for the sole purpose of being understood and where thought is carried to a height that will not permit of conclusions dictated in advance by the ephemeral prejudices of politics, of faith, or of metaphysics.

For which sentiments Darmesteter is categorized by Richard J.H. Gottheil in his book *Zionism* as being not a genuine Jew but only "a Frenchman of Jewish race."

Professor Feingold can, therefore, expect to find no answer to his question unless, like Darmesteter, he can see history from outside the confines of his identity as a Jew—after which, if it is scholarship that commands his allegiance, again like Darmesteter, he will have ceased to be a Jew. In a word, he can be a Jewish historiographer, but he cannot at the same time be a scholar and a Jew, for in historical scholarship, as in all the sciences, it is the shared interest of all mankind that is called on to preside over the study and contemplation of the legitimate separate interests of the innumerable groups of which mankind is composed.

That does not mean that all history not written by Jews qualifies as genuine scholarship; in fact, very little of it does so qualify. History is the story of what happened and is, therefore, always heavily influenced by those who make things happen and who are naturally inclined to represent their actions and intentions in laudable terms. In particular, the history of any great conflict is inevitably the victor's story; and in more general terms it can be stated as an axiom that it is the prevailing power, those who control the present, who dictate the story of the past and of the present—in their history books and in the media of public communication which they own or control.

Nevertheless, there is still a significant difference between Jewish and non-Jewish historiography, the one always more rigorously partisan than the other, the one intended exclusively for a Jewish readership and the other, with all its faults and shortcomings, addressed to the world at large. The main difference is one of subject matter which, in the case of Jewish historiography almost invariably repels the attention of the gentile. Thus, opening Shimoni's book at random, at page 173 we read:

Far more vibrant than *Mizarchi* was the socialist-Zionist *Paolei Zion* (Workers of Zion) Party, founded in Johannesburg in November 1918 by a group of young immigrant Jews of *Litvak* background, notably the brothers Richard and Leibl Feldman, Jacob Judelowitze, E.M. Pincus and S. Kartun. Emphatically preferring Yiddish to Hebrew, *Paolei Zion* produced a Yiddish monthly called *Unser Weg* (Our Way) . . .

Closing the book and re-opening it at random we find ourselves at page 263 and we read:

. . . and by the time *Habonim* augmented by the merger with *Dror* and *Bnei Zion* has at last crystallized its educational policy, there were far fewer candidates for *Chalutz Aliyah* than there had been at the time of Israel's establishment.

The general reader cannot be interested in all this because the concepts and the institutions lie entirely outside his own field of experience and have no meaning except to Jews, and words are used which are not to be found in any English dictionary.

There may be little genuine historical scholarship in very many books written by gentiles—but scholarship is always amply represented within the corpus of Western historiography. Thus, while British establishment writers, many of them highly gifted, were churning out shamelessly partisan histories of the Anglo-Boer War period in South Africa, it was still possible for British readers to find books on the same subject which were destined to stand the test of time, like J.A. Hobson's *The War in South Africa*. Genuine history in the West has tended to lag behind propaganda; yet truth has prevailed, if only, as Lord Acton put it, "when it is no longer in anyone's interest to suppress it." The propaganda story of the Anglo-Boer War period has tended to fade into popular forgetfulness, to be replaced in our time for the benefit of those who still want to know what happened, by Thomas Pakenham's *The Boer War*, which hides nothing, falsifies nothing and makes no excuses for British policy in Africa, even if it falls short of explaining in historical terms what happened.³

On the other hand, in the entire corpus of Jewish historiography we find nothing but the most slavish subordination of scholarship to a stringently narrow conception of the Jewish national interest, accompanied very often by the execration of any Jewish writer who has fallen into the heresy of trying to achieve a reconciliation of the moral interests of Jew and gentile, the most bitterly execrated of these being the philosopher Baruch Spinoza.

Moses Maimonides (born at the Talmudic Center, Cordova, in 1135) drew up a famous code of the principles of Judaism and wrote:

It is forbidden to defraud or deceive any person in business. Judaist and non-Judaist are to be treated alike . . . What some people imagine, that it is permissible to cheat a gentile, is an error and based on ignorance . . . Deception, duplicity, cheating and circumvention towards a gentile are despicable to the Almighty, as "all that do unrighteously are an abomination unto the Lord thy God." (Quoted by Douglas Reed in *The Controversy of Zion*).

The Talmudists denounced Maimonides to the Inquisition, saying: "You who clear your own community of heretics, clear ours too."⁴

It is thus by insisting on separateness and secrecy, that a Jewish presence in the West "resists the tools and thwarts the assumptions of modern scholarship." Nothing could be more idiosyncratic or peculiar than the presence in history of a nation, strongly united and organized, an endogamous or inbreeding biological unit, not confined like all other nations within territorial boundaries but dispersed worldwide among other populations. For Jewry, under the banner of Zionism, as Shimoni and virtually all other Jewish historiographers frankly admit, is a real nation in which religion is a factor of rapidly diminishing importance.

Many pages of Shimoni's book are taken up with an account of the struggle within Jewry which gathered pace early in this century as Zionism, an essentially secular nationalist ideology, prevailing irresistibly over Judaism as a religious adaptation to existence.

Prominent in the religious rear guard was the Reverend A.P. Bender of Cape Town, of whom Shimoni writes:

He regarded Zionism as a misleading illusion, since the revival of a Jewish homeland was, in his view, a matter for God and not men. If anything, he preferred territorialism contending that, whereas the Zionist goal was only "a far-off divine event," territorialism might at least provide immediate relief.

Shimoni writes elsewhere that Zionism made rapid progress in South Africa—more so than in the United States and Britain—adding: "Consequently it must be noted that in South Africa successive generations of Jewish youth were exposed, almost exclusively, to a mode of identification determined by Zionism."

Shimoni's book is virtually devoid of any religious tones and is the clearest imaginable statement of the fact that Jews within the

nations of the West are alien political intrusions highly organized and integrated on an international basis as a separate nation with a different and separate set of interests and values.

Needless to say, it is nowhere suggested in Shimoni's book that the world's Jews regard Israel as a homeland to which they or their children hope one day to be able to return, this perception of the imagined destiny of the Jews being today almost exclusively confined to Christians.⁵

It is this idiosyncratic Jewish presence, exerting enormous and even decisive influence within all the nations of the Western world, including the Soviet Union, and in all spheres, economic, political and cultural, which today presents to what is left of Western scholarship a challenge which it declines or evades at its peril.

In other words, it has become the most pressing duty and responsibility of Western scholarship to penetrate, explore and fully incorporate in the shared knowledge and wisdom of mankind a partisan history from which it has allowed itself for so long to be rigorously excluded; the urgency of this duty has been enormously enhanced in recent years by developments in the Middle East where Jewish interests and those of all other nations are inseparably involved, and where it is Jewish interests which most frequently take the initiative and exert the decisive influence.

The late Professor Sir Arthur Keith, one-time President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, penetrated to the heart of the anthropological problem in his book *A New Theory of Human Evolution*.

The chapters in which Professor Keith examines the problem of Jewish minorities and of the phenomenon called "anti-Semitism" form only a small portion of a book of more than 400 pages in which he explains the role of group consciousness in the evolution of races, nations, and moral sentiment.

Dr. Shimoni's history of the Jewish community in South Africa, like "Dr. B.A. Kosmin's history of the Jews in Zimbabwe"⁶ (formerly Rhodesia), like nearly all histories of the Jews and biographies and autobiographies written by Jews, endorsed Professor Keith's thesis by illuminating it with innumerable examples.

What Professor Keith says is that *The Jews are permanently at war with the peoples among whom they dwell*—no less a state of war because the weapons used are almost exclusively those of the mind. This situation illustrates the *Ingsoc* dictum in George

Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, "War is peace and peace is war," where war itself wears the disguise of peace; indeed, Orwell's book can be read as a brilliant expose of some of the methods now actually being used by a small alien power elite to expand its dominion over the rest of mankind.

However important the mind-bending technology analyzed by Orwell, this is only a small portion of a technology of political warfare which covers the entire range of human activity, including high finance, the media of communication, party politics, the administration of justice, education and the arts—and does not even stop short, as Shimoni shows, at active involvement in revolutionary subversion and terrorist violence.⁸

Dr. Shimoni supplies the facts about Jewish involvement in revolutionary activity in South Africa but makes no attempt to interpret or explain, confident, no doubt, that his mainly Jewish readers will need no help in relating these facts to Jewish political aims and aspirations. The main struggle began, he writes, in 1950 when the South African Government introduced the Suppression of Communism Act, a measure amended from time to time to give the state powers to ban any organization deemed to be furthering the aims of Communism.

Shimoni writes at page 227:

Apart from the effect of these dramatic events upon the lives of Jews as White citizens of South Africa, they had significant consequences for South African Jewry as a community. The reason was the extraordinary salience of Jewish individuals in the White opposition to the regime of *apartheid*. Throughout this period Jewish names kept appearing in every facet of the struggle: among reformist liberals; in the radical Communist opposition; in the courts, whether as defendants or as counsel for the defense; in the lists of bannings and amongst those who fled the country to evade arrest. Their prominence was particularly marked in the course of the Treason Trial which occupied an important place in the news media throughout the second half of the 1950s. This trial began in December 1956, when 156 people were arrested on charges of treason in the form of a conspiracy to overthrow the state by violence and to replace it with a state based on Communism. Twenty-three of those arrested were Whites, more than half of them Jews.

Shimoni lists the names of some of those accused: they included Yetta Barenblatt, Hymie Barsel, Lionel (Rusty) Bernstein, Leon Levy, Norman Levy, Sydney Shall, Joe Slovo, Ruth (First) Slovo,

Sonia Bunting, Lionel Forman, Isaac Horvitch, Ben Turok, Jacqueline Arenstein, Errol Shanley, Dorothy Shanley. Then he adds, casually:

To top it all, at one stage in the trial the defense counsel was led by Israel Maisels, while the prosecutor was none other than Oswald Pirow. The juxtaposition was striking: Maisels, the prominent Jewish communal leader, defending those accused of seeking to overthrow White supremacy; Pirow, the extreme Afrikaner Nationalist and former Nazi sympathizer, defending White supremacy.

It is significant, surely, that nowhere in Shimoni's books do we find any trace of an antagonism of interest and attitude between the Jewish community as a whole and those accused of seeking by revolutionary means to overthrow the state. The same bland non-committal attitude of the Jewish community towards revolutionary activity was revealed in 1963 when the police raided the luxurious home of one Arthur Goldreich at Rivonia near Johannesburg, where they captured almost intact the leadership cadre of a supposed Black Communist revolutionary movement called *Umkonto we Sizwe* ("Spear of the Nation").

Writes Shimoni:

Seventeen people were arrested, including Sisulu and Kathrada, leaders respectively of the banned African and Indian Congresses who were both hiding from the police. Five of those arrested were Whites, all of them Jews. They were: Arthur Goldreich, Lionel Berstein, Hilliard Festenstein, Dennis Goldberg and Bob Hepple.

The Jewish community's weirdly antithetical role in South Africa (as in so many other Western countries) was summed up by Nathaniel Weyl in his book *Traitor's End*, when he wrote of anti-Semitism in South Africa:

A perhaps more important ingredient was the prominence of South African Jews in finance, mining and other economic command posts of the nation on the one hand, and in revolutionary and racial reform movements on the other. From the outset Jews had been prominent in the Communist Party and its various fronts. They were equally conspicuous in the various movements which sought to break down the barriers separating the White from the non-White population.

Since the weird contradiction of a highly privileged ethnic minority represented out of all proportion among those who seek to overthrow the prevailing order is left unexplained in books

written by Jews (like Shimoni's history of Zionism in South Africa) it must be assumed that among the Jews themselves no explanation is needed or required. Such an assumption which offers to resolve the contradiction would be fully in line with Professor Keith's thesis that the Jews, for reasons of group solidarity, are everywhere committed to clandestine warfare against the majorities among whom they dwell as self-perpetuating minorities. Hence their continuous struggle to break down all barriers separating one ethnic group from another, except only that occult barrier that has always ensured Jewish separation.

Shimoni's handling of the subject of anti-Semitism is founded on the simple presupposition that there never was and never can be any justification for gentile dissent or disapprobation of anything the Jews do or say in maintaining or promoting their group interests.

Anti-Semitism is thus regarded either as an infectious form of moral perversion to be equated with "racism" and "intolerance" or as an evil ideology associated with "Nazism," "Fascism" and any other form of political totalitarianism—except Communism which, although frequently mentioned in the book, is nowhere disparaged.

Shimoni writes of that period in South African history when simultaneously nearly all White listed Communists were Jews and when Israel voted consistently against South Africa at the United Nations:

Also reflective of the groundswell of suspicion against Israel and Jewry was the hostility revealed by an organization called the Inter-Church Anti-Communist Actions Commission (AntiCom). It published a bilingual newsletter which fostered the impression that there was a close tie between Jewry and Communism. With the support of "evidence" taken from standard neo-Nazi propaganda, it purported to show how Communism and Bolshevism were fomented by Jews. In the circumstances prevailing in South Africa, these allegations were particularly insidious, for AntiCom ostensibly enjoyed the responsible auspices of the Afrikaner churches. Yet protestations by the Board of Deputies to the AntiCom committee were of little avail. It responded that in the light of "the high percentage of Jewish names among the listed Communists," the Jewish community should declare where it stood in "the fight against Godless Communism."

The Jewish community was evidently in no position to declare itself unequivocally against "Godless Communism," nor would it have been possible in an atmosphere of full and frank discussion to

prove to AntiCom that its allegations were groundless and that there had been no linkage between Jews and Communism before, during and after the Bolshevik Revolution. The Board of Deputies then, as always in such circumstances, could respond only in one way: by indignantly condemning all such accusations. Again, when at an International Symposium on Communism in Pretoria in 1966 Major-General Hendrik van den Bergh, chief of South Africa's security police, coupled Jews and Communism, there was nothing the Board of Deputies could do except angrily condemn the General's remarks and bring massive pressure to bear on him to retract them—without any attempt to prove that what he had said was untrue or incorrect, or even permit the matter to be debated.

There is not, nor has there ever been, in the West anything of the kind represented by the word "anti-Semitism"; the West has never offered any resistance whatever to the acceptance and assimilation of persons of Jewish ethnic origin; in fact, innumerable Jews down the ages have disappeared through assimilation into the different nations of the West; and all the world's Jews would quickly vanish as ethnic minorities if they abandoned their policy of exclusiveness and the dual code of conduct which such exclusiveness necessitates. That which is called "anti-Semitism" is, therefore, only a gentile reaction to the Jew's unwillingness to be accepted and assimilated and the steps which the Jews take to give effect to that unwillingness.

Anyone who studies Jewish newspapers and other publications—very few Westerners do—is left in no doubt that it is the ongoing process of assimilation that worries Zionist leaders most and that sign of gentile resentment are always given the maximum of publicity and are eagerly exploited to scare rank-and-file Jews back into line and increase resistance to the natural temptations of assimilation.

One of the consequences of all this, almost laughable for its absurdity, is that many gentiles find themselves burdened with guilt feelings over what they are supposed to have done to the Jews—when, in fact, all the trouble can be traced to what the Jews persist in doing in their efforts to preserve their exclusiveness and, when possible, extend their predominance over the gentiles.

A great deal of space in Dr. Shimoni's book is taken up with information and discussion about the strenuous and persistent efforts of Jewish leaders in South Africa to harden Jewish youth against the temptations of assimilation. Having already discussed

the various Jewish youth movements and *Habonim* youth-training and indoctrination camps, he writes on page 253:

Another index of Zionism's strength in South Africa was its influence upon the phenomenal development of the Jewish day schools after 1948. By 1967 there were 14 such schools spread throughout the major cities of Southern Africa, encompassing 5500 primary and secondary school children or about 30 per cent of the Jewish population of school age. Although these day schools were neither created nor directly sponsored by the Zionist Organization, their protagonists and promoters were almost all Zionists. Moreover, as we have noted in an earlier chapter, the formula "Jewish education based on broadly national-traditional lines" had been incorporated into the Board of Education's constitution in 1945.

The Jews' insistence on Jewish nationalism as a basis for their children's education did not predispose them to regard with sympathetic understanding the efforts of the Afrikaners to influence their children in favor of *Christian-national principles*. On the contrary, the Afrikaners' policy of Christian National Education (CNE) was regarded as "yet another reactionary and, therefore, potentially anti-Jewish expression of Afrikaner nationalism."

It is not simply the practice of a dual code, clearly distinguishing between "us" and "them," that is idiosyncratic about the Jewish presence in history, for the dual code, as Professor Keith explains, is part of an evolutionary process which has always ensured the promotion and preservation of group solidarity, as among all other social creatures; what is idiosyncratic is a dual code, as practiced by the Jews *within the territorial boundaries of other nations*, establishing within the nations so penetrated *an antagonism of group interest* hurtful to the host people and sometimes dangerous for the Jews.

Shimoni's history provides innumerable examples of the weirdly different kind of thinking and of expression made necessary by this idiosyncratic presence in history, producing in the reader who does not "belong" sensations of bewilderment much like those experienced by Alice in her Wonderland; for it is a world in which the unreal acquires to a quite marvellous degree the verisimilitude of the real and in which the most radical contradictions are rendered convincingly acceptable.

It is a kind of thinking with which the West has gained a slight acquaintance in its attempts to penetrate the mysteries of Marxist-Leninist dialectic, the main features of it being the subordination

of all tests of truth and of logical consistency to the requirements of "the cause"—if it suits "us" it is true; if it suits "them" it is untrue; thus, it is possible to reconcile in a single belief what is both true and untrue; this is what George Orwell calls *Doublethink*.

It must be a source of infinite wonder and amused self-congratulation among the Jews to find that the whole world seems not to have noticed that what they so passionately condemn as "apartheid" is only an Afrikaans version of what they themselves preach and practice under the name of Zionism—namely, racial and national self-preservation and self-determination. At the same time, while Jews all over the world are in the forefront of every campaign against South Africa, Jews in South Africa, many of them Israeli citizens, work in the closest cooperation with the government on every plane, including high finance, industry, military defense and even in national security agencies.⁹

It would be tediously repetitive to list the innumerable examples of double standards, or *Doublethink* in Shimoni's book, for in virtually every page we see how it serves the purposes of a nationalism of the mind that lacks the security of geographical boundaries. One example, therefore, will have to suffice.

Question: What in the Zionist view is the most detestable of all political ideologies? Answer: National Socialism.

Next Question: What was happening in South Africa while German National Socialism was raging in Europe?

Answer: We read in Dr. Shimoni's chapter on the war years in South Africa of the emergence of the Zionist Socialist Party—the word *Zionist* having by now been firmly established as synonymous with *national*; this Zionist Socialist Party, we are told, was "making great strides." Dr. Shimoni writes: "In the late 1930s and during the war years a new ideological constellation at last conducive to socialist Zionism had been taking shape in the country."

International Socialism and its supposed deadly opposite National Socialism are brought together by Dr. Shimoni without the slightest hint of contradiction in fact or logic:

The ideological program of the party affirmed that it stood together with the socialist labor movements of all countries and people in the struggle to "liquidate the capitalist system of private property and to create in its stead a socialist society built on the basis of cooperative ownership of the means of production." However, it contended that *for Jews* the prerequisite of socialism was a Jewish homeland in Palestine so that their occupational

distribution and their *national existence* could be normalized. *Zionism embodies a progressive nationalism compatible with socialism*, according to the formula: "*Socialist in content and national in form.*" (Emphasis added).¹⁰

In a word, *national socialism* for "us" and international socialism for "them"; the preservation of group identity for "us" and the obliteration of group identity for "them"; one standard for "us," another for "them"; power for "us," impotence for "them."

Could it be purely fortuitous that the concept of *Doublethink*, so clearly enunciated and explained by George Orwell, corresponds so closely with the kind of thinking we encounter in Jewish historiography, whether addressed to Jew or gentile? And could it be fortuitous that *Doublethink* and the behavior that goes with it are precisely what is required to give effect to a dual moral code which Professor Keith has identified as a significant feature of race consciousness?

We are driven to the conclusion that Jewish historiography precludes any possibility of scholarly debate—for what kind of debate can there be with enmity, no matter how carefully disguised? Or, to put it another way, what kind of debate can a gentile scholar have with those who insist in advance that Judaism's *separate interest* is sacrosanct, therefore non-debatable?

For the gentile student, Jewish historiography is like that legendary Cretan labyrinthine cave from which the hero Theseus would never have been able to extricate himself without the clew of thread given to him by Ariadne, daughter of King Minos. The detailed analysis and explanation of *Doublethink* which Orwell has supplied is for the gentile student the equivalent of Adriadne's clew of thread, the fibers of it *moral as well as intellectual*.

We learn from Orwell that:

Doublethink means the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them . . . The process has to be conscious, or it would not be carried out with sufficient precision, but it also has to be unconscious, or it would bring with it a feeling of falsity and hence of guilt . . . To tell deliberate lies while genuinely believing in them, to forget any fact that has become inconvenient, and then, when it becomes necessary again, to draw it back from oblivion for just so long as it is needed, to deny the existence of objective reality and all the while to take account of the reality which one denies—all this is indispensably necessary. Even in using the word *doublethink* it is necessary to exercise *doublethink*. For by using the word one

admits that one is tampering with reality; by a fresh act of *doublethink* one erases this knowledge; and so on indefinitely, with the lie always one leap ahead of the truth. (*Nineteen Eighty-four*).

The Jewish historiographer is proof against any feeling of falsity, or any twinges of conscience, because the justification of a potentially hostile and assimilatory majority is felt to be necessary for the preservation of a separate Jewish identity and interest, therefore, *biologically necessary*, to be practiced just as *innocently* as all those other forms of camouflage and concealment which characterize antagonism of interest throughout nature.

Doublethink can be regarded as a kind of original sin that has been with the human species ever since it was discovered that an untrue statement, if believed, can produce the same effect as a true one, and that the misrepresentation of reality can be used by one to impose his will on another. Falsely inform someone that his house is on fire, and he will react and behave exactly as if it is on fire. *A state of persuasion* has thus been substituted for a state of genuine knowledge and understanding. Plato in his criticism of the sophist (*Phaedrus* 261) draws attention to what he calls "the universal art of enchanting the mind with arguments," producing opinions that come from *persuasion* and not from truth. However, this is a process that places some strain on the persuader, because every factual misrepresentation and every misleading argument he uses requires the incorporation of more unreality in his own thinking processes, increasingly at the risk of undermining his own grip on reality. The end result is a state of alienation or schizophrenia where all ability to distinguish reality from unreality has been lost.

However, in much the same way that training and practice make possible certain physical feats otherwise impossible and even dangerous to attempt, so, too, can the practice of *Doublethink* be developed in some individuals far beyond the breaking point of the untrained and uninitiated. It is this highly sophisticated *Doublethink* which has been developed into a major weapon of psychological warfare in our century, practiced with incomparable skill by nationalist Jews, either as Zionists or Communists, and with less skill by their gentile surrogates. Indeed, there is a big difference between *Doublethink* as practiced by Jewish political activists, including journalists and historians, and as practiced by their intellectually enchanted surrogates—the first energized by strong race instinct and reinforced with centuries of accumulated

experience, and the other having no other source of motivation and assurance than a bloodless leftist ideology.

There is thus a world of difference between the *Doublethink* of a Whittaker Chambers (principal witness in the memorable Alger Hiss Soviet espionage case in the USA 1948-1950) and that of a leading modern Jewish historian like Professor Norman Cohn. Chambers, having broken under the strain of trying to live simultaneously in two mental worlds, explained as follows the purgation of his psyche which preceded his conversion to Christianity:

I have had to transform my whole way of life and thought. In the process I have thrown off many-year-old influences. It happened that they were almost completely Semitic. There is no question of blaming these influences. Rather would I blame my own susceptibility to them. (Whittaker Chambers, letter to a friend in 1943).¹¹

So complete is the amalgam of *reality* and *unreality* in the mind of the trained and instinctually strengthened practioner of *Doublethink* that he can, as Orwell remarks, actually believe (if only for as long as necessary) what he knows to be untrue, without any risk of disturbing his total grip on reality; and it is the fact that he himself believes it that confers on his utterance a high degree of credibility.

An excellent example of this species of *Doublethink* is the concluding chapter of Professor Norman Cohn's book *Warrant for Genocide*, in which he attributes Gentile reactions of resentment to a psychological "mechanism by which human beings read into the behavior of others the anarchic tendencies which they fear to recognize in themselves."

Cohn argues his thesis most ingeniously:

... the Jews, as a collectivity, are unconsciously seen both as the "bad" son, i.e. the rebellious son full of murderous wishes toward the father, and the "bad" father, i.e. the potential torturer, castrater and killer of the son.

He goes on to explain:

Following Sigmund Freud himself, various psychoanalysts have argued that the Jews, because they reject the Christian God, are unconsciously seen by some Christians as "bad," rebellious sons—indeed, as parricides; this means that traditionally, it has been easy and tempting for a Christian to make the Jew into a scapegoat for any unconscious resentment he may have against this father, or that matter against his God.

If that explanation leaves us unpersuaded, Professor Cohn has a couple of others to offer:

Unconsciously, the Jew is even more closely identified with the "bad" father than he is with the "bad" son. This is understandable enough, for the historical relationship of the Jewish people to Christianity and to Europe makes it almost inevitable that it should be seen as a kind of collective father-figure. As an identifiable people the Jews are, of course, very much older than most of the European peoples, but that is not all: Jewish religion is the *parent* religion out of which, and in rivalry with which, Christianity developed.

Still not persuaded? Professor Cohn has yet another explanation to offer:

Most important of all, perhaps, is the fact that while the God of Christianity combines the attributes of father and son, the God of the Jews is father only—and, one might add, in the eyes of the Christians who learn of him only from the Old Testament and know nothing of the later development of Judaism, a singularly tyrannical and merciless father at that.¹²

We are reminded that exactly the same kind of persuasion is used in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, where O'Brien (his name now interchangeable with that of Emmanuel Goldstein) says to Winston Smith:

You know perfectly well what is the matter with you. You have known it for years, though you have fought against the knowledge. You are mentally deranged. You suffer from a defective memory.

It is explained to Winston that his memory can be described as defective because he has insisted on retaining knowledge that ought to have been forgotten and so rendered totally nonexistent.

Similarly, the gentiles are called on to expunge from their collective memory all knowledge about injuries and injustices suffered at the hands of the Jews, and to understand that anything short of total conformity with Jewish requirements is classifiable as no more than what Professor Cohn calls "collective psychopathology."

In tones of cold superiority, Mephistophelian in confidence and arrogance, Professor Cohn presents a slightly complex explanation of "anti-Semitism" which the unwary student, impressed by its ingenuity and logical consistency, will be tempted to accept—without pausing to scrutinize the dubious foundations on which it has been reared; namely, a murky and wholly unsubstantiated Freudian thesis of innate "father-son" enmity.

All such "explanations" of "anti-Semitism," like much of Freud's writing, are identifiable as a form of psychological warfare passed off as scholarship, cunningly contrived to disable the Western mind and to transfer and transfix attention as far away as possible from an area of inquiry where, logically and realistically, any genuine investigation should begin: actual complaints of Jewish injustice which have been made almost continuously down the ages by people of different race and nationality among whom the Jews have dwelt as minorities. Instead of the *complaint* being made the subject of inquiry, it is the *complainant* who is put on trial or, better still as Professor Cohn suggests, handed over to the psychiatrists for clinical study!

Jewish injustice, the practice of which Professor Sir Arthur Keith has described as a "code of enmity," is proverbial in all the languages of the Western world. Thus we find in standard dictionary English the noun "Jew" defined as "an extortionate usurer, driver of hard bargains," and the transitive verb "jew" as meaning "to cheat, overreach" (*Concise Oxford Dictionary*).

All the facts appertaining to the perpetually troubled relations of Jew and gentile are readily accessible to investigation; all that is lacking most often is *the will and the power* to investigate. The Jews in their determination to survive, prosper and grow strong; as a self-conscious, geographically dispersed nation have always found it necessary to concentrate their energies on precisely those forms of economic activity which lend themselves most readily to the "driving of hard bargains, cheating and overreaching" where, by collective action, they can most easily control the flow of money and goods. So, also, they have always shown a marked preference for those professions and occupations which provide firm bases for a maximum exercise of influence over the host population; on the other hand, rigorously avoided are all those avenues of employment in which a firm and inseparable *common interest* prevails, such as agriculture, the armed services and all the skilled trades.

Thus, armed in our minds with complete insight into the motives and methods at work, we can venture into the dark labyrinthine caverns of Jewish history-writing, whether addressed to Jew or gentile, without much risk of being overcome with giddiness or of losing our way, firm in our faith—like Christian in *The Pilgrim's Progress*—that there does exist truth, the truth we need for our health and happiness, capable of standing firm against any

passionately partisan powers of persuasion and intellectual terrorism.

Notes

1. *Jews and Zionism: the South African Experience 1910-1967*, Gideon Shimoni (Oxford University Press, Cape Town 1980).
2. Professor Henry L. Feingold, in *Special Interest Report*, August 1982, published by The American Council for Judaism.
3. *The Boer War*, Thomas Pakenham, (Honathan Ball and Weidenfeld & Nicholson); *The War in South Africa*, J.A. Hobson (James Nisbet, London, 1900); see also *Sir William Buller, an Autobiography*, Lieut-General the R. Hon. Sir W.F. Butler G.C.B., chapters xxi, xxii and xxiii (Constable, London, 1912).
4. The anathema pronounced against Spinoza by the Amsterdam rabbinate is given in *The Controversy of Zion* by Douglas Reed. More recently the distinguished American Jewish scholar Dr. Alfred Lilienthal, author of *The Zionist Connection*, was excommunicated by the Jewish hierarchy in the United States.
5. Dr. Alfred Lilienthal, in his newsletter *Middle East Perspective* of December 1984, reports on his visit to Israel and the various evangelical Christian movements operating inside Israel to form "an invaluable adjunct to the Zionist movement."
6. *Majuda: a History of the Jewish Community in Zimbabwe*, (B.A. Kosmin, Mambo Press, Zimbabwe, 1981); this is a significantly different history of Rhodesia (now called Zimbabwe).
7. Referring to the destruction of Carthage, Professor C. Northcote Parkinson, in his book *East and West* (Riverside Press, Cambridge 1963), makes the following observation which would appear to coincide with that of Professor Sir Arthur Keith: "Carthage had been destroyed, but among the Carthaginian satellites had been the Jews, scattered westward from Palestine but of Asian origin and sympathies, potential spies and rebels, difficult to assimilate and impossible to trust. The Jew represented then, and has appeared ever since, as an enemy agent behind the European lines . . ."
8. Dr. Nahum Goldmann, former president of both the World Jewish Congress and the World Zionist Organization, put it this way in his book *The Jewish Paradox*: ". . . the fact is that the Jews are revolutionaries for other peoples but not for themselves."
9. A significant article on "the Relationship between Israel and South Africa" appears in the February 1985 issue of *Israeli Foreign Affairs*, "an independent Monthly Research Report on Israel's Diplomatic and Military Activities World Wide" (5825 Telegraph Ave. No., 34, Oakland, California, 94609 USA).

10. It is of interest to note that E. Ben-Shaul, writing in the *South African Jewish Herald* of August 27, 1974, stated that the Israeli Establishment "was by its very nature secularist and Marxist, a socialist-cum-nationalist movement . . . (whose) external policy towards the Mandatory was dovetailed into the socialist program of creating a new Marxist, secular society on a selective basis."
11. Whittaker Chambers's letter to a friend is quoted by Allan Weinstein in his book on the Chambers-Hiss case, *Perjury*; it was Alger Hiss who was convicted of perjury for denying under oath his treasonable activities. A brilliant summary of the Chambers-Hiss case is given by Douglas Reed in *Behind the Scene* (a reprint of Part Two of *Far and Wide*); see also Whittaker Chambers's autobiography, *Witness* (Random Press, New York 1952).
12. A healthy corrective to the involute thinking of Professor Norman Cohn on so-called "father-son" psychology is given by Professor Thomas Szasz in *The Myth of Psychotherapy*, and Douglas Reed in *The Controversy of Zion*.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Zionist-Communist Collusion in the Middle East

This chapter is a reprint of a portion of the newsletter *Behind the News* of January 1984 and later published in Canada as a booklet entitled *The Middle East Riddle Unwrapped*. It also formed a chapter in the first edition of *The Zionist Factor* and is reprinted yet again for its value as a total picture of the Middle East situation in world-historical perspective, endorsed by developments which have occurred since it was first written.

We cannot hope to be able to understand the present perilous and rapidly worsening situation in the Middle East unless armed in our minds with an interpretation of history which exhibits in their true colors the two main antagonists: the Soviet Union as the supposed supporter of the Arab states and the state of Israel as the supposed bastion of Western resistance to Soviet expansionism.

In other words, the real meaning of developments which threaten to draw the world into the conflagration and holocaust of another great world war is to be found *not in the Middle East today* but in developments of a very different kind which began towards the end of the nineteenth century.

According to this interpretation of history, not to be found in media reporting or in any of the history books, all the major political changes which have occurred in our century can be traced to revolutionary changes which at that time began to take place in the realm of high finance.

Political happenings which are joined inseparably to these financial changes include: the Bolshevik Revolution and the subsequent raising of the Soviet Union to the status of an industrial and military giant; World War II; the dismantling of the colonial

empires; the setting up of the United Nations and the instant creation of innumerable new nations, some of them very small, none of them economically self-sufficient, all of them now represented in the new shadow world parliament and government.

Changes in the realm of high finance which made all these and many other revolutionary changes possible can be described briefly as follows.

For a long time after the beginning of the modern industrial era, finance-capitalism—not to be confused with private-ownership capitalism—existed almost entirely in *national* concentrations; there was a British finance-capitalism, answerable to a British government which was in turn answerable to an electorate; a German finance-capitalism, a French one, a Dutch one, etc., each one joined to a national government and finally answerable to a national electorate.

Last century and well into the twentieth, these national concentrations of financial power were in vigorous competition, a major example of this rivalry being the scramble for colonial possession in Africa and elsewhere in the industrially undeveloped world, and another was the First World War, which arose out of the rivalry of national financial powers centered in Britain and Germany.

What then happened was that the many national concentrations of finance-capitalism were drawn into coalescence to form something new in history: namely, an *international* finance-capitalism, fiercely resolved to free itself from answerability to any national government and its electorate.

This process of coalescence had already begun at the time of the Anglo-Boer War but only began to exert a major influence in world affairs in the next two decades.

One of the last national concentrations of finance-capitalism to capitulate was that of the United States of America; this occurred in the middle 1930s when the multi-millionaire American pioneering families, led by J.P. Morgan, finally lost their supremacy in Wall Street to the internationalists, as recorded by Dr. Carroll Quigley.

There can be no doubt that a major factor in bringing about revolutionary changes in the realm of high finance was the existence within the different nations of Europe of banking families or dynasties which had always specialized in transnational

banking as is told by Dr. Quigley in his "History of the World in Our Time," *Tragedy and Hope*; he writes:

The greatest of these dynasties, of course, were the descendants of Meyer Amschel Rothschild (1804-1812) of Frankfort, whose male descendants, for at least two generations, generally married first cousins or even nieces. Rothschild's five sons, established at branches in Vienna, London, Naples, and Paris, as well as Frankfort, cooperated together in ways which other international banking dynasties copied but rarely excelled.

Dr. Quigley names as some of the other international banking families: Baring, Lazard, Erlanger, Schroder, Seligman, Speyers, Mirabaud, Mallet and Fould. This list could easily be extended—Warburg, Kuhn, Loeb, Schiff, etc.

There is no need to inquire deeply into the genealogies of these internationally dispersed banking dynasties which, as Dr. Quigley put it . . .

. . . in time brought into their financial network the provincial banking centers organized as commercial banks and savings banks, as well as insurance companies, to form all of these into a single financial system on an international scale which manipulated the quantity and flow of money so that they were able to influence, if not control, governments on the one side and industries on the other.

Everyone knows that with very few exceptions these banking families are, and always were, Jewish—and even exceptions like Morgan and Rockefeller can be shown to support the thesis that the control of international finance as an integrated system is essentially Jewish. The all-important subject of the submergence of national high finance in a Jewish-controlled international high finance calls for some expansion: this is supplied as a note at the end of this chapter, and further developed in other chapters.¹

With so much at stake for the West, and the peril increasing daily, the time has come to state bluntly that any further yielding to propaganda and pressure aimed at discouraging full and frank discussion of the Jewish role in power politics is an unforgivable evasion of duty and responsibility.

All the major changes which have occurred in our century—the Bolshevik Revolution and its aftermath, the precipitation of World War II, the dismantling of the colonial empires and the creation of a bogus "world parliament," etc.—all of these and much else can be explained as having been dictated by the needs and ambitions of the new international financial power; for there was obviously no way

in which the prosperity and security of this Jewish-controlled money power could be reconciled with the continued existence of strong governments in Europe and Russia to which it would have to be responsible and answerable.

Only the wilful blindness of those totally committed to a socialist religion-substitute can prevent anyone from finding out for himself that the Bolshevik Revolution and the so-called "dictatorship of the proletariat" which it inaugurated, was an exercise in fraudulent misrepresentation without parallel in history.

The Bolshevik Revolution was masterminded and financed from abroad, and the Soviet Union was set up, rescued from collapse, and raised to the status of an industrial and military superpower by the same international money-power which set up and has continued to maintain and massively arm the state of Israel; there is enough evidence to support that statement to fill a library, evidence which the media have found it safer to ignore than to challenge.

The dismantling of the colonial empires can be similarly explained as *the freedom which international finance secured for itself* as it detached vast territories from the jurisdiction of the European colonial powers, setting over them instead oppressive proxy regimes, easy to manipulate and even easier to remove when no longer required—with the weakening of the nation states of Europe and the creation of innumerable controllable votes at the United Nations as an additional gain for the internationalists.

While no one with any pretensions to a knowledge of history would dare to challenge the thesis that the Bolshevik Revolution was preeminently a Jewish exercise, and that there could have been no massive transfers of Western wealth and industrial technology to the Soviet Union without the endorsement and participation of a Jewish-controlled international finance, there has been much confused debate down the years about the ethnic identity of the Soviet Union's political masters, particularly after the end of World War II.

Soviet policy in the Middle East in the 1960s has been put forward as the strongest argument against the thesis that Jewish power still predominates in the Soviet Union. For it would seem, as one writer has pointed out, that being the self-proclaimed friend of the Arabs and funnelling vast amount of money into the more anti-Zionist Middle East states is not exactly an exhibition of "pro-Semitism." So it would seem, but how else than by false *seeming*

could so many of the Arabs—and the rest of the world—have been deceived?

Where deception is suspected, as in the case of the ostensible Soviet support for the Arabs, should we not pay more attention to the *results produced* than to the kind and quantity of assistance given? So, what were the *results* of Soviet policy in the Middle East?

Answer: Both the Zionists and the Soviet Union made important gains in the Middle East, and Soviet "assistance" left the Arabs, especially the Palestinians, worse off than ever. The Soviet Union was able to secure a firm foothold in the eastern Mediterranean, and Israel was able to grab more Arab territory, both inside Palestine and from neighboring states.

It is hard to see how the Israelis could have made such gains *without that ostensible Soviet support for the Arabs.*

The Israelis clearly *needed* the specter of Soviet expansionism in the Middle East; they *needed* to be able to represent themselves as a "bastion" of Western resistance to the expansionism in order to justify or explain the massive aid in money and arms they demanded and received from the Western countries and especially from the United States.

And the Soviet Union gave the Israelis exactly what they *needed*, while at the same time taking good care of its own expansionist interests.

In other words, the Soviet union behaved throughout exactly as might have been expected by those who knew it to be still covertly under Jewish control at the highest level—a false friend to the Arabs and a feeble and ambivalent opponent of the Israelis.

The late King Faisal never doubted that there had been continuous collusion between the Soviet Union and the Zionists in the Middle East; interviewed by *Newsweek* (December 21, 1971), he said: "Zionism and Communism are working hand-in-glove to block any settlement that will restore peace," and went on to describe Zionism as "the mother of Communism," adding: "It helped to spread Communism around the world. It is now trying to weaken the U.S. and if the plan succeeds it will inherit the world."

Asked how he reconciled this view with the fact that the Russians and Israelis were on opposite sides in the Middle East conflict, King Faisal replied:

Its part of a great plot, a grand conspiracy . . . They are only pretending to work against each other in the Middle East. The

Zionists are deceiving the United States . . . the Communists are cheating the Arabs, making them believe they are on their side. But actually they are in league with the Zionists.

Brigadier Sir John Glubb (Glubb Pasha), in his book *Middle East Crisis*, says nothing about possible Jewish influence in the Kremlin, but he never doubted for a moment that it was Soviet policy in 1967 "to cause the United States to come out irretrievably on the side of Israel" and then to "lure the Arabs into a catastrophic defeat" which would leave them even more helplessly dependent on Soviet support.

More important than the views of authorities like King Faisal and Brigadier Glubb is the evidence of *what actually happened* in the Middle East.

On whose side did the Soviet Union stand when the state of Israel was inaugurated? The Polish-born Jewish scholar Isaac Deutscher (Stalin's biographer) writes in his book *The Non-Jewish Jew*:

In 1948 when Israel was forming itself into a state we witnessed a curious situation in which the Russians and the Americans—the super-antagonists—joined hands. Together they managed to dislodge the British from the Middle East; and together they acted as midwives in the act of the birth of Israel.

This would not have seemed "a curious situation" to the *Times* of London correspondent Douglas Reed, who saw it all coming immediately after the end of World War II:

Today the scene is set for the third act, intended to complete the process. The money-power and the revolutionary-power have been set up and given sham but symbolic shapes ("capitalism" or "Communism") and sharply defined citadels ("America" or "Russia"). Suitably to alarm the mass-mind, the picture offered is that of bleak and hopeless enmity and confrontation . . . Such is the spectacle publicly stated for the masses. But what if similar men with a common aim secretly rule in both camps? . . . I believe any diligent student of our times will discover that this is the case.²

But the Soviet Union's role as a friend of Israel did not end when it joined hands with the United States in assisting at the somewhat gory parturition of the state of Israel. For, as Israel's first prime minister, Mr. David Ben-Gurion, remarked in an address to university students at Haifa, "Russia supplied us with arms that helped us to survive our war of independence," adding: "Present Soviet policy is only a passing stage" (*Chicago Tribune*, June 8, 1970).

Mr. Ben-Gurion went much further in exonerating the Soviet Union from blame, for the *Chicago Tribune* report goes on: "Ben-Gurion said he could not accept popular current charges that the Soviet Union helped Israel from the beginning in hopes of using Israel as a stepping stone into the Middle East."

Why should David Ben-Gurion have spoken like that so soon after a war in which Israel's Arab enemies had been encouraged and armed by the Soviet Union, if it did not mean that he knew a lot more than it would have been expedient to reveal?

Millions of people in the West have been helped to forget—that they were ever told—that the part which the Soviet Union played in helping to dislodge the British from the Middle East included the arming of terrorist groups like the Stern Gang and Menachem Begin's Irgun Zvai Leumi, with consequences like the shooting down of British soldiers, the assassination of UN negotiator Count Bernadotte of Sweden and British ambassador Lord Moyne, and the bombing of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem. It was war material supplied by the Soviet Union that was used by Begin and his henchmen when, with a campaign of terror that began with a great massacre of civilians at Deir Yassin, the Jews drove close on a million Palestinians into the Negev Desert and into the neighboring Arab states, including Lebanon.³

For obvious reasons it would have been impossible for Mr. Ben-Gurion to publicly inform an entire body of Jewish students that there was collusion at the highest level between the Soviet Union and Israel, but he came as near as possible to so doing as he shared with them his own confident assurance that the Israelis had nothing to fear from that quarter.

It has never been seriously denied that the Six-Day War which ended so disastrously for the Egyptians was precipitated by the Soviet Union, not is there any doubt about how it was done: Moscow's military intelligence informed the Egyptians that the Israelis were planning to launch an attack on Syria, one of Egypt's partners in a defense alliance of Arab states. It was common knowledge at the time, confirmed by the Soviet specialist Isaac Deutscher, that it was as a result of this warning, "and with Soviet encouragement," that Colonel Nasser ordered mobilization and a concentration of his forces on the Sinai frontier, the sole purpose of it being to discourage Israel from attacking Syria.

Is it possible that the Kremlin bosses were acting as genuine friends in offering this advice and encouragement to Egypt's Colonel Nasser?

There were certain suspicious circumstances which could only have come to the attention of a Soviet specialist with ready access to the Soviet press; Deutscher writes:

Soviet propaganda still continued to encourage the Arabs in public. However, a conference of Middle Eastern Communist Parties held in May (its resolutions were summarized in *Pravda*) was strangely reticent about the crisis and allusively critical of Nasser. More important were the curious diplomatic maneuvers behind the scenes. On 26 of May, in the dead of night (at about 2:30 a.m.) the Soviet Ambassador woke up Nasser to give him a grave warning that the Egyptian army must not be the first to open fire. Nasser complied. The compliance was so thorough that he not only refrained from starting hostilities, but took no precautions whatsoever against the possibility of an Israeli attack: he left his airfield undefended and his planes grounded and uncamouflaged. He did not even bother to mine the Tiran Straits or to place a few guns on their shores (as the Israelis found to their surprise when they got there). (*The Non-Jewish Jew*, Isaac Deutscher).

Deutscher tries to explain what happened as Kremlin "bungling," but the facts he supplies make out a much stronger case for deliberate treachery; he goes on:

Having excited Arab fears, encouraged them to risky moves, promised to stand by them, and having brought out their own naval units into the Mediterranean to counter the moves of the American Sixth Fleet, the Russians then tied Nasser hand and foot. Why did they do it? As the tension was mounting the "hot line" between the Kremlin and the White House went into action. The two superpowers agreed to avoid direct intervention and to curb the parties to the conflict.

The decision of the superpowers not to intervene would have been communicated immediately to the Israeli government and would have been all they needed to know before launching their attack on the hopelessly inferior Egyptian forces on the other side of the border, paralyzed into a state of unpreparedness by the belief that they had full support of an ally the Israelis would not dare to challenge.

Is it possible that the Kremlin bosses were so stupid as not to know that by committing themselves not to intervene they were giving a vastly superior Israeli army *carte blanche* to destroy the Egyptian army and to seize its huge store of weapons supplied by

the Soviet Union? Could it have been "bungling" that reduced all the Arab states to an even worse state of helpless dependence on the Soviet Union?

Brigadier Sir John Glubb's answer:

After the destruction of the Egyptian army in Sinai, the British press expressed jubilation at the rebuff suffered by Russia, who had "backed the wrong horse." Unfortunately the Soviet government are not so simple-minded as that: On the contrary, Russia must have been fully aware that the Egyptians would be disastrously defeated, *and wanted it that way.* (*Middle East Crisis*; emphasis added).

Is it possible that the Kremlin bosses in their "bungling" imagined that the Egyptians would be able to withstand an Israeli onslaught? Glubb's answer: "Everyone who had any military experience in the Middle East during the last twenty years was fully aware that the Egyptian army had not the faintest chance against the Israelis."

There were no signs at the time that the Soviet leaders were upset and angered over what looked like an appalling miscarriage of their Middle East policy: and a few days later, to the dismay of the whole of the Arab world, the Soviet delegate at the United Nations voted in unison with the Americans for a cease-fire *without attaching any conditions for an Israeli withdrawal from captured territory.* Deutscher writes:

The debacle aroused an alarm in Eastern Europe as well. "If the Soviet Union could let Egypt down like this, may it not also let us down when we are once again confronted by German aggression?", the Poles and the Czechs wondered. The Yugoslavs, too, were outraged. Tito, Gomulka, and other leaders rushed to Moscow to demand an explanation and a rescue operation for the Arabs. This was all the more remarkable as the demand came from the "moderates" and the "revisionists" who normally stand for "peaceful coexistence" and *rapprochement* with the U.S.A. It was they who now spoke of Soviet "collusion with American imperialism."

The government of Red China was convinced that there had been collusion, and stated so publicly.

A history of collusion between the top echelons of Zionism and Communism also offers to explain why the Soviet leaders harbored no feelings of resentment towards the Israelis for having apparently upset their political applecart in the Middle East. The *Zionist South African Jewish Times* shortly after the Six-Day War

reported a visit by four leading members of Israel's Communist Party to Moscow:

Hardly had the Israeli Communists left the Kremlin gates *when rumors began to circulate that they had received important assurances.*

Yet there is reason to believe that, if not actually an assurance, the Israeli Communists were given to understand that the Kremlin is not committed to support Nasser in his aggressive plans . . .

To a certain extent this gesture was promoted by a desire to show Nasser that the Soviet leaders understand and appreciate the situation of Israel, where the Communist Party is officially represented in Parliament, has its own press and may criticize, if not actually influence, Government policy. No such conditions exist in Egypt. Hence the Israeli Communists were treated as real friends and people of importance.

This importance was emphasized by the very warm reception which the Israeli delegates were later given in the editorial offices of the *Sovietisch Heimland*. More than that, the Kremlin went even further in preparing the ground and the warm atmosphere for the visit of the Israeli Communists. (Emphasis added).

There was no suggestion in the *South African Jewish Times* handling of this report that the Israeli delegation who went to Moscow so soon after the "debacle" were in any way out of favor with the government of Israel—or with the *Jewish Times*.

Again, it is only the willful blindness of the totally misled which can prevent anyone from seeing that all over the West there has been evidence of continuous collusion between Communism and Zionism, with examples enough to fill innumerable volumes. As Douglas Reed remarks in his great book *The Controversy of Zion*, Chaim Weizmann's autobiography, *Trial and Error*:

. . . is the best single fount of information about the twin roots of Communism and Zionism and their convergent purpose. He was present at the birth of Zionism, he became its roving plenipotentiary, he was for forty years the darling of Western courts, presidential offices and cabinet rooms, he became the first president of the Zionist state, and he told the entire tale with astonishing candor.

Nowhere in post-war Europe was the conjunction of Soviet and Zionist interests more plainly in evidence than in the career of Britain's former Prime Minister, Harold Wilson, for whom, as he himself put it on one occasion, "support for Israel and friendship with Russia need not be mutually exclusive." (*Inside Story*, Chapman Pincher).

In his book, Chapman Pincher shows that in the case of this politician, support for Israel and friendship with the Soviet Union could even be complementary and mutually supportive; for virtually all Wilson's contacts with the Soviet Union after the end of World War II were exercised through Jewish intermediaries, "refugees who had retained and developed contacts behind the Iron Curtain which enabled them to make huge fortunes in Britain and acquire considerable political influence, some of them even to be raised to the peerage."

Typical of these, all of them "passionate Zionists," was Lady Plummer (born Beatrice Lapsker), "a frequent and welcome visitor to the Soviet Embassy" who, with his lordship her husband, enjoyed the privilege of holidays at a Black Sea resort where they could bask in the company of premier Khrushchev. Lady Plummer, Chapman Pincher tells us, "was instrumental in introducing Wilson to many of the Jewish businessmen to whom he later awarded honors," and Wilson was even employed for nine years by one of these Jewish tycoons, with duties that "took him to Moscow on several occasions."

Even a cursory scrutiny of postwar public affairs in the United States reveals similar convergence of Soviet Communism and Zionist affiliations, among "majority" politicians no less than among citizens of Jewish origin; nor has there been any evidence of antagonism between those promoting aid for Israel, by whatever means, and those involved in subversive activity on behalf of the Soviet Union.

Even the most concise interpretation of the history of the 20th century would be incomplete without some reference to the climate of ideas which made possible so many revolutionary changes.

We should remember, however, that it is strong *motives* rather than strong ideas which produce important changes, and that ideas are almost invariably found to be at the service of motives.

While it is true, therefore, as Solzhenitsyn remarked in his 1976 BBC address, that it is certain doctrines which have produced a widespread paralysis of the will in the West, the real danger will be found not in the doctrines or their misguided exponents but, rather, in the power-wielders of high finance who instantly recognized ideological socialism as a potent weapon to be used against the West.

For there was no way in which an aberration of the intellect, the treachery of the miseducated, *le trahison des clerics*, could have gained such ascendancy over the minds of many millions in the West, if it had not been massively funded and encouraged from centers of high finance. The establishment of the London School of Economics as a fountainhead of socialist indoctrination by millionaire banker Sir Ernest Cassel set the pattern for the ensuing decades and epitomizes the fraudulent character of a doctrine which, by promising a brave new world for the masses in the West, plans to grab everything for its own alien elite.

Notes

1. See Chapter 9, "The Communist-Capitalist Nexus." The role of the money-power during the Anglo-Boer War is illustrated in Thomas Pakenham's *The Boer War* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1979); see also, *The War in South Africa*, J.A. Hobson (James Nisbet, London 1905), Sir William Butler, *Autobiography*, chapter XII-XIV and XXII and XXIII (Constable, 1911).
2. *Far and Wide*, Douglas Reed (Jonathan Cape, 1951).
3. Deir Yassin and other Israeli acts of terrorism are detailed in *Dispossessed: The Ordeal of the Palestinians 1917-1980*, David Gilmour (Sidgwick & Jackson), *The Controversy of Zion*, Douglas Reed (Dolphin Press), *The Zionist Connection*, Alfred Lilienthal (Veritas, Australia), *Bitter Harvest*, Sam Hadawi (Veritas), and others. See also article by Dr. R. Gayre in *The Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. IV No. 2 Oct-Dec. 1963, "Northern European Elements in the Eastern Mediterranean" (Armorial, Edinburgh).

CHAPTER NINE

Communist-Capitalist Nexus

There is no proletarian movement, not even a Communist one, which does not operate in the interests of money, in the direction indicated by money, and for the period permitted by money, and all this without the idealist in its ranks having any suspicion of the fact.

— Oswald Spengler,
The Decline of the West

Even the briefest survey of the forces which are shaping the history of the twentieth century, creating social and political conditions correctly described by Spengler as "anarchy become a habit," would be incomplete without a closer look at the relationship of those supposed mighty opposites: Capitalism and Communism.

The key to the riddle is the word *capitalism*. Most people, most of the time, make the mistake of supposing that the word *capitalism* means one thing; in fact, the word as commonly used has two sets of meaning as different as chalk and cheese.

If we are to understand why governments representing capitalist states adopt the most weirdly ambivalent attitudes towards Communism, we must first learn to separate in our minds the two sets of meaning which that one word *capitalism* has been called on to represent.

Thus, two words are needed: *capitalism*, meaning what that word originally meant, what the dictionary says it means; and *supercapitalism*, meaning the wholly changed form of what was once correctly called capitalism.

Capitalism, as originally and correctly understood, means private ownership of property and resources and competitive free enterprise in the supply of goods and services.

Supercapitalism, which can be defined as highly concentrated finance-capitalism, is not only different from capitalism, it is the antithesis of capitalism and sooner or later acquires the character of being actively *anticapitalist*.

For it is not possible to continue *concentrating ownership* and control of property and resources without *at the same time reducing the number of those who own and control property and resources*. Likewise, there can be no huge concentration of ownership and control without a corresponding inhibition or suppression of competitive free enterprise.

What we have seen in the West is a progressive degeneration of capitalism into a form of supercapitalism or anticapitalism, which the less it resembles the original capitalism *the more it resembles socialism, or Communism*.

Just enough genuine capitalism has remained in most of the countries of the West, and especially in the United States of America, to confuse the picture and make it harder for most people to see that capitalism has been largely replaced by what is essentially supercapitalism. In other words, the weak and struggling capitalism that survives serves as a camouflage for an all-powerful anticapitalism which dominates both economics and politics.

Modern supercapitalist regimes, like the American and Communist regimes, have their differences and their oppositions of interest, but these are unimportant when compared with what they have in common.

Both are irreconcilably antagonistic towards nationalism. Therefore, both supercapitalism and Communism are essentially *revolutionary*, having set themselves in fierce antagonism towards all political forms which are essentially *evolutionary*.

Since nationalism is inseparably joined to a people's cultural heritage, it follows that all attacks on nationalism much include cultural sabotage and subversion—which is what we see today on both sides of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, promoted with equal zeal by supercapitalists and Communists.

There is only one genuine nationalism they both support and that is Zionism, which is an internationally dispersed Jewish

nationalism—plus, of course, all sorts of spurious “nationalisms” which they themselves set up and use, like “Black nationalism” in Africa, and even these are nearly always heavily laced with Marxism.

The reason why Western supercapitalism lives in constant dread of nationalism can be easily explained.

The fundamental issue in any state is whether or not there shall be an authority superior to economics. Which shall rule—politics or economics? There can be doubt that nationalism, in spite of all the ailments to which it is heir, energized by the instincts and will of the population, means that politics is the master and that economics, no matter how important it may be, has been reduced to its proper and natural subordinate status.¹

Since there is no way in which Communism can be effectively resisted and defeated *except by nationalism*, it follows that Western supercapitalism is totally committed to coexistence with Communism, and that supercapitalists, even if not Zionists, can have no other long-range aim except that of ultimate convergence with Communism—never suspecting that the ultimate triumph of their antinationalism would manifest itself instantly as the triumph of Zionist nationalism.

Likewise, and this is most important, there is only one political weapon that supercapitalism can use against nationalism, and that is a socialist or Communist ideology that marshals the forces of the underworld and of rootless intellectualism, holding them ready to be aimed like a battering ram against all nationalist targets—*except only one*, that of Zionism.

What, then, is the real relationship of Western supercapitalism and Marxist-Communism? Is there one new global imperialism?—or two?—or, with Zionism, three? If only one, how are they all conjoined?

There is no way in which we can hope to find clear answers to questions like these unless we are armed in advance with a sound political philosophy which serves us both as a firm foothold in reality and as an instrument of the mind with which to dissect, analyze and evaluate all political phenomena.

As this writer has observed before, any individual who has, from whatever causes, begun to adopt a detached, sceptical and critical attitude towards an ailing 20th century world and its dubious values has, in fact, set his feet on the path towards personal regeneration and that of the community to which he belongs.

Notes

1. This aspect, the authority of a genuine nationalism, has been developed by the present writer in his book *Truth Out of Africa*, Chapter 9, "Dr. Sun Yat-sen and the Principles of Nationalism."

CHAPTER TEN

Some Reflections on "The Mammon of Unrighteousness"

The final battle for Christianity will be over the money problem, and until that is solved there can be no universal application of Christianity.

— Henry de Balzac

A question is asked: *What do you consider to be the subject on which, more than any other, the people of the West need to be enlightened?*

The monetary question—more precisely, the principle of usury, which is the keystone of the present monetary system and the key to all modern monetary questions.

Why is the principle of usury the most important part of the most important issue now troubling mankind?

The principle of usury is the eye of the octopus of that huge unrighteous power which Alexander Solzhenitsyn has called "the concentration of world evil." Or it could be called the eye at the apex of the pyramid of worldwide illegitimate power.

Is there any possibility of overthrowing the present global usurocracy?

The power of money is symbolized by the Tower of Babel; those who labor to build it higher are not going to desist until the tower totters and the stones fall about their heads. This the usurocrats know, and they are now desperately trying to save themselves *and perpetuate their power* by converting their money power into a global political and military power.

Precisely what is meant by the word "usury"?

Usury means money lent at a profit; it means converting money, a medium of exchange, into a commodity which can be bought and sold like any other. A clear distinction must be drawn between money lent at a profit and other things of value lent at a profit. A farm or house for which rent is paid can be said to have been lent at a profit, but that is something fundamentally different from money, *the medium of exchange*, lent at a profit.

Is it possible to compress into a few words the truth about usury that all people need to know?

We can say, as has been said again and again all down the ages, that usury is intrinsically evil, but it is not possible to convey in a few words an insight that recognizes at a glance its appalling *potentiality* for evil. Some truth is of that kind. Pythagoras could "see" that the square of the hypotenuse of a right-angle triangle is equal to the sum of the squares of the other two sides; most of us still do not "see" it, we only believe it because it has been *demonstrated* or infallibly proved true by experience. The truth about usury can be *seen* clearly only on the screen of the moral imagination.

The lending of money is not always and inevitably disadvantageous to the borrower—a particular loan can even be highly advantageous—but those who make a trade of lending place themselves *at compounding statistical advantage* over those who borrow and, collectively, against the whole class of those who work and produce, *by declining to share the borrower's risks*; the balance of advantage is, therefore, always with the lender, as with one who operates a sweepstake or plays with loaded dice.

The socially injurious *compounding advantage enjoyed by the practitioner of usury consists of this: he frees himself from the natural law of enrichment*. As men work and produce, contributing to the common weal, there is a *natural limit* to the surpluses capable of being generated by those who deal in money; hence the existence of banking families powerful enough to place a lien on the productive powers of entire populations by lending to governments. Money in such quantities serves only one appetite: an insatiable appetite for power.

What authority is there for the statement that the principle of usury is pernicious?

We find it in the Holy Bible, in the Holy Koran, in the writings of the West's greatest savant, William Shakespeare, and in many

other authoritative places—if we are to be guided more by authority than our own insight.

In chapter 15, verse 6 of the *Book of Deuteronomy* we read: "Thou shalt lend unto many nations but thou shalt not borrow and thou shalt reign over many nations but they shall not reign over thee."

And again, in chapter 18, verses 12 and 13: "Thou shalt lend unto many nations, and thou shalt not borrow. And the Lord shall make thee the head, and not the tail; and thou shalt be above only, and thou shalt not be beneath."

These were injunctions addressed to the Judahites by their tribal god and not by the Creator and God of *all* mankind.¹

Deuteronomy, like other books in the Old Testament, draws a clear distinction between two radically different moral codes—a code of righteousness and justice to be practiced inside the community and a code of indifference or enmity to be practiced against all those who do not "belong." It is obvious that the writers of the *Book of Deuteronomy* understood with complete certainty that usury, money lent at a profit, the conversion of the medium of exchange into a commodity, is in its final analysis a principle hostile to group unity and amity, establishing, as it must sooner or later, relationships of injustice and unrighteousness—usury leading in the end, inevitably, to *usurpation*. Hence, money lent at interest to "a brother" is condemned as an abomination (*Deuteronomy* 23:20).

Islam is equally categorical in its condemnation of usury, declaring that both the lender and the borrower and the writers of its papers are guilty. On the other hand, Islam, worshipping the God of all mankind, does not recommend usury as a form of political warfare designed to enable one set of people to get "above" and to "reign" over others. There can be no doubt that the Prophet Mohammed saw usury as a form of social poison utterly irreconcilable with a faith that promotes the principle of the equality and brotherhood of man *in the sight of God*—which was also the teaching of Jesus Christ.

The same would apply to any kind of lending which permits one man to take advantage of the misfortunes or needs of another in order to gain possession of his property. Shakespeare, with his genius for penetrating the deepest recesses of the human heart and mind, is no less definite in his understanding of usury, and his play *The Merchant of Venice* is a masterly treatise on the subject,

leaving nothing unsaid. Shakespeare pinpoints the essentially evil character of usury in the dialogue between Antonio and Shylock, in which Shylock tries to justify usury as a form of "thrift" comparable with the lawful but morally indefensible trick used by Jacob in getting as his wages more than a fair share of his uncle Laban's flocks which he had been minding (*Genesis 31*).

How, then, are we to explain the persistence down the ages of a principle of evil which has been exposed so often by mankind's most revered philosophical leaders?

For reasons much the same as those that explain the persistence of habit-forming drugs—because it is profitable to the "pusher" and because it confers the euphoria of a short-term advantage, or an illusion of advantage, on the user.

As the proliferation of the opium trade in China reduced a large part of the population to a condition of drug dependence, so has usury reduced most people in the industrially developed countries to a condition of loan-dependence.

Like grains of steel under the influence of a powerful magnet, we are all held, together, by a confused sentiments of self-interest, real or imagined, participating in varying degrees of compromise, as lender, borrowers or "writers of its papers." And everyone knows that any sudden "kicking" of the habit is liable to produce painful withdrawal symptoms, for the "hooked" nation no less than for the "hooked" individual.

This means that the salvation of a nation would require a careful process of detoxification, not to be undertaken as national policy without some danger. Meanwhile, however, there is a great deal the individual can do to effect his own personal salvation; and there is no possibility of effective collective action which does not begin with the awakened individual doing something to protect himself.

Stated bluntly, what has come into existence in the world is an enormously powerful criminal *overworld*—power unregulated by moral obligations—corresponding exactly with a much publicized criminal *underworld*, with unmistakable signs of a nexus between the two as the dregs and dropouts of society are incited, financed and regimented in subversion and revolution against all who offer any resistance to the overworld's ambitions.

This criminal overworld profits enormously as it builds up the Communist states, and profits again as it sells the so-called "free" nations the arms with which to try to defend themselves.

The evil of lending at a profit is multiplied a thousandfold by a system of legalized counterfeiting and theft as vast quantities of money are created out of nothing and pumped into the economic system as interest-bearing debt. For how else has there come into existence a quantity of debt which compares with money in circulation and on deposit as a mountain compares with a molehill, turning the banking system into an insatiable cancerous growth on the body of mankind?

How else was it possible for the West to channel into the Communist and Third World countries hundreds of billions of dollar's worth of goods and services, to be paid for finally in the form of inflation and taxation by the diminishing few in the West who work and produce or render genuine service?

If that is true, how is it to be explained that the Western European intellect, which has proved itself capable of placing men on the moon, has failed to discover that usury is being used to corrupt and dragoon the West into a slavlike subjection?

One part of the answer is that the Western intellect for more than a century has been concentrating its attention almost exclusively on problems of science and technology and has been richly rewarded and further motivated by the results produced.

The other half of the answer is that the income of a fraudulent monetary system is so enormous that the hordes of otherwise innocent and well-meaning people drawn into active participation in the swindle can be handsomely rewarded, people like politicians, bankers, academics and journalists. Human nature is so constituted that very few are proof against the temptations of obvious private advantage, whether in terms of cash or advancement in their careers. The evil is compounded by the Westerner's pronounced acquisitive instincts, nowhere exhibited more clearly than in the present-day consumerist mania which binds the masses ever more securely to the debt system, as the instant euphoria of acquisition blinds them to all other considerations.

That is all very well, but what about the economists and monetary experts—haven't they been using all the disciplines and explorative skills of modern science in their efforts to solve the problems of the distribution and exchange of the products of human endeavor, assisted today by a computer science that can multiply a thousandfold the powers of the human mind?

The short answer is that economics is a bogus science; it betrays its bogus character by evading its moral obligation to define its own terms—the term “money,” for example, or “credit.” Economists can hardly be expected to solve problems *which they cannot even state and make comprehensible!*

However, to be more precise: before we can solve a problem we must know precisely what is the problem we are trying to solve. Even then, we cannot solve it unless we have been able to bring together all the information relative to that problem. By placing men on the moon, American scientists showed that they were in possession of all the facts relative to the problem of putting men on the moon and bringing them safely back to earth. If those scientists had proceeded as economists do, those men would either have been burned to a cinder on the ground or shot off into space to be lost forever.

Not only do the economists fail to bring together all the necessary information, *but the most vitally important information is expressly excluded*, as we shall see.

The writers of the *Book of Deuteronomy*, the Prophet Mohammed, Shakespeare and others did not have anything like the *quantity* of information available to the modern economist, but they could solve the problem of usury with what they had because they did not lack that knowledge which is the key to the whole problem: *information about man himself and his moral nature.*

Thus the discipline of scientific “detachment” and “objectivity” with which economists flatter themselves, by excluding man himself, his appetite for possession and power and his susceptibility to the temptations of injustice, not only fails to produce good results but is dangerously counterproductive, compounding and consolidating the evils of usury instead of exposing them.

The very thing that adds telescopic and microscopic power to the intellectual eyes of the scientist only fixes and confirms the economist in his incomprehension—an incomprehension not punished with natural consequences, as in the exact sciences and technology, but *rewarded* with prestige as well as high incomes.

Economists see usury only as an apparently necessary part of a monetary mechanism which they hope will one day be made to work; wise men of all ages have seen it as something that cannot be prevented from adding strength to the elbow of unrighteousness, a weapon of aggression against “strangers,” and

an “abomination of desolation” when practiced against a friend or brother.

Final question: How is the individual helped by fully understanding the truth about usury in a society which has almost turned it into a condition of existence?

The short answer is that a knowledge of the truth, in all circumstances, operates on the individual as a *liberating force*, even if it tells him no more than that he is not free and that *only the truth will make him free.*

In other words, there is not one who is not fortified inwardly and better equipped morally and intellectually to solve the problems of his adjustment to society by a clear insight into those influences which are so obviously spreading a soul-sickness and discouragement among the people of the West.

Note:

A few of the many works dealing with modern banking systems, economics, etc., recommended for further reading are: *Money: the Decisive Factor*, Desmond Allhusen & Edward Holloway, with foreword by Sir Arthur Bryant (Christopher Johnson, London, 1959); *Equality, the Third World and Economic Delusion*, Professor P.T. Bauer (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1981); *The Income Tax: Root of all Evil*, Frank Chodorov (Devin-Adair, 1963); *A Matter of Life or Debt*, Eric de Mare (Veritas, 1986); *The Monopoly of Credit*, C.H. Douglas; *Individualism and Economic Order*, Friedrich A. Hayek (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949); *The New Despotism*, Lord Hewart of Bury, Lord Chief Justice of England (Ernest Benn, London, 1945); *The Federal Reserve Bank*, H.S. Kenan (Noontide Press); *The Bankers' Conspiracy*, Arthur Kitson (Omni, California, 1967); *Banking and Currency and the Money Trust*, Charles A. Lindbergh Sr; *Wealth, Virtual Wealth and Debt*, Professor Frederick Soddy (Omni, 1961); *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, Werner Sombart (Macmillan Company); *The Menace of Inflation*, G. Carl Weigand, ed. (Devin-Adair, 1977); *God and the Goldsmiths*, R. McNair Wilson (Omni, 1961).

CHAPTER ELEVEN

Geography of the Intellect

A sentence, even a phrase, may seem plain enough; yet when its meaning has been thoroughly examined, the intricacies and errors that were hidden in apparent simplicity are startlingly revealed.

John Baker
Race

Dr. Nathaniel Weyl and his wife Sylvia Casleton Weyl have been active in promoting the theory that the Jews are the leading "creative elite" in the United States of America, and that their superiority is the product of genetic inheritance.

In an article in *The Mankind Quarterly*¹ the Weyls suggest that the source of Jewish superiority is "an aristocracy of religious scholarship, and the development of institutional and religious pressures upon this scholarly element to marry early and procreate much." They state:

In short, the acute and subtle minds, winnowed out of the Jewish mass by the competitive educational process, must have outbred the others for they married earlier, were eagerly sought after for marriage alliances with the richer and merchant families, and hence, through such advantages as better diet, housing, clothing, sanitation, medical care, foreknowledge of impending persecutions . . . more likely to succeed in raising more of their children to maturity.

Dr. Weyl has already explored this theme with some thoroughness in learned journals and in two well-documented books, *The Creative Elite in America*, and *The Geography of the Intellect* co-authored with Dr. Stefan Possony.²

Another major contributor to this branch of sociological research is Professor Ernest van den Haag, whose book *The Jewish Mystique* was promoted with great fanfare of academic trumpets in 1970 and was, paradoxically enough, warmly endorsed by several of the world's most vehement protagonists of the "race equality" theory, including Professor Ashley Montagu, thus lending more weight to the doctrine enunciated by George Orwell in his book *Animal Farm* that "all animals are equal but some are more equal than others."

No fault can be found with the statistical methods used by Nathaniel and Sylvia Weyl in establishing Jewish predominance in terms of performance coefficients, calculated on a percentage basis, in various academic disciplines, but the question arises whether all the facts which they offer can be accepted as proof of their main thesis that Jewish success is attributable to genetic factors.

Have they supplied all the evidence? Have they even considered all the evidence from which a historically valid assessment of Jewish intellectual talent can be drawn? It would seem that the whole of their study has been conducted within a too severely restricted intellectual frame of reference.

As we are so often reminded in the teachings of the Chinese savants, the truth will often elude us unless we seek it in the "whole" to which it belongs. Bring one set of facts together, and we get one result; increase the number of relevant facts, and it can happen that we get a totally different result. The important thing, therefore, is to be sure, in respect of any propositions or any statement of what we hold to be true, that it is indeed the product of all the necessary facts.

In fairness to Dr. Weyl, it should be pointed out that in *The Geography of the Intellect* he does give us a clue to the possible existence of some more comprehensive frame of reference, for he tells us that "both Spengler and Toynbee contributed to cultural anti-Semitism"—meaning, of course, that these two leading Western scholars did not endorse the Jewish assessment of Jewish intellectual superiority.

"To Spengler," wrote the Weyl-Possony partnership, "Judaism was a 'fellow religion' which had been lifeless for at least nine centuries." The two authors add: To Spengler also the Jews were decadent because they were vestiges of a Magian culture-civilization which had long since exhausted its creative impulse."

Toynbee, on the other hand, they go on, "discovered that the Jews were 'fossilized fragments of the Syriac civilization'; in other words, he appropriated Spengler's ideas, but changed the vocabulary."

Carl Gustav Jung, the Swiss-German psychologist, also drew some unwelcome attention to himself with his comments on some of the qualities which make the Jewish intellect significantly *different* from that of the typical Western European. Freely admitting that there was an area of activity in which the ordinary Jew enjoys competitive advantage, Jung writes:

As a member of a race with a 3000-year-old civilization, the Jew, like the cultured Chinese, has a wider area of psychological consciousness. Consequently it is, *in general*, less dangerous for the Jew to put a negative value on his unconscious.

Jung adds:

The Jew, who is something of a nomad, has never yet created a cultural form of his own and, as far as we can see, never will, since all his instincts and talents require a more or less civilized nation to act as host for his development.

These brief references to Spengler, Toynbee and Jung should at least indicate that there has existed in some gifted minds an intellectual frame of reference which could put a wholly different construction on all those facts so painstakingly gleaned from the statistics of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare by Nathaniel and Sylvia Weyl.

Any thoroughgoing investigation of the comparative intellectual status of different ethnic taxa would need to begin with some agreement over the meaning of expressions like "intelligence," "cognitive ability" and "performance," all of them used when the achievement levels of different races of people are compared.

Dr. John Baker, in his book *Race*, discusses some of the innumerable definitions of the word "intelligence" which have been offered by psychologists and others. Alfred Binet, who gave his name to a system of intelligence testing which, with variations, is still in use, settled for a rather prosaic explanation of what the word means: "Intelligence reveals itself by the best possible adaptation of the individual to his environment." Dr. Baker adds that "one can find in the literature a number of definitions that follow this line," and he gives several examples.

An expression like "adaptation to environment" presents no difficulty when applied to fauna and flora and even to human beings

in small and primitive communities, but how is "adaptation to environment" to be evaluated in an infinitely complex and even dangerously unstable human environment of the kind to be found in most civilized countries today?

Here the concept of "adaptation" acquires hitherto-undreamed-of dimensions of meaning. In Germany before World War II the Jews had an elitist coefficient easily comparable with what has been achieved in the United States of America, but, as events were to show, this did not prove the "best possible adaptation" to that particular environment.

Even in the short range, in respect of the performance of the individual in a relatively homogeneous community with a shared genetic inheritance, there can be an elusive dynamic element, "environment," that can make all the difference in the world. Hence the old English saying: "From clogs to clogs in three generations," meaning that a very ordinary man, possibly even a peasant-type, can produce a son who is an outstanding performer, who in turn produces a son who is a bitter disappointment in spite of, possibly even because of, all the apparent environmental advantages conferred on him by his successful father.

The operative environment in the case of the outstanding performer must thus be conceived of as essentially a dynamic reality, a special kind of stimulus-response motivational system giving rise to chain reactions of energy release which can even transmute environmental disadvantage into its very opposite, a sort of springboard of advantage! And all within a shared pool of genetic inheritance.

Establishment academics who do not happen to be Jewish can be expected to give a wide berth to the issues raised by the Weyls, Possony and Van den Haag because, as experience has shown they must either agree wholeheartedly with the conclusions drawn by these scholars, or else, like Spengler, Toynbee, Jung and Keith, expose themselves to the risk of being tagged as "anti-Semites."

For it is obviously impossible to make a full and proper comparative analysis without acknowledging that from the point of view of performance, Jews and gentiles are different people occupying different stimulus-response motivational systems. In other words, the two groups are not competing on one track but on parallel tracks, are differently mounted and perhaps even have different winning posts in view.

For how is it possible to compare on a percentage basis the contributions to any kind of elitism of two communities so different in character and so differently situated? On the one hand, a majority which needs for its cultural survival a substantial reservoir of skilled artisans and even unskilled workers, plus an agricultural or peasant class with its roots deeply planted in the soil; and on the other hand, a small population minority, its nerves always under great strain, wholly committed to the preservation of its national identity and unity while dispersed in a much larger host population.

Jung showed that he understood the subtle but most important difference in the area of motivation and performance when he remarked that the Jew has a wider area of consciousness and that it is consequently "less dangerous for the Jew to put a negative value on his unconscious."

Obviously there is some competitive advantage in being able to put a negative value on the unconscious, but the question might as well be asked whether the Jewish people are not paying too high a price for this advantage in terms of long-term viability. Are they not just packing up for some future day of reckoning a danger inseparable from the downgrading of the unconscious?

Indeed, the very influence which confer elitist success on Jews in Western society have been the very ones from which persons of Jewish descent *have frequently sought emancipation* in order to be able to operate intellectually on a very much higher plane—men like Moses Mendelssohn and his son, the musician, Spinoza and Disraeli, not to mention Moses ben Maimonides and many others, including courageous Jews of our times named elsewhere in this book.

Thus, it would seem that the high degree of intellectual specialization and differentiation is for the Jews both an advantage and a disadvantage—and at many times in their troubled story it has been a grave disadvantage.

The Jewish people may be able to read a warning out of Fredrich Schiller's remarks about the harmful consequences of an excessive specialization of function:

When the commonwealth makes the office or function the measure of the man, when of its citizens it does homage only to memory in one, to a tabulating intelligence in another, and to a mechanical capacity in a third; when here, regardless of character, it urges only toward knowledge, while there it encourages a spirit of order and law-abiding behaviour with the profoundest intellectual obscurantism—when, at the same time, it wishes these single

accomplishments of the subject to be carried to just as great an intensity as it absolves him of extensity—is it to be wondered at that the remaining faculties of the mind are neglected, in order to bestow every care upon the special one which it honors and rewards?

The profoundest intellectual obscurantism! Schiller saw it coming—a much honored and richly rewarded elitism of one-sided mental development, accompanied inevitably by generalized intellectual obscurantism!

We can think of two other dimensions in which a study of this kind could be extended. One of these is the factor of mutual support and recommendation among academics forming a self-conscious racial or national minority, and the other is the present Jewish preponderance in what could be called “fringe sciences” like social anthropology, sociology, political science and psychiatry, each and every one of them, for Jew and gentile alike, an impenetrable forest of obscurantism.

A clear distinction must be drawn between a society within which there is considerable specialization of function and a society like the Jewish which is committed *as a whole* to specialization of function. In other words, a highly developed Jewish capacity for abstract thinking has been harnessed to a single commanding set of purposes.

Jewish experience down the ages as a people preserving national identity and unity while dispersed among other populations has produced a vast accumulation of skills having as their object *the acquisition of power* while almost wholly neglecting everything that has to do with the *use of power*. Creativity, whether in the arts, agriculture, politics or anything else, requires sympathetic identification with things or people. Power acquired must be used creatively, or it will vanish. The Jewish people had the specialized skill with which to gain enormous power in Russia; but having gained that power, were unable to use it creatively, for that would have required sympathetic identification with the Russian people—an attitude irreconcilable with the preservation of their own separate national identity.

The foregoing may help to explain what Jung meant when he described the Jew as “something of a nomad (who) . . . has never yet created a cultural form of his own.” It is the distinguishing characteristic of the nomad that he occupies territory but forms no vital attachment to it. He is a gatherer, not a producer. This is,

however, only a *collective phenomenon* in which any individual who has experienced the joy of total identification with things—Mendelssohn, Mahler, Spinoza, etc.—is free to opt out.

There are some questions which the Weyls, Van den Haag and others might have asked before committing themselves to the notion that Jewish elite leadership is mainly attributable to genetic factors. For example: What is the real character of this “leading elite”?

The Jewish elite has undergone a radical transformation in our time; where for many centuries it was an elite of the synagogue, now it is an elite of the university and counting house. From being an elite which put *some* value on the unconscious it is now one that owes its predominance to the fact that it puts a *negative* value on the unconscious, playing down almost to vanishing point metaphysical factors which were always a binding force or cement of the Jewish consensus.

Both elites, the Jewish and the gentile, are now living out at an accelerating pace a process which prompted the Old Testament prophets to utter a warning that “God will not be mocked,” which the modern psychologist might translate as: the unconscious will not permit itself to be suppressed or undervalued. For the unconscious thus offended can reassert itself in unpleasant ways, among some elitists as neurosis, alcoholism, etc. And among the Jews today there is good reason to believe that it is an outraged Jewish unconscious—their God, and the tribe of Judah—which is producing a most dangerous reversion to primitivism in the form of a rabid Zionist nationalism, “primitive” in that it lacks any religious content, setting the mass in motion but offering no enlargement of the moral resources of the individual.

Thus, in the mindlessness of an inflamed group spirit we see the sharp knife of Jewish intellectualism now pressed against its own breast.

Karl Marx remarked that Western finance capitalism “generates Jews out of its entrails,” meaning that a *milieu* has been created in which the upper strata of *both* Jews and gentiles are forced to think and act in the same way—both putting a maximum premium on the intellect and a negative value on the unconscious which is the course of life-serving creativeness.

Spengler takes up the same theme in *The Decline of the West*:

Today this Magian nation (the Jews), with its ghetto and its religion, itself is in danger of disappearing—not because the metaphysics of the two cultures come closer to one another (for

this is impossible) but because the intellectualized upper stratum of each side is ceasing to be metaphysical at all. It has lost every kind of *inward cohesion*, and what remains is simply a cohesion for practical purposes. (Emphasis added).

Another question to be asked: Is it not just as easy to attribute Jewish predominance in the race of the elite to a set of competitive advantages arising from certain peculiarities of the Jewish presence in the West? In other words, is it not possible that Jewish predominance is the product not of genetics but of circumstances of a kind which did not exist in the past and could disappear in the future?

With the progress of industrial revolution in the West, private ownership capitalism which released astonishing amounts of Western enterprise and energy, especially in the United States, gave rise to pure finance capitalism, first on a national scale and then on an international scale. These developments, to which gentiles contributed substantially, would have occurred—if at a slower tempo—even if there has been no Jews in the world.

However, the Jews as a people who have for centuries concentrated their energy and intellectual skills on monetary transactions, and as a cohesive nation dispersed among other nations, were ideally placed to exert a wholly disproportionate influence in promoting the concentration of finance capital, nowhere more so than in the United States, in time swallowing up and absorbing the great gentile family fortunes represented by names like Morgan, Ford, Carnegie, Vanderbilt, Rockefeller, etc.

In the United States a compelling advantage thus acquired (as Dr. Carroll Quigley has explained in his book *Tragedy and Hope*) instantly took effect as a rapidly expanding control of all higher education, starting with Columbia University, plus, of course, predominance in the ownership and control of the news media and the power to manipulate, by means of funding, the country's political parties, its administration, judiciary, etc.

A truly awesome power, compounded in this way, makes complete nonsense of any comparison of the two elites, history having provided one of them with an irresistible advantage that requires no genetic explanation—in much the same way that historical processes have conferred on a few ethnic groups among the innumerable artificially created Black "nations" in Africa the power to tyrannize other groups which had previously ruled the roost for a very long time.

Another major advantage enjoyed by the Jews in the "latter days" of Western capitalism is group cohesiveness with its freemasonry of mutual trust and cooperativeness, maintained by what Professor Keith has described as the Jews' "dual code" in their relations with "strangers," an advantage compounded by the prevailing atomization of the Western elite, all of whom are too busy competing among themselves to think of responding to the challenge by working in concert against the Jews.

In a word, what does it matter which elitist group is out in front when neither knows where it is going and when there are many signs that both are racing towards disaster?

Notes

1. *The Mankind quarterly*, Edinburgh, Scotland—Nathaniel Weyl contributed regularly to this quarterly journal, under the editorship of Dr. R. Gayre, during the 1960s and 1970s.
2. *The Creative Elite in America*, Nathaniel Weyl (Public Affairs Press, Washington D.C., 1966); *The Geography of the Intellect*, Nathaniel Weyl and Stefan Possony (Henry Regnery Company, Chicago, 1963).

CHAPTER TWELVE

Dissecting A Racial Mystique

No one must lightly dismiss the question of race. It is the key to world history and it is precisely for this reason that written history so often lacks clarity—it is written by people who do not understand the race question and what belongs to it. Language and religion do not make a race, only blood does that.

Benjamin Disraeli

A subject which has been made topical in a number of learned journals in the United States, following the publication of Professor Ernest van den Haag's *The Jewish Mystique*, is the claimed superiority of the Jewish "intellectual apparatus" as a possible explanation of the truly astonishing predominance in wealth, power and influence of a tiny Jewish minority in the Western world.

We may be sure there is some truth in the claim put forward by Dr. Nathaniel Weyl (some of whose work has been discussed in Chapter 11) and others that centuries of "selection for intelligence" has played an important part in the evolution of a Jewish race and nation with an exceptionally high average standard of intelligence and a remarkable dearth of fools and misfits. We also know that the same "intellectual apparatus" works differently in different circumstances and in response to different stimuli, and we know, or ought to know, that the peculiar circumstances of the Jewish people, always a tiny minority in a human environment which they feel to be potentially hostile, must have the effect of prodding their minds into alertness and activity.

What we really want to find out is whether the present extraordinary disparity is the product only of a superior "intellectual apparatus" or whether there are other important factors involved.

How, for example, are we to reconcile the present apparent disparity in performance with the indisputable fact that the whole might of the West, the civilization which has today spread its influence all over the globe, is essentially a product of the energy and creative genius of Western Christian European people, and that in 3000 years the Jews have been unable to produce anything even remotely comparable?

One of the distinguishing features of the European people, as a race, is that they are to a most unusual degree "culture builders," with countless individuals, often at some sacrifice of their private interests, contributing to a vast shared cultural treasury. By comparison, as Spengler and Toynbee have pointed out, the Jews are basically a nomadic "fella" people who accommodate themselves readily to a culture created by others.

How do we reconcile the present competitive inadequacy of the Western European with a recognition of the mighty powers of mind and spirit whose achievements in every field of human endeavor, especially in architecture, art, music and literature, represent to this day, after centuries of competitive striving, the highwater mark of human achievement?

We cannot hope to be able to understand the world in which we live and our own situation in that world if we are unable or afraid to try to find the answers to questions like these.

We do know also that there have been lengthy periods in history when the inferior status of the Jewish people has contrasted markedly with the power, confidence and brilliant achievement of the people among whom they dwell; and we are not aware that such inferior status was ever attributed to any inferiority of the Jewish "intellectual apparatus."

One part of the explanation of the apparent contradiction can be traced to the well-established fact that the human mind can function in radically different ways. It can function solely at the service of the individual, when it fully deserves the description of an "apparatus." Or it can function almost entirely at the service of the community, when it is not so much an apparatus as a super-personal phenomenon, a sort of cyclonic funnel drawing to its center and expressing in works the entire cultural resources of the race.

Western European achievement has never depended on a high average of intellectual activity but more often on the exceptional performance of a few gifted individuals. Those who form the bulk of

the population are then naturally inclined to coast along as comfortably as possible, sharing and enjoying the benefits provided by the activated few, propping up and carrying along with them many who might otherwise fail to keep up, and carrying along with them also a genetic inheritance capable of throwing up more exceptional individuals when these are required.

This phenomenon of the exceptional individual is better known as genius, where the great tidal flow of race energy and will force itself impetuously and turbulently through the narrow strait of the individual mind, too often at terrible cost to the individual concerned.

What it all comes to is that prevailing historic circumstances, including the almost complete domination of the economic motive in modern life, are as advantageous to the Jewish people as they are disadvantageous to the Western European people, confining them almost exclusively to science and technology and other pursuits which have to do with the manufacture and distribution of goods; and the disparity continues to widen as private-ownership capitalism degenerates at an accelerating pace into anonymous finance capitalism.

The "degeneration" refers, of course, to the fact that the displacement of private-ownership capitalism is one of the evil results of the betrayal by governments of one of their most important social responsibilities—that of preventing the emergence of concentrations of economic power large enough and strong enough to control government itself, all this being part of the process whereby the Western European, whether in Europe or elsewhere, has been largely dispossessed of the control of his own destiny.

For this state of affairs the Western European has no one to blame except himself, because in making money and material possession the only measure of value, he has created an environment and a complex of human relationships more advantageous to the energetic and self-reliant Jewish minority than to people of his own kind.

The result we see all around us. The essential Western European, whether he be an Englishman, a Frenchman, a German, an American or South African, is afflicted with a form of soul-sickness which undermines his morale, stifles imagination and enterprise and inhibits mental activity in all its forms, and illness which naturally varies in intensity according to personal

circumstances. Unable to be true to himself, the Western European has become the victim of cultural and political distortion, the main symptoms as experienced by the individual being the lack of a sense of direction and purpose; in other words, a haunting sense of the futility of existence, converting masses of the educated, especially the young, into ductile revolutionary material capable of being used by the prevailing powers for almost any purpose.

It is not enough, however, to say that the Western European is today afflicted with soul-sickness and to make an inventory of the symptoms and consequences of that sickness.

What we need, if we are to do ourselves any good, is to gain an insight into the etiology of it, tracing with precision the nature of the distortion and the causes which lie immediately behind the symptoms.

The entire known history of the human race will confirm that man is essentially a social animal and that he needs, as one of the first requirements of his moral health, the security provided by a sense of community or sense of belonging, which is something he has never been able to find hitherto except in some circumscribed group or community made up of individuals much the same as himself.

Inseparable from such a pattern of existence which has persisted through millennia and is shared by the greater part of the animal kingdom, is a dual code of attitude and conduct clearly designed by nature to preserve that pattern—inside the group, amity and co-operation and mutual sympathy (even if spiced with a little competition between the individuals composing it); towards all those outside the group, an attitude of indifference which can harden into hostility and conflict, as circumstances demand.

The individual living in such an environment is never morally confused. "These people," he says to himself, in effect, "are my people. These I can trust and they can trust me. I help them and they help me." He draws a deep-rooted sense of security from the knowledge that there are people joined to him by a shared set of interests and obligations. Operating from such a firm base of security, he is prepared to risk his life, nay, even willingly sacrifice it, giving his all to the group form which he derives all.

What the individual, then, calls his "conscience" is part of the psychological machinery required to ensure that he always

maintains towards other individuals in the group, or towards the group as a whole, a code of attitude and conduct calculated to serve the best interests of the group and of all the individuals composing that group.

The moral and political distortion which afflicts the people of Western European origin can thus be ascribed to the obliteration of the ancient boundaries separating groups of self-consciously similar people and their enforced inclusion in some larger heterogeneous political unit.

The individual saddled with a psychology which is the evolutionary product of millennia of experience, now finds himself on the horns of a dilemma. Drawn or forced into a heterogeneous human environment, he brings with him, and cannot be parted from, a deep-rooted need for a *homogeneous* human environment.

But how, in a heterogeneous society with its strange new matrix of relationships dictated by an economic ordering of society, does the individual distinguish between "us" and "them," between those who belong with him and those who do not? Even more painful is his dilemma when he finds himself in a greatly expanded political unit which includes people widely different in race and life-style, in some cases not even sharing with him the same language.

The result for the Western European individual is inner conflict and confusion; his responses, instead of being simple and clear-cut, as they would be in the simpler form of society whence he emerged, are mixed up in such a way as to produce psychological disturbances, including guilt feelings and a weakened morale. The individual is divided within himself and his creative and intellectual potential greatly reduced, likewise his capacity for effective combination with other individuals of his own kind.

The trouble does not end there—far from it! Society itself shows signs of deep inner division as the many soul-sick individuals tend to cluster together according to the way in which they seek individually to resolve their dilemma of a dual code which has ceased to work, giving rise eventually to two major groupings which we can identify with the terms *right* and *left*.

On the *right* are those who hope to find salvation in the re-establishment of smaller, more homogeneous units of humanity in which the psychology of the dual code can once again be made to work freely; or, at any rate, resist all those influences tending toward the creation of still larger, more heterogeneous political units, culminating even in the possibility of a one-world state.

Conspicuous among those on the *left* are individuals in whom intellect has been developed at the expense of instinct, and who now seek salvation in an imagined world in which all people will be equal and undifferentiated and in which mankind's primordial heritage of a dual code can be replaced with a single code of universal amity and "brotherhood."

Thus a conflict which originates inside the individual is transferred to society itself, even dividing families, and creating a situation which any alien minority can exploit to its own advantage.

We cannot know how all this is going to work out in the years ahead, but we do know for sure that the psychological disturbances which arise out of efforts to apply a single code of universal amity and equality in a dual-code world which no one can change, constitutes a form of soul-sickness which has everywhere reduced the moral and political potential of the Western European peoples, and has created conditions highly advantageous to a small Jewish minority which united in dispersion jealously preserves its dual code morality.

The key to this unique minority advantage is a system of institutionalized learning, hitherto reinforced by religion, which makes it possible for the Jewish people to preserve an intensely self-conscious racial and national *unity in dispersion*, whereas for others, national and racial unity has always depended on geographical boundaries. Instead, Jewish race-consciousness and nationalism have become all the more intense for having been confined entirely to the mind.

The science of anthropology has had to be falsified and smothered to a truly astonishing degree to prevent information of this kind being universally known and understood. Many of those sciences whose purpose it is to help man understand himself—anthropology, psychology, genetics, etc.—are in the same state of eclipse today as were astronomy and other sciences in the Middle Ages and for the same reason: that their findings threaten the foundations of existing power structures, whether these be religious or political or financial.

Political commentators and analysts who decline for one reason or another to probe below the surface for causes of what is happening in the world today, so far from making any contribution to public enlightenment, are only helping to thicken the fog of confusion in which millions of the soul-sick flounder.

A strong sense of group identity, pride of race, nationalism—call it what you will—gives people a strong sense of purpose and direction which renders them almost totally immune to the culturally and morally subversive influences which are rampant in the Western world, all utterly destructive of the health and happiness of mankind.

From which it follows that when a civilization is in decline and the process of culture-building has virtually ceased, the Jewish people with their strong sense of race identity and their readiness to associate closely for practical ends, enjoy an enormous competitive advantage.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Reform and Orthodox: Some Angles on the Middle East

The emergence of the Jewish nation in the 20th century as by far the most powerful in terms of wealth and influence has left the Jewish community sharply divided under the labels "Reform" and "Orthodox," or "Zionist" and "anti-Zionist," these antonyms corresponding with the terms "secular" and "religious."

This sharp division inside Jewry, with all forms of worldly power overwhelmingly on the side of the Reformers, has given rise to a weirdly contradictory situation in which the Reformers, who have flatly rejected a Biblical interpretation of history, find themselves today without any religious support for their Zionist ambitions except that supplied by Christians who continue to believe that the Jews are "God's chosen people" now in the process of fulfilling prophecy.

As modern Jewish historians frankly admit (for example, Abram Leon Sachar in *The History of the Jews*, and Howard Morley Sachar in *The Course of Modern Jewish History*). Judaism and Christianity have been equally influenced by the so-called Enlightenment, ushered in by European thinkers like Kant, Hegel, Fichte and Charles Darwin. In the resultant secularization, Reformist Jews, who today form the overwhelming majority, have dispensed with just about everything in the old orthodoxy based on an anthropomorphic concept of "God," many of them even taking pride, as Abram Leon Sachar remarks, in "aggressively spelling the name of the deity with a small 'g'."

After much bitter internal strife among the Jews, some semblance of order was restored at the Universal Synod of Berlin in 1889 when it was agreed that Jews would be free to interpret

scripture as they pleased and could even be agnostics or atheists, provided they remained loyal members of the nation. Therefore, while today many Christians cling to the notion of a "Judeo-Christian God," the modern educated Jews, whose views are decisive in communal affairs, no longer believe in a God with human attributes, a God who is "pleased" or "angry," who "chooses" a people and confers on them territorial freehold in perpetuity. All this is dismissed by the Reform Jews as mere symbolism, now to be replaced with the concept of a nation which does not have to wait for a promised "Messiah," but is quite capable of being its own "God" and "Messiah."

So why the schism within Jewry today? Why have they not all become equally secularized? The answer to such questions is that while Judaism always was a racial creed inseparable from the national identity of a people living in dispersion, it did possess a somewhat elusive religious component which in New Testament times had faded out of the prevailing orthodoxy and needed to be found and restored. Thus it is clinging to something in Judaism which is more than raw nationalism which explains the passionate intensity of a tiny minority of so-called "strictly orthodox" Jews today, some of whom go so far as to identify with non-Jewish opponents of Zionism.

Nevertheless, the preservation of the group solidarity of a people living in dispersion among "strangers" has always required the implementation of a dual moral code—one law for "us" and another for "them," one set of attitudes among "us" and another towards "them."

The almost irresistible appeal of Zionism today, especially among the young who have lost all feeling for religion, is the motivating excitement of group ambition and aggrandizement, an appetite much whetted by the rewards of unprecedented success during the last century and a half.

These facts have an important bearing on developments in the Middle East where in 1982 the exultant Zionists made an astonishing demonstration of their power and influence and where also they encountered Jewish opposition on a scale not to be seen anywhere else in the world.

A newspaper headline on September 21 summed up the main news of the day: "U.S. Forces for Beirut—if Israel Approves." No attempt was made by the media to answer the obvious questions:

- Why did the United States, a nation on which Israel is almost wholly dependent for both money and armaments, have to submit to the indignity of having to wait—like France and Italy, also—for permission to send its peacekeeping force back to Lebanon?
- Why no angry outcry from American congressmen and senators over ruthless aggression carried out by Israel in contemptuous disregard of all the conditions which Congress had attached to American military aid, one of these being that such arms must be used only for defensive purposes?
- Why the nervous circumspection, even timorousness, of the leaders of so many other supposedly powerful industrially developed nations, in their reactions to Israel's long-prepared and massive invasion of Lebanon in equally contemptuous disregard of all the orders and injunctions of the United Nations, not to mention the rude brushing aside of a peace-keeping force which the UN already had in southern Lebanon?

On the same page of the headline quoted above was this one: "Israel No Longer David; It's Now Goliath"—a rather unguarded remark from President Reagan which made nonsense of a Middle East policy which has cost the Americans scores billions of dollars since the state of Israel came into existence in 1948 and had now brought American armed forces into the battle zone of Lebanon.

Almost simultaneously the International Institute of Strategic Studies in London declared that Israel then ranked as fourth in military might, the first three being the United States, the Soviet Union and the Peoples' Republic of China. A tiny state which received nearly all its money and arms as gifts from the United States was now more powerful in military terms than populous and highly industrialized countries like Britain, France, Italy and Japan.

There is only one way in which the paradox can be resolved: There is another kind of power in terms of which Israel ranks a good deal better than No. 4 in the world. And what kind of other power is there except the financial to which all other forms of power, the industrial, commercial and political, are subordinate?

What this means is that if the tiny state of Israel is in its own right not a superpower, it is most certainly one of the limbs of a superpower—other such limbs including powerful lobbies in all the developed nations with effective participation in their administrations and almost total control of the world's network of public communication, or press, correctly described by Alexander

Solzhenitsyn as being "more powerful than the legislature, the executive and the judiciary."

Understandably, therefore, the emergence in the West of a new and wholly unprecedented kind of superpower, with Zionism as its political aspect, has remained one of the twentieth century's biggest unreported happenings, hard to identify and even harder to describe because, unlike any other superpower that has ever existed, it has no territorial or geographical boundaries, Israel itself being no more than one of the innumerable signs of its existence.

And yet, how this weirdly different kind of superpower came into being can be quite simply explained to those not wholly ignorant of history.

The story of what happened is so strange and, for many, so hard to understand, that it can hardly be repeated too often.

Last century, and until quite early in this, great money power existed mainly in the form of *national* concentrations of it, bent on promoting national purposes. Thus, there was a British money power (for many years the greatest), an American money power, a Belgian money power, etc. Not only were these agglomerations of money power separate but they were even in fierce competition with each other, as witness the 19th century's scramble for colonies in all the so-called undeveloped parts of the world.

What then happened was that the Jewish banking families which had for a long time been operating from within the different Western countries, working in unison, were able to draw all the national concentrations of financial power into a single *international* or global financial system, which they now control and which they hope to be able to convert into a single global political power.

The United States, Britain, France, Belgium, Italy, etc., all look as if they are separate and independent nations, but let us not be deceived; all have lost their economic separateness, all are under the dominion of a kind of witch-doctor magic exercised by a single global money power.

One of the features of the new superpower that makes it different from all its predecessors is that since most of its influence and controls are *exercised through the mind*, it depends heavily on deception and, therefore, cannot afford to be open and honest about its operations and intentions. The source of its great strength is, therefore, also the source of its weakness, its Achilles'

heel—hence, its frenzied and sometimes quite violent response when its paper curtain of protective falsehood is penetrated.

So massive, so intensive and so long-continued has been the falsification of information bearing on the Middle East situation, that today the reality bears hardly any resemblance to the media-sponsored appearance.

Developments in the Middle East, including the invasion of Lebanon, the seizure of the Golan Heights from Syria, the occupation of the Gaza Strip and West Bank of the Jordan, are of the greatest historical importance because they—and the reactions of the so-called superpowers to them—epitomize our entire century of conflict.

Obviously, when Israel's leaders flung a powerful army into Lebanon, rudely brushing aside a United Nations peace-keeping force which had the support of both the United States and the Soviet Union, they knew for sure that they had nothing to fear from either of the "superpowers," and even less to fear from the U.N.

The Israelis had no more to fear from the Soviet Union this time than before; for was not the Soviet Union the only country supplying Israel with arms during the 1948 fighting which resulted in close on one million Arab inhabitants being driven from Palestine into the desert or into exile in the neighboring Arab states? Nor would those Israeli leaders have forgotten that after the Six Day War of 1967 the Arabs were astonished to see the Soviet delegate at the United Nations vote in unison with the American delegate calling for a cease-fire *with no conditions for a withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Arab territory they had seized*.

The only opposition encountered by Prime Minister Menachem Begin in those days was from the Orthodox minority in Israel; they held a mass demonstration in Tel Aviv and demanded Begin's resignation.

Even Dr. Nahum Goldmann, for many years president of both the World Jewish Congress and the World Zionist Organization, who devoted his life to championing the interests of the Jewish people, later maintained a decidedly negative attitude towards the state of Israel and its leaders.

What the huge Reform Jewish majority see and celebrate as a triumph of Jewish nationalism in the Middle East, many Orthodox Jews, especially those living in present Israel, regard with deep anxiety as an explosive disintegration of Judaism as a faith and way

of life and as a community, culminating possibly in a worldwide hostility to the Jews of unprecedented dimensions.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

Behind the Scenes With Dr. Goldmann

Dr. Nahum Goldmann could not have chosen a better title for his book—*The Jewish Paradox*.¹

What is a paradox? The definition in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* is itself somewhat paradoxical, explaining that a paradox is either “a seemingly absurd though perhaps really well-founded statement” or “a self-contradictory, essentially absurd statement”—take your choice. The prefix “para,” from the Greek, is defined as having any of these meanings: “beside,” “beyond,” “wrong,” “irregular.”

However, we can learn far more about the paradox from the way it has been used from time to time by those who handle it with skill, like the late George Bernard Shaw—and like Dr. Nahum Goldmann.

As the experts have demonstrated, the paradox is simply the truth stood upon its head. A writer can attract attention to what he wants to say by making a statement which is instantly noticed and challenged because it is obviously absurd—but behind that absurd statement there can lurk an important truth which takes the reader or listener by surprise. The mind is first boggled, then suddenly illuminated.

The paradox can be used for very different purposes, as Dr. Goldmann has demonstrated in his book producing the effect of a sort of double paradox, simultaneously mind-boggling and instructive, words used with consummate skill to instruct some readers while at the same time thrusting others more deeply into ignorance and confusion.

But, who is Dr. Nahum Goldmann? In a few words he was the world's top Jew, having combined for some years the presidency of

the World Jewish Congress and the World Zionist Organization, the man who spoke for world Jewry with all the world's leaders since long before World War II.

Goldmann is himself a sort of walking paradox. Having campaigned all his adult life for a return of the Jews to Palestine in fulfilment of Bible prophecy, he candidly admits that he is himself *not* "an orthodox Jew"—"I stopped being religious in the traditional sense at the age of 17, meaning that I stopped observing the laws, eating kosher, going to the synagogue . . ."

There are evidently many other Jews who have been estranged from orthodox religion, for Goldmann remarks that "relations between the state and religion constitute one of the great unsolved problems in Israel where a formal separation of the two could produce a splitting of the population into 'believers and unbelievers'." Having informed us that not all Jews are religious believers, he goes on to say that they are united in believing that *for religious reasons* the Jews were fully justified in taking Palestine from the Arabs.

What Goldmann has to say about the "Jewish identity" reminds us of the mazes of the Cretan labyrinth from which heroic Theseus was able to extricate himself thanks only to a clew of thread given to him by Ariadne, daughter of the King of Crete. Prepare to enter the labyrinth on the subject of "Jewish identity." Says Goldmann:

I remember giving a lecture when I was a student during which I offered more than twenty definitions: Judaism is a religion, a people, a nation, a cultural community, etc. None of them was absolutely accurate . . . For some the keystone is religion. For others it is the glory of a people which has given the world monotheism, the prophets, Spinoza, Marx, Freud, Einstein and so many other geniuses. For others again it is their respect for Jewish sufferings past and present that cements their adhesion.

Goldmann rejects a definition offered by one of Jewry's staunchest defenders, Jean-Paul Sartre: "A Jew is anybody whom other people designate as such,"—a definition that served to conceal the fact that he was himself a Jew.²

It is somewhat paradoxical that the short list of Jewish "geniuses" should have included Spinoza, who in 1632 was cursed and anathematized by the Amsterdam rabbinate:

. . . with all the cursings which are written in the Torah; cursed by day and cursed by night, cursed when he goeth out and cursed when he cometh in . . . There shall be no man to speak to him, no man write to him, no man show him any kindness . . .³

On the other hand, the claim that Jews gave the world "monotheism" is no paradox at all, but a simple falsehood—for we may read in the ancient Egyptian *Book of the Dead*, dated approximately 2600 BC:

Thou art the one, the God from the very beginnings of time, the heir of immortality, self-produced and self-born; thou didst create the earth and make man" (translated by the British archaeologist and Egyptologist E.A. Wallis Budge).

"Jewish philosophy, thought and ideology," Dr. Goldmann goes on, "are made up of manifold contradictions. One of them is that we are at one and the same time the most separatist and most universalist people in the world." In support of this statement he quoted the Talmud as saying that "a *ger*, a convert, is as hard to bear as a sore."

However, Goldmann has some words of comfort for those who might begin to fear that they have been discriminated against by what he calls "the Jewish God": "That is the great characteristic of our people; we are apart and isolated from the rest, and at the same time destined to fulfil a mission which concerns the whole world, to be the servants of humanity."

The paradox here is concentrated in one word, "servants," which stood upon its head gives us the word *rulers*, for was there ever a ruler, no matter how vicious and arbitrary, who did not regard himself as the servant and benefactor of his people?

There is much more in the same vein. In one and the same paragraph in the introduction we read that "the Jews are the most separatist people in the world" whose "belief in the notion of the chosen people is the basis of their entire religion," and we read also that no other religion has "proclaimed so passionately the equality of all races and all classes before God." In other words: "All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others"—since there must surely be some superior kind of equality among those who qualify as "the chosen."

There is, of course, no mention in Goldmann's book of the fact that most of those who now call themselves Jews have no lineal connection with the Jews of the Bible, being the descendants of a Turko-Mongol people, the Khazars of South Russia, who were converted to Judaism during the seventh century of our era.

If, instead of trying to follow Dr. Goldmann all the way through the labyrinthine caves of the Jews' "revolutionary notion" of a

people that is at once "separatist and universal," we drive a perfectly straight, well-lit tunnel right through this great mountain of paradoxes, what do we find?

We find that the Jews are a chauvinist, nationalist and racially-oriented people who have learned how to preserve their unity and cohesion in spite of geographical dispersion. This lesson, first learned during the Babylonian Captivity, has been vastly amplified down the centuries and is the central teaching of the Talmud. Once we understand this, we have a key which instantly unlocks every imaginable manifestation of "the Jewish paradox."

A relationship of competitive nationalism—for that is what it is—gives rise inevitably, as Professor Sir Arthur Keith has explained, to the practice of twin ethical codes, an "in" code and an "out" code, one for "us" and the other for "them."

On this subject, too, Dr. Goldmann is surprisingly frank, but always, of course, in the same paradoxical way. Thus, the man who proudly claims that he carried the passports of eight different countries, quotes himself as saying in an interview with Dean Acheson, then U.S. Secretary of State: "Listen, Mr. Acheson, I am talking to you now not as a Jew but as an American. I am an American citizen."

Further on in the book Goldmann writes of his influence with leading Western politicians:

Seduction can become a passion. When one seduces a woman, the sensation may be more acute, but seducing a statesman comes close to it. When I convinced Dean Acheson to accept the partition of Palestine in spite of his anti-Zionist convictions, I felt an almost sensual pleasure . . . a success of the sort makes you feel that you are cleverer than your opposite number.

There, of course, he was implementing the *out* code, treating the U.S. Secretary as an enemy to be outwitted and defeated.

And, of course, Dr. Goldmann was not being "cleverer" than his opposite number; all he had to do was to bring to bear on Dean Acheson the irresistible pressure of America's Zionist lobby.

Numerous other examples of the practice of what Leon Abramowicz describes in a laudatory preface to Goldmann's book as a combination of "prudence, dissimulation and astuteness" are provided. Thus, we learn how President Truman, "a simple, upright man" whose "honesty was proverbial," arrived at a decision of global historical importance "against the advice of all his

advisers, *except one who was a Jew*"—said Truman: "My friends are Jews, the Jews want partition; alright, they can have it."

It would be hard to find another book which tells us more about the way modern power politics are conducted—provided, of course, that we have first acquired the art of translating paradoxes into plain, straightforward English.

Writes Goldmann:

All through my life I have observed the same thing: the diplomats were against the resurrection of Israel, and the great statesmen were for it. Without Balfour, Lloyd George and Wilson we would never have obtained the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and what ensued from it. All the ministerial machines were hostile to the project and all the functionaries said . . . "It's unheard of."

Translated out of the lingo of paradox, what that means is that it is easier to "seduce" a few top "statesmen" who depend heavily on Jewish favor in terms of votes, financial backing and press support, than to seduce scores and possibly hundreds of people lower down in the echelons of power who have nothing to gain by surrendering their integrity and self-respect, and are, in any case, not so easily reached by those who would like to seduce them.

Similar methods, Goldmann informs us with unconcealed pride, were used to persuade Lyndon Johnson to grant him a two-million dollar Agency for International Development (AID) low interest loan for the purpose of financing the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*:

One of Lyndon B. Johnson's friends was a Polish Jew called Jim Novy who . . . was treasurer of the committee which financed his presidential campaign and had a pass authorizing him to enter the White House day or night, and even to request a bed there, just like a hotel.

Again, Goldmann tells us how, as a youth in Lithuania, he was able to avoid conscription into the army:

Luckily there was a law exempting "only sons" from military service, and in Jewish communities it was the Rabbi who kept the birth register. So when my father had three sons, they were each entered under a different name.

(Good for "us," not so good for "them").

On the subject of the Soviet Union Goldmann makes some interesting admissions:

After the Revolution in 1917 there was a very intense Jewish cultural life in Russia, both in Yiddish and Hebrew. It should not be forgotten that Israel's present national theater, Habima, was created in Russia.

He quotes Ben-Gurion as saying that it was thanks more to the USSR than America that the state of Israel came into existence. As for Israel being the West's great "bastion" of resistance to Soviet expansion in the Middle East, he explains:

. . . if today, they (the Russians) have an interest in the existence of the Jewish state, it is *paradoxically* because it was Israel which brought them a political victory they had awaited for centuries, *by enabling them to gain a foothold in the Mediterranean.* (Emphasis added).

Dr. Goldmann's book is a perfect treasure-house of paradoxes. We are told that "Israel is one of the most conservative countries in the world," while "Jews are revolutionaries for other people but not for themselves." This paradox when translated means that "other people" are used for Jewish revolutionary purposes.

The Jews, Goldmann tells us, have always taken the initiative against discrimination, "in the United States together with the Blacks, in Catholic countries together with the Protestants, and in Protestant countries together with the Catholics—in other words, wherever discrimination exists." A minority, he insists, has a right to preserve its separate identity and to have, "for example, its own schools." The paradox here is that minorities may preserve their own identity and have separate schools, *but not majorities.*

Another interesting item: How many Catholics know that such was the influence exerted by Dr. Nahum Goldmann on the Vatican that there now exists:

. . . a composite commission of Catholics and Jews which meets three times a year to delete or modify controversial passages in the various Catholic books—from the elementary catechism to the textbooks used in Catholic universities and seminaries, by way of liturgy and, most of all, the service for Good Friday.

What have they done with the *New Testament*, we wonder—surely the most—"controversial" book of all? Dr. Goldmann does not tell us.

The crowning paradox is Israel itself as it now exists: Dr. Goldmann does not believe in it; it should have been something quite different, something even the Arabs could have accepted. He tells us that Ben-Gurion was himself most pessimistic about the new state's ability to survive:

Why should the Arabs make peace? If I were an Arab leader I would never make terms with Israel. That is natural; we have

taken their country, Sure, God promised it to us, what does that matter to them? Our God is not theirs.

Notes

1. *The Jewish Paradox*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978.
2. *The Jewish Paradox* (above cited). See also, Chapter 3 of the present work ("The Identity Problem").
3. *The Controversy of Zion*, Douglas Reed (p. 101) quoting from the ban pronounced against Spinoza by the Amsterdam rabbinate in 1632.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

Underground Big Business in the USSR

One of the most jealously guarded secrets of the Soviet Union, so far as the people of the non-Communist world were concerned, was the highly privileged position of the Jewish minority during the seventy years or so after the Revolution; hence it was only in 1981 that it came to be known in the West that privately owned industrial and commercial business had continued to thrive, nearly all of it in the hands of Jewish citizens.

The story of *Russia's Underground Millionaires* was first told in the June 29, 1981, issue of *Fortune* magazine, the plush and expensive sister journal of *Time*, by no less an authority than a former international law expert in the Soviet Ministry of Justice, one Konstantin Simis, now resident in the United States.

"How to Succeed in Business Where Business is a Crime," declared the second heading over the *Fortune* magazine review of a book by Simis which was shortly to be published.

Writes Simis:

Everyone knows that the Soviet state is the monopoly owner of all means of production and that private enterprise is a crime. But the remarkable reality is that in the Soviet Union a great many private enterprises operate—at great profit. Indeed, a network of privately controlled factories spreads across the whole country and these factories manufacture goods worth hundreds of millions—perhaps even billions—of rubles.

Private enterprise, Simis goes on, cannot for obvious reasons, handle items like motorcars and machinery, but must concentrate on items of the kind that most people want and can afford to buy, like clothing, shoes, artificial-leather goods, sunglasses, costume jewelry, and recordings of Western popular music, etc.

But how did they manage to do that in a country so rigorously policed by the KGB and where every citizen is encouraged to spy on his neighbor?

Part of the answer:

A private enterprise will coexist under the same name and the same roof with a state factory; it could not exist without this cover. In this symbiotic relationship the state factory manufactures goods as called for by the state plan. These goods appear on the factory's books and are distributed through commercial channels for sale. But along side these official goods the same factory is manufacturing goods not registered in any documents.

There is no reason to believe that such privately owned enterprises ceased to exist in the Soviet Union with the coming of "glasnost" and "perestroika."

Goods of the first kind are called "registered for," and others in the jargon of the "underground" are described as "left hand." Simis tells us that not only are there "tens of thousands" of such factories all over the Soviet Union, most of them concentrated in the great towns and cities like Moscow, Odessa, Tiflis, Riga and Tashkent, but there exists also a vast distribution network handling a "left hand" trade worth possibly billions of dollars a year.

One "company" is mentioned, part of the "Glazenberg empire," which owned so many factories that it was forced to set up its own marketing group which proceeded to organize outlets of its own in 64 towns and regions—in addition to all the outlets provided by the state.

And who are these daring energetic businessmen who appear to have fashioned for themselves cloaks of invisibility?

Writes Simis:

For historical reasons, the underground business milieu in the large cities of Russia, the Ukraine, and the Baltic republics has been predominantly Jewish. While my clients included Georgians, Armenians and members of other groups, the great majority were Jewish—like myself.

What "historical reasons?"

Simis says that the Russian Jews, after having been discriminated against by the Tzarist regime, were "liberated" by the Bolshevik Revolution, thereafter throwing themselves eagerly into spheres of life previously closed to them, like science, the arts and literature, etc. He tells us that during and after World War II Stalin turned against the Jews, many of whom were then forced to find outlets for their energies in "underground business."

Elsewhere in his article, however, Simis tells us about one Isaac Back, who in the mid 1930s set about creating a family company which by 1940 (when Stalin was at the peak of his power) owned "at least a dozen factories manufacturing underwear, souvenirs and notions, operating at the same time a network of stores in all the republics of the Soviet Union."

Some of these Jewish entrepreneurs, including Back and one of the three Glazenberg brothers, were prosecuted and imprisoned, but evidently not enough of them to discourage the rest. It was decided to "sacrifice" young Lazar Glazenberg, says Simis, whose job it was to defend them in court, "at least partly because of his playboy life-style as reflected in his two dozen suits and the wardrobe of his wife . . ."

Although private business enterprise was always publicly regarded in the Soviet Union as a most dangerous and destructive form of sabotage, being the antithesis of Marxist Socialism, there is no mention of this class of big-fish offenders among the hundreds of individual cases discussed by Alexander Solzhenitzyn in the three volumes of his *Gulag Archipelago*; indeed, Jewish prisoners are rarely mentioned by Solzhenitsyn, whereas, judging by their names, there was no scarcity of Jews among the slave camp bosses—Aron Solts, Jakov Rappaport, Matvei Berman, Lazar Kogan and, most notorious of all, Naftaly Frenkel, who is said to have masterminded the whole slave-labor operation.

Nor have big businessmen figured at all prominently in the great show trials which the Western media were permitted to report and dramatize, most of these being reserved for Stalin's Jewish rivals in the great power struggle inside the Communist party which developed in the two decades after the Bolshevik Revolution.

Next question: Why should this kind of activity, with its almost fabulous rewards, plus attendant dangers, be confined almost exclusively to Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union?

Simis gives us what is obviously an important part of the answer:

The sense of national identity among Jewish underground businessmen is strong—much stronger than that of the Soviet Jewish intelligentsia. There may not be many among them who understand what Zionism is all about—even fewer who are prepared to relinquish their fortunes and emigrate to Israel—yet I never met a single one who was indifferent to the fate of that country and who did not feel a blood relationship with it. It came as

no surprise to me that during the Six-Day War the underground businessman in many cities donated large sums in dollars—not rubles but dollars—to Israel.

These underground business tycoons would have been much assisted, we may be sure, by another circumstance revealed by Simis:

Nevertheless, many Jewish underground businessmen of all ages eagerly joined the Communist party for desperately practical motives: to enhance their social prestige and gain some shield—beyond bribery—to keep them from being prosecuted by the DCMSP.

Simis seems to have forgotten what he told us a few paragraphs back: that Jews were forced into underground business by discrimination that excluded them from the party and state hierarchy.

Simis explains how the wheels of the “left hand” industry are copiously oiled with bribes. The blue-collar factory workers are bribed with additional tax-free incomes to work for the private operator and keep their mouths shut, as are also the clerical personnel and foremen; bigger bribes are paid to officials whose duty it is to establish quantity and quality norms for goods manufactured for the state, giving the private operator his main supplies of raw materials in the form of surpluses which do not have to be recorded; the biggest bribes of all are those paid to officials of the DCMSP, which is an arm of the KGB, whose precise task it is to “combat the misappropriation of Soviet property.”

It would appear that the “underground” businessmen who are caught and punished are those whose operations have become too glaringly obvious, like one Golidze who “owned two magnificent houses, luxuriously furnished with antiques bought from dealers in Moscow and Leningrad” and who “entertained officials with banquets which would go on for hours . . .”

Most Soviet tycoons try not to be too ostentatious as they stash away most of their wealth in foreign currencies, precious stones, metals and gold coins. Simis tells us that during the 1960s and 1970s the salon of one Elizabeth Mirkien enjoyed great popularity in Moscow, for here middle-aged businessmen could enjoy excellent meals, plus the euphoria of *feeling rich* as they risked the loss of huge stakes at cards and roulette.

“But all to what end?” asks Simis rhetorically.

Dealers in precious stones in Moscow, Tashkent, Riga and other cities continue to operate diligently to this day, filling the caches of underground millionaires with their wares. These caches amount to vast treasures, probably worth more than all the pirate booty in Caribbean waters. And yet—what about their owners? What are they waiting for? A fabulous future time when they will be able to unearth their riches and regally use them? Or the downfall of the Soviet regime?”

So, what does it mean? How is it to be explained, and all the contradictions resolved?

Simis himself does not seem to know, for he leaves many of the most insistent questions unanswered.

If we are to have any hope of getting at the real and final meaning of the Simis story, experience should have taught us that we are here exerting our investigative skills in an area of maximum falsification and concealment in which devices of deception are used which are the product of centuries, even millennia, of practice and accumulated experience.

The *Fortune* magazine review was evidently based on the original manuscript or on page proofs of the work, for the book when it eventually appeared had been purged of a good deal of the information included in the review.

So how was it possible to “succeed in business” where business “was a crime?” The first requirement obviously was to be accepted as a member of what Simis called “the Jewish underground,” united by a sense of “national identity.” These were in most cases already installed as managers of the state enterprises, sharing that sense of “national identity” with the man who was for many years chairman of the Kremlin’s Economic Council and Tsar of all commercial and industrial activity in the Soviet Union, one Venimin Dimshits, a post held previously, ever since the Revolution, by Lazar M. Kaganovich, also a Jew and Stalin’s brother-in-law—not to mention the succession of Jews who headed the dreaded secret police, first the Cheka, later the KGB.

We are told in a biographical piece in *Fortune* magazine that from 1953 Simis acted as defense lawyer for dozens of prominent “underground” businessmen, giving up his practice in 1971 to join the Ministry of Justice as an international law expert. In 1976 the KGB raided his apartment and seized the manuscript of a book on Soviet corruption, the first draft of which was already in the hands of an American publisher. Then Simis and his wife Dina, who is also

a lawyer, were told that unless they left the Soviet Union they would be sent to a hard labor camp.

Simis could hardly be expected to regard this as severe punishment for so grave an offense, for he was able to join his son who was already established in the United States at Johns Hopkins University as director of a Soviet studies program, thus acquiring a vastly improved launching pad for his literary assault on the Soviet regime.

So how was it possible for so much of the long-concealed truth to be released in 1981? An answer to that question provided in the first edition of this book, written shortly after the appearance of the *Fortune* article, can now be seen to have been endorsed by subsequent events and is reprinted below.

- The story which the people of the West have been getting since before the Bolshevik Revolution is now going to be adjusted to accommodate and absorb information which has been seeping through and which could quite soon be common property. For the future edification of a deliberately stupefied public opinion in the West, there are to be, as it were, "guided tours" through what were hitherto "no-go" areas in the realm of news reporting, public debate and contemporary history-writing.
- A start must be made in preparing the public mind for changes inside the Soviet Union and in East-West relations which are pending, or, at any rate, intended. These changes could be of a magnitude of, and every bit as traumatic as the Moscow-Berlin pact of 1939 or the process of de-Stalinization after World War II.
- Implied in the policies and actions of the leading Western powers, the United States of America in particular, is the assumption that all are working towards the "ideal" of some sort of convergence of the two worlds, and "ideal" that does not, however, exclude the possibility of a third world war.
- Meanwhile, it is becoming increasingly obvious that economic socialism of the kind implemented in the Soviet Union by Lenin and his successors cannot ever be made to work.
- It is highly significant, therefore, that there came into existence in the Soviet Union, virtually from the time of the Bolshevik Revolution, a vast network of wealthy capitalists complementing in so many ways the super-rich capitalists in the West.
- That would explain quite a lot—would it not?—including the massive participation of Western big business in building up the Soviet Union's industrial and military might, much of it never to be paid for, most of it at the expense of the Western worker and taxpayer. And Churchill's "riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an

enigma" begins to fall apart as we see this network of supercapitalists ideally situated to grab everything and take over total control when the official system collapses, as collapse it must, sooner or later.

Poles Apart in Poland

Closely guarded too by the Western media was the secret of a similar phenomenon in Communist Poland, for it was only in January 1984 that the news was permitted to leak out that in Poland too there was a whole class of prosperous private enterprise businessmen, manufacturers, and distributors of consumer goods, coexisting in perfect amity with a strict socialist economic structure.

Reported Tony Barber in a Reuter message from Warsaw:

As Poland struggles to emerge from its economic crisis, some 500 foreign-owned private businesses are scoring successes which both please and perturb the Communist authorities. They are called "Polonian" firms, since the owner of all except 40 of them are North Americans, Europeans and Australians of Polish descent.

The report goes on:

Granted the right to operate in 1976 as part of a plan to encourage Westerners of Polish origin to maintain ties with their ancestral country, they are all small or medium-sized businesses with an average of 40 workers each. They produce clothes, shoes, leather articles, perfumes, furniture and a range of other goods that are instantly snapped up by Poland's shortage-plagued and quality-starved domestic market.

The range of products listed corresponds very closely with the list given by Konstantin Simis for the private operators in the Soviet Union.

The Polonian companies, said Barber, made only a small contribution to Poland's gross national product, but were growing fast and their success was a "mild embarrassment" to the authorities whose ideology ruled out the very survival of private enterprise.

He quotes Poland's then Communist party leader and Prime Minister General Jaruzelski as having said: "We shall continue to ensure conditions for their activities. But they should not be an enclave of unjustified privilege in the economy."

This was a perfect example of Orwellian doublespeak, for Jaruzelski knew perfectly well that those private enterprise

businessmen were an enclave of privilege from which the country's own citizens were totally excluded.

Private enterprise was then booming in Poland. Statistics provided by Mr. Mirosław Galczyński, a spokesman for the Polish Chamber of Commerce, showed that the number of *independent* enterprises had increased from three in 1977, with a total revenue of about \$180,000, to 500 in 1983 with combined revenues totalling \$400,000. Prospects in poverty-stricken and debt-laden Poland must have been bright, for Barber was able to report: "They have reinvested their profits in Poland and continue to recruit workers and diversify their activities."

So much for some of the hard facts, but what do they mean? We need an answer to that question because it could throw some light on hard-line Communist regimes which, ever since the Bolshevik Revolution, have been able to establish harmonious relations with some "capitalists" while continuing to belabor capitalists as a class with their Marxist-Leninist propaganda.

Who are these "North American, Australians and Europeans" of Polish descent who returned to Communist Poland to launch themselves in business? How, when and by whom were they recruited? Did they bring their own capital, or was this supplied by the socialist state? The United States, Canada, Australia, Britain and many other countries, including South Africa, have substantial communities of Polish immigrants who never showed any signs of wanting to return to an ancestral homeland while still under Communist rule.

The Reuter report contains no answers to such questions. So we cannot know *for certain* who were these most fortunate "North Americans, Europeans and Australians of Polish descent" who were to be allowed to form a privileged segment of Poland's population—but we do know for certain the identity of a similar enclave of privilege in the Soviet Union: the "great majority"; as Konstantin Simis tells us, were Jewish, like himself.

Therefore, it is not unreasonable to assume, until evidence to the contrary can be produced, that the great majority, of not all, these "North Americans, Europeans, Australians," etc., were Jews who had emigrated from Poland and had been welcomed back with their capital and industrial and commercial expertise and strong links with big business outside Poland.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

The Zionist Role in Rhodesia

I am not anti-Semitic. One must avoid imagining anti-Semitism everywhere . . . The truth, or its research, cannot be anti-Semitic.

Professor Robert Faurisson
Storia Illustrata, August 1979.

A significantly different version of the Rhodesian drama, in which the Zionist role is explained at some length, is presented in a book published in Zimbabwe, formerly Rhodesia—*Majuta* by B.A. Kosmin, with the sub-title *A History of the Jewish Community in Zimbabwe*.¹

The author makes no secret of the fact that in Rhodesia long before the unilateral declaration of independence (UDI) the terms "Jew" and "Zionist" were, as he puts it, "almost interchangeable." He tells us that in 1967, when the Rhodesians were already feeling the bite of UN-imposed economic sanctions, the President of the Central African Zionist Organization (CAZO), Mr. A.E. Abrahamson, led a delegation to Prime Minister Ian Smith "to inform him of their planned manpower and financial aid to Israel," a move which, he adds, "achieved the desired results." (Emphasis added.)

In the 1930s, says Dr. Kosmin, the per capita monetary contribution of Rhodesian Jews to the Zionist cause was the highest in the world, "a tradition maintained into the 1970s" in spite of sanctions which had virtually placed the country in a state of siege.

Equally disproportionate, it would seem, was the attention lavished on Rhodesia, with its tiny Jewish population, by the world's Zionist leaders: we read that visitors to the country

included Chaim Weizmann, Vladimir Jabotinsky, Nahum Sokolov, Moshe Sharett, Nahum Goldmann, Norman Bentwich, Cecil Roth and, in more recent times, Generals Moshe Dayan, Yigal Allon, Chaim Hertzog, and Ezer Weizmann.

Kosmin's book makes it clear that a highly organized and powerfully united Rhodesian Zionist community, which dominated the country's economic life, was always totally opposed to independence as envisaged by the ruling Rhodesian Front party although frequently compelled for reasons of strategy and tactics to occupy positions on both sides of the battle line.

White Rhodesia is described by Kosmin as a "Herrenvolk democracy" with political trends "dangerous to Jews," among these dangerous trends being "a greater and more exclusive British patriotism" engendered by World War II, to be further enhanced when British forces were drawn into a struggle with Irgun and other Zionist terrorists in Palestine.

In 1952, therefore, it was firmly decided at the annual congress of the Jewish Board of Deputies to urge Jews to become more actively involved in Rhodesian politics.

"It was perhaps no coincidence," says Kosmin, "that Jews returned to the Federal and Territorial Assemblies in the 1953 elections were all actively identified with the community and had experience of Jewish organizations."

With the dissolution of the Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland,² the White population, including the Jewish community, found itself massively concentrated in Southern Rhodesia where there were already signs of growing White dissatisfaction with the policies being promoted by the United Federal Party (UFP), which has hitherto held the reins of power in both parliaments and in which, as Kosmin adds, the Jews were by now "over-represented."

Garfield Todd had been ousted as Southern Rhodesia's prime minister for pressing forward too rapidly with a policy of racial integration, replaced by Sir Edgar Whitehead, a dyed-in-the-wool Fabian socialist, who was no better and had to be removed. Then came the Southern Rhodesian general election of 1962 when the United Federal Party, with its constant facing-both-ways attitude on the race question, was swept out of power in a White backlash by the then recently established Rhodesian Front (RF) under the leadership of Winston Field.

From the Zionist point of view what had happened was just about the worst imaginable, for the government was now firmly in the

hands of the very people whom they had for years fought tooth-and-nail to keep out, and they now had only one representative in parliament, A.E. Abrahamson, who had managed to retain his UFP seat in the predominantly Jewish constituency of Bulawayo East.

However, they could hardly have found a better man to represent them, for Abrahamson was President of the Jewish Board of Deputies, Vice President of the Central African Zionist Organization, and also a member of the executive of the World Zionist Organization.

To make it worse for Rhodesia's Jewish community—or so it seemed at the time—the hardliners in the Rhodesian Front ousted Winston Field in a "cabinet revolt" and replaced him with Ian Smith, who had only joined the RF shortly before the 1962 election after resigning from the UFP in which he had figured prominently. Smith was preferred by the RF as a leader, partly because he had had considerably more parliamentary experience than most of the RF "new boys," and partly because he expressed himself more vigorously in favor of securing early Rhodesian independence; he was also preferred as leader of the Rhodesian Front on the grounds that he was a "born Rhodesian," whereas Winston Field was born in Britain. Dr. Kosmin writes:

The scene was thus set for the intrusion of racial politics in all spheres of social action. In June 1964, Ivor Benson, a "far rightwing political theorist," was imported from Natal as Government Information Adviser. Up until that time there had been no coherent R.F. ideology but merely an updated amalgam of the thinking of those groups and factions which had opposed Huggins³ in the past. At the 1962 election the R.F. had fought on the type of program which would have been advocated among the more enthusiastic Tories of the English shires. Law and order was advocated and the war service of their candidates was well featured.

Benson, however, offered the new Government a coherent radical rightwing policy which would suit both their internal and external problems. Rhodesia began to be presented as the last bastion of Christianity and Western tradition against the attack of sinister forces directed from joint headquarters in New York and Moscow. This type of insidious propaganda began to infiltrate the Government controlled media of radio and television with attacks on the ever ubiquitous communists and international financiers. This, of course, was the Europeans' answer to the Third World Revolutionary ideology of the African nationalists . . .

The Jewish community which has been in the forefront of the liberal multiracial camp felt very vulnerable in this heightened political atmosphere . . .

At the 1964 proceedings of the Jewish Board of Deputies Congress, I.R. Rosin, a leading surgeon in Rhodesia, spoke optimistically about the Jewish community "helping the emerging African." Kosmin quotes Rosin as saying: "I pay tribute to Northern Rhodesia for their attitude in accepting the changed political situation in their country."

The attitude of the Whites in Northern Rhodesia—now called Zambia—was, in fact, no different from that of Southern Rhodesia's Whites, the only difference being that in Northern Rhodesia the Whites were too few to be able to offer any resistance.

As was only to be expected, A.E. Abrahamson lost no time in using the shelter of parliamentary privilege to launch a viciously defamatory attack on the Rhodesian Government's recently imported Information Adviser, quoting extensively from an assessment provided by the Zionist Weiner Institute of Political Studies in London.

Rhodesia's Zionists must have felt even more vulnerable when Ian Smith, anxious to consolidate his position among rank-and-file supporters of the Rhodesian Front after having helped to dislodge Winston Field, and still under some suspicion as a former UFP parliamentary whip and cabinet minister, found it necessary to garnish his conservative image by using speeches and radio scripts prepared for him by his new Information Adviser. Indeed, it was Ian Smith's enhanced conservative image which made it possible for the RF to administer an even more crushing defeat on the UFP in the 1965 elections in which Smith gained the two-thirds majority necessary for amendment to the constitution.

The uneasiness among Rhodesia's Zionists was understandable, for it must have seemed inconceivable that Rhodesia's Whites would not eagerly accept the offer of what they lacked and so obviously needed: "a coherent policy that would suit both internal and external problems."

Another factor which Rhodesia's Zionists found discouraging was the reaction of sympathy and support for Rhodesia all over the Western world, where literally hundreds of "friends of Rhodesian independence" organizations came spontaneously into existence within a few weeks of the subsequent unilateral declaration of independence.

Dr. Kosmin remarks that overseas support for Rhodesian independence "was mainly confined to groups in the Western democracies which linked Zionism along with Wall Street and

Communism as part of the three-prong attack on Western Christendom."

He adds:

As a result, from 1965 onwards Rhodesia was visited by extreme rightwing propagandists and known anti-Semites such as Eric Butler of the Australian League of Rights and Major Bundy of the U.S.A. In their public pronouncements, such people studiously refrained from open anti-Semitism, but dwelt on the more obvious racial themes. However, when Col. Curtis B. Dall and the American Liberty Lobby visited Bulawayo they made anti-Jewish remarks in front of Jewish Councillors at a civic reception.

As events were to prove, Rhodesia's Zionists had nothing to fear from a Rhodesian Front party that remained under the firm control of Prime Minister Ian Smith, who emerges in Dr. Kosmin's book with a clean bill of health and without the blemish of a single adverse personal comment.

Dr. Kosmin goes on: "The confidence of Rhodesian Jewry was restored in 1967, the year which saw the Israeli triumphs in the Middle East and the departure from Rhodesia of the much loathed Ivor Benson."

In fact, Kosmin makes it clear that the turn-about in the political fortunes of Rhodesia's Zionists could be attributed entirely to Prime Minister Ian Smith after they themselves had been humiliatingly defeated in their efforts to set up an opposition to the Rhodesian Front with a new Rhodesian Party under the leadership of Sir Roy Welensky⁴ and the long continued support of other opposition groups and factions, including the Center Party.

For it was after the most crushing defeat of Sir Roy Welensky in a Salisbury by-election and his final elimination from public life, that the Zionists, who had sponsored him offered their support to Prime Minister Ian Smith, were warmly accepted and were soon again "over-represented" in government. Writes Kosmin:

After the Arundel by-election the R.F. undertook a policy aimed at wooing the Jewish community in order to enhance European unity and convince some ditherers who respected Jewish opinions on economic questions. In the 1962 elections they had not fielded any Jewish candidates, but in 1965 they put forward three successful ones: Mr. Joel Pincus who was their candidate in the traditionally Jewish seat of Bulawayo East, Mr. Bernard Ponter who was surprisingly successful in the constituency of Willovale with its large proportion of colored voters, and Mr. Theo Ellison who won Salisbury, Greenwood . . .

Thus while Ian Smith juggled the hard-line and pro-settlement factions within his Cabinet and tried to prevent the emergence of any significant White political opposition on his left or right, the leaders of the Jewish community began to assert themselves a little more. For a long time the community had studiously avoided official contact with the Government and there were no invitations to communal functions for politicians. This was not due to personal hostility on either side, for most of the people involved had gone to school together and knew each other socially. Ian Smith even has a Jewish godmother, Mrs. Tilly Jacobson of Gwelo.

One of the biggest problems which presented itself to the Zionist leaders in Rhodesia was that of trying to reconcile their own conflicting responses to economic warfare waged jointly by the British Government and the United Nations.

They shared with these outside forces a strong desire to bring about the overthrow of White local self-determination. But they also realized, as Kosmin tells us,

"... that to the overseas politicians they (Rhodesia's Jews) were expendable, and believing that their own survival and their families' livelihood depended on frustrating the efforts of the British civil servants, they launched into a wholehearted campaign of sanctions-busting.

He records with evident pride:

The result of this contest was easily predictable, for on the one side there were committed imaginative persons with a stake in what they were doing, and on the other, impractical, faceless bureaucrats with no stake in the contest, who were much less willing to put the necessary time and effort into the economic war . . .

Jewish businessmen made use of their friends and relations and linguistic skills in order to evade the restrictions placed on their activities by the United Nations.

One key figure in the sanctions-busting operation was William Margolis, an economic consultant to successive Rhodesian governments after World War II and now chairman of the Grain Marketing Board, whose sale of \$20-million worth of maize to Zambia (formerly Northern Rhodesia) in 1971 served the double purpose of earning much-needed foreign currency and of helping to feed the scores of thousands of Joshua Nkomo's terrorists being trained in that country.

Another was Elias (Elly) Broomberg who, on being reelected in 1974, became Ian Smith's Minister of Commerce.

However, Dr. Kosmin draws a veil of modesty over the sheer magnitude of the Zionist comeback in a party which, until their defeat in the Arundel by-election, they had fought unceasingly to destroy.

In 1976 when Prime Minister Smith was confronted with a revolt in the party and the resignation of twelve members of parliament, the party's national chairman and many others, he shifted this same Elias Broomberg to the post of Minister of Information and Tourism and permitted him to fire the entire board of the RBS/RTV and its director-general Harvey War, and install himself in undivided control of Rhodesian radio and television.

By this time, then, the Rhodesian Front had become little more than a Zionist operation.

In the light of this development, those members who had resigned from the RF to form the Rhodesian Action Party (RAP), and others who had resigned or been expelled, could hardly be blamed for wondering whether Ian Smith had not been deliberately planted in the RF when it had become clear that the RF was headed for victory in that 1962 election.⁵

Meanwhile, the anti-RF side of the Zionist operation was partly in the hands of lawyers like Ben Baron of Bulawayo (whose daughter, Saone, married Chester Crocker, later the U.S. Secretary of State for African Affairs) and Leo Baron Nkomo's one-time legal adviser who later fled the country after a brief period of detention (Kosmin says he was "expelled"), returning after Black "independence" to take up a post as an Appeal Court judge.⁶

Shared Zionist aims, we now find, easily reconciled these apparent contradictions in the Zionist response to the Rhodesian challenge.

As events were to prove, economic sanctions greatly strengthened the Jewish hold on Rhodesia's commerce and industry, since inevitably the persons who benefited most from the sanctions-busting operation were those mainly responsible for conducting it; and those most vulnerable to sanctions were also most vulnerable to campaigns of intimidations and pressure exerted by Black nationalist revolutionaries inside the country.

The next result is that commerce and industry in the new Zimbabwe are more than ever concentrated in the hands of the Jews, with big companies powerful enough to be able to influence the Black politicians, and strategically placed to share with them the abundance of money coming into the country in the form of low-interest loans and foreign aid grants.⁷

On the military front, too, Rhodesia's Zionists demonstrated that they knew how best to take care of themselves as a "culturally autonomous" group bent on promoting its own "national liberation" (quoted words are Dr. Kosmin's).

There had been some diminution of the Jewish population shortly after the dissolution of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, says Kosmin, but "the most striking loss was in persons in their twenties"—the age group on which Rhodesia depended most heavily in its constantly expanding bush war. A.E. Abrahamson is quoted as saying in 1973: "We see the elimination of almost an entire generation of young men and women who leave us to study in South Africa and overseas and, save for a few, do not return."

In fact, by 1969 already, according to a survey quoted by Kosmin, there were only 227 Jews (of both sexes presumably) between the ages of 20 and 25 in the country; there were then only three Jews in the police and only seven in the armed forces establishment—enough of them, at any rate, to keep the Jewish Board of Deputies and CAZO informed about what was going on in these two important services.

Whatever young Jews did get into uniform were, as Kosmin makes clear, in the Middle East fighting for the Israeli state.

Dr. Kosmin's book is thus a rare and most valuable contribution to the literature of political science, recording with commendable frankness and with much detail what can be accomplished by a small, tightly knit, well organized, passionately group-conscious community (only 2.2 percent of Rhodesia's White population) in preserving itself and advancing its long-term purposes in difficult and even daunting circumstances.

The book may even provide an answer to a question which appears to have baffled Dr. Henry L. Feingold, Professor of History at New York University, who asks: "Is it possible that there is something so idiosyncratic about the Jewish presence in history, considering the fact that it is a community based on an idea and on history itself, that it resists the tools and thwarts the assumptions of modern scholarship?"⁸

The "much loathed" former Rhodesian Information Adviser would answer that question as follows: Nothing could be more idiosyncratic or anomalous than the presence in history of a fervently self-conscious and ambitious nation dispersed thinly among innumerable other nations. For such a nation can only survive, as Professor Sir Arthur Keith has explained, by

implementing a dual code of ethics which clearly distinguishes between *us* and *them*, giving rise to a relationship between the two which is ambivalent, if not always hostile.

Such an idiosyncratic relationship cannot possibly be maintained except by means of continuous exercise of the arts of mystification; and it is this dependence on mystification that makes it difficult and even hazardous for the Jewish community to engage in the writing of its own history.

The struggle of a predominantly British White Rhodesian population to avoid being drawn into the internationalists' New International Economic Order⁹ occupies only a small part of Dr. Kosmin's rather indiscreet history, which traces the role of the Jews since they entered the country before the turn of the century, mostly as peddlers and cattle dealers, to be joined later by numbers of "refugees" from Czarist Russia. The writer has been remarkably candid in revealing by what means they gained an economic foothold—the burning down of insured trading stores, phoney bankruptcies, and currency smuggling being at one time highly rewarding.

The real secret of the Rhodesian Jews' success, however, as we are shown quite plainly in the book, was that exercise of double standards—one for themselves and another for the "stranger," rigid segregation and group self-interest for themselves and "liberal" policies of multiracialism and non discrimination for others, all this while maintaining the closest bonds of cooperation with their co-nationals abroad.

Yet there is not one chapter in the book which does not contain some reference to the pained surprise and reproach with which Rhodesia's Jews reacted from time to time to signs that the rest of the White population did not always take kindly to such behavior on the part of those whom they had so willingly accepted as fellow Rhodesians.

Of this we are left in no doubt by Dr. Kosmin: The overthrow of White rule in Rhodesia and its replacement with a puppet black regime was fully in line with Zionism's long-term requirements.

Notes

1. *Majuta: a History of the Jewish Community in Zimbabwe*, B.A. Kosmin, with a foreword by Professor Michael Gelfand (Mambo Press, Zimbabwe, 1980).
2. Now called Zambia, Zimbabwe and Malawi, respectively.
3. Sir Godfrey Huggins, later Lord Malvers, a former Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia and an architect of the short-lived Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland.
4. Roland Welensky, son of a Polish-Jewish immigrant, his mother an Afrikaner; Welensky was prominent in Northern Rhodesian politics and trade unionism before succeeding Sir Godfrey Huggins as Prime Minister of the short-lived Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland.
5. The present writer has analyzed the struggle for Rhodesia and the role of Ian Smith in *Truth Out of Africa*, the second edition, published in 1984. As was only to be expected in the light of all the information supplied by Dr. Kosmin in his book *Majuta*, the Zionists finally dropped Ian Smith and transferred their support to a Black government under Robert Mugabe who was installed by international high finance under the useful guise of "liberation" and "Black self-determination."
6. An item in the *Bulawayo Chronicle* of September 11, 1967, carries a picture of the couple on a visit to Rhodesia, with the caption: "Mr. Chester Crocker (25), and American postgraduate research student, and his Bulawayo-born wife, Saone, who are visiting the City. Mrs. Crocker is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ben Baron. Mr. Crocker has a Ford Foundation grant to study African security problems, on which he will write a Ph.D. thesis."
7. The fraudulent nature of "foreign aid" to undeveloped countries of the so-called Third World has been examined in detail by Professor P.T. Bauer, London School of Economics, in his books *Dissent on Development and Equality, the Third World and Economic Delusion* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson). Two significant contributions to the truth about "foreign aid" are *The Destruction of a Continent* by Professor Karl Borjén and Kathleen Corbett, lecturers at Kenya University (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich) and *The Third World Calamity* by Brian May (Routledge Kegan Paul). See also, *Somewhere South of Suez* by Douglas Reed, the Postscript chapter in which President Truman's "Point Four Program" of foreign aid is examined; this book was published in 1950.
8. Professor Henry L. Feingold was quoted in the conservative American Council for Judaism publication *Special Interest Report* in August 1982.
9. The New International Economic Order (NIEO) was unveiled in a United Nations declaration, and is referred to in Professor P.T. Bauer's book *Equality, the Third World and Economic Delusion*.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

The Genocide Convention

After this chapter was written, the United States yielded at last to enormous pressure and voted on February 19, 1986, for ratification of the Genocide Convention but with seven provisos designed to protect USA sovereignty. Implementing legislation by the House of Representatives would also be needed to give the Convention the effect of law.

* * * * *

Any study of the Jewish role in 20th century history would be misleadingly incomplete without some reference to the United Nations Genocide Convention, which had its origin in the mind of a Jewish lawyer from Poland, one Raphael Lemkin, and has been promoted with the utmost vigor by Jewish organizations around the world since it was passed by the UN General Assembly in December 1948.

The Genocide Convention has all the appearance of having been from its inception a Jewish exercise. There is no record of any prominent Jewish individual or organization having ever opposed it, nor, as far as can be ascertained, has any other "national, ethnical, racial, or religious groups, as such," all supposedly objects of the conventions' concern, joined forces with the Jews in promoting it.

It is thus necessary to bring to bear on the Genocide convention all the insights and powers of political analysis which have been exercised in the preceding chapters of this book.

By the end of 1984 this treaty, whose ostensible purpose it is to brand genocide as an international crime, had been ratified

by some 90 member nations of the United Nations, including the United Kingdom, France, Western Germany, Sweden, Norway, Canada, and many Communist states—but had not yet, by the end of 1984, been ratified by the United States, where it was more strongly resisted than anywhere else in the world.

James J. Martin, in his book *The Man Who Invented Genocide*, tells us what happened when the treaty was first presented to the United States Senate for endorsement:

The signal for the really heavy political traffic on the Genocide Convention was the announcement in August 1949 that a sub-committee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would start hearings on the ratification question, chaired by Senator Brien MacMahon (D-Conn.) during the early weeks of the coming session of Congress. On August 23 a combined pressure move by 26 national organizations, all associated with the National Civil Liberties Clearing House, hailed this new development and began their squeeze on the Senate for agreement on GC ratification. This band of groups included the American Veterans Committee, the Americans for Democratic Action, B'nai B'rith, the American Jewish Committee, Hadassah, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the Evangelical and Reformed Church.¹

The "band of groups" continued to expand rapidly and presently included, among scores of others: the American Jewish Congress, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the Committee of Jewish Writers and Artists, the Consultive Council of Jewish Organizations, the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations, the Institute of Jewish Affairs, the Jewish Reform Congregations, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, the Synagogue Council of America, the Union of Hebrew Congregations, and the Union of Orthodox Rabbis—to be joined in a "last-minute flurry of heavy pressure group muscle" shortly before the McMahon report was due to be presented to the Senate in 1950, by the National Community Relations Advisory Council, the "policy formulating body" of six national Jewish organizations and 28 local community councils.

We therefore labor under a disabling handicap if we continue to accept the Genocide Convention at face value as a genuine international instrument of law aimed at the protection of innumerable "national, ethnical, racial, or religious groups." As such, it makes no sense. On the other hand, it lends itself readily to explanation as a legal construct meant by its principle promoters only to strengthen and protect one group, namely, the Jews.

It should be noted that "genocide" is a new word not to be found in the standard dictionaries until about ten years after the end of World War II, and then defined only briefly as "deliberate extermination of race, nation, etc." In the Genocide Convention, however, the word "genocide" has been invested with innumerable other meanings—a circumstance that should warn us to be most wary about all that follows.

Lemkin, in his book *Axis Rule Over Occupied Europe*, used the word at first only to mean "extermination." He must soon have realized, however, that the kind of convention he had in mind would be hamstrung by so narrow a precise a definition, so he proceeded to give it an expanded meaning:

By "genocide" we mean the destruction of a nation or ethnic group . . . Genocide has two phases: one, the destruction of the national pattern of the oppressed group; the other, the imposition of the national pattern of the oppressor . . . Denationalization was the word used in the past to describe the destruction of a national pattern.

Extermination is thus replaced by assimilation (the remedy offered by Shakespeare in *The Merchant of Venice*) as the main danger, and this Lemkin calls genocide, showing again that it was only the Jewish group and its resistance to "denationalization" that he had in mind in explaining his plan for a Genocide Convention.

In the Genocide Convention as finally passed by the United Nations the process of redefinition is carried a stage further:

Article II

In the present convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

- (a) Killing members of the group;
- (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group;

Article III

The following shall be punishable:

- (a) Genocide;
- (b) Conspiracy to commit genocide;
- (c) Direct public incitement to commit genocide;
- (d) Attempt to commit genocide; and
- (e) Complicity in genocide.

Anyone with an elementary knowledge of law and of court procedure in Western countries will realize after a few moments of reflection that any attempt to implement the above would produce the utmost confusion.

But why? Short answer: Because these two Articles alone flout one of the basic requirements of jurisprudence as understood in all civilized countries where some measure of freedom remains: that of using words and phrases that are capable of legal definition. Thus differences of interpretation which have always exercised the minds of lawyers and judges would be multiplied a thousandfold by words and phrases which no one has even attempted to define.

For example, all the offences listed hinge on the word "group"—but what exactly, in the context of the convention, is a "group"? All human beings belong to some group or other, so which qualify for protection under the convention and which do not? How about the Muslim Black Panthers; are they another group or just part of the Negro group? Are the Moonies, Scientologists, Mennonites, Doukhobors all groups to be protected along with a variety of immigrant minorities in Western countries? And if the "Gays" (homosexuals), who have complained of harsh treatment, decide to claim the status of a religious group—which they could so easily do with so many clergymen in their ranks—who is to say them nay.

It stands to reason that any group claiming protection for its members will have to satisfy a "genocide" convention court under what heading it falls—national, ethnical, racial or religious? The British House of Lords has ruled that the Jews have no separate status as a group except as "a dissenting religious denomination," that means that they have no more claim to a separate status in Britain than the adherents of any other religious denomination except the state religion of Anglicanism. Dr. Nahum Goldmann, at one time President of both the World Jewish Congress and the World Zionist Organization, tells us in his book *The Jewish Paradox*

that in a student lecture he once provided more than 20 definitions of Judaism, "not one of them absolutely correct." If Dr. Goldmann, then the world's number one Jew, could not even define his own group, how then is the word "group" to be defined in its applicability to the rest of mankind? It might also be argued plausibly that a group which has survived for more than 2000 years and is today probably the wealthiest and most powerful on earth hardly qualified for special protection of the kind offered by the Genocide Convention.

Equally unamenable to legal definition are the words and phrases used in the list of punishable offenses. There need be no doubt about the meaning of the word "killing," but how is "killing" to acquire the more serious aspect of "genocide?" And how is it to be proved that the killing of "part of a group," which could be one member of it, formed part of an intention to wipe out the entire group? Grotesque, too, from a legalistic point of view, is the expression "mental harm." How is that to be defined in such a way as to leave a court in no doubt as to what is and what is not "mental harm?"

A word or phrase that can mean almost anything can be said in legalistic terms to mean nothing.

The categories of offense listed in Article III are not rendered less problematic when attached to clearly defined offenses under common law, like murder, arson, hijacking kidnapping, etc.; as supplementary to the offenses in Article II they only make "confusion worse confounded," depriving the genocide Convention of any claim to the serious consideration of trained legal minds in any country still enjoying some measure of "rule under due process of law."

Nearly all the convention's other articles are equally vulnerable to examination.

What it amounts to is that those who drafted the convention felt no need to define the words and phrases used. Like Humpty Dumpty in Lewis Carroll's *Alice Through the Looking Glass*, they say, in effect: "Please don't trouble yourselves trying to find out what our words mean; they mean what we say they mean, no more and no less." Or, to put it differently, the Genocide Convention can be made to work without any difficulty in a totalitarian state where words mean what the police and prosecutor say they mean, no more and no less, and where the courts, as an executive arm of those who rule, are no more than a public place where punishments

can be seen to be imposed.

If the Genocide Convention does not mean protection for endangered groups, and if wholly irreconcilable with trial procedures in the West, then what does it mean to those who continue so strenuously to press for its acceptance and implementation by all nations?

An answer to that question will be more easily understood after we have dealt with a couple of other questions: how and why has the convention encountered more powerful opposition in the United States of America than anywhere else in the world? How was it possible for the Americans to spend 35 years wrestling with the problem without coming to a final decision?

A short answer to the first questions is that in terms of the Constitution of the United States an international treaty takes effect automatically as the law of the land, prevailing over any existing law that might stand in the way of its implementation. Thus, in the United States the Genocide Convention would operate at once as a *legal instrument* capable of revolutionizing the legal system, whereas in most other countries it could be regarded as no more than a political statement of intent having no immediate effect on existing laws. More particularly, the Convention could be seen at once as a threat to the powers enjoyed by all the states of the union, powers of local independence and limited self-government which it is the principal function of the US Senate to protect. The struggle over the Convention has continued down the years because of the enormous power of those promoting it, who evidently hope to be able, sooner or later, to overcome all resistance.

From Harry Truman in 1949 to Ronald Reagan in 1984, seven presidents of the USA have given the convention their personal approval. One or two of them—Jimmy Carter, for example—may have been stupid enough to see no harm in it, but one fact emerges clearly: For any aspirant for the high office of president, and any president hoping for reelection, it would have been politically suicidal to challenge those powers on which both main parties are largely dependent for funds; powers, moreover, whose control of the mass media of communications is almost complete. As was only to be expected, therefore, a few days before the 1984 presidential election, Ronald Reagan and his principal opponent, Walter Mondale, presented themselves personally before the

national convention of the Jewish organization B'nai B'rith, yarmulkas on their heads, to pledge their support for the Genocide Convention.

However, it needed more than the assent of the president to make an international treaty; a two-thirds majority vote in the senate is also required. Therefore, the president, even if personally opposed to the convention, always had an easy way out: he could leave it to the senate to handle in the usual dilatory way, untroubled by any fear that he might have "sold the pass."

But, how were the senators, many of them not always in safe seats, to resist the same dangerous pressure to give the convention their endorsement? Answer: by interminable deferment and delay, a process of stalling much facilitated since the end of World War II by America's involvement in a succession of major global disturbances, including the Vietnam War. Nevertheless, senators had to exercise their wits to a maximum to prevent the convention coming to a final vote in the senate, dutifully endorsing the "sentiments" and the "principle" of the convention while at the same time never ceasing to render it innocuous with "amendments," "conditions," etc.

Significantly, too, it was the clearly perceived revolutionary implications of the Genocide convention and the senate's constitutional powers of obstruction which made possible a more thorough professional examination of the convention than anywhere else in the world.

It says much for the power and tenacity of purpose of its promoters that a convention stripped of any semblance of juridical respectability by two subcommittees of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (1949 and 1970) could still be primed up for presentation to the Senate again in 1984—when once again a seemingly irresistible combination of persuasion and terror just failed to shift an immovable spirit of foot-dragging, deferment and delay. The following quote from a report in the Washington weekly *The Spotlight*, October 22, 1984, even lends strength to the hope of many Americans that the immovable object may perhaps have gained something in immovability:

The defeat of the Genocide Convention did not come without cost, however. After opponents threatened to load up the bill with amendments, Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker (R-Tenn.) proposed a non-binding resolution supporting the "principles" of the treaty and expressing the interest of the Senate to work in the next session to act "expeditiously" on the treaty . . . Eleven senators did

not bother to show up for the vote which was considered little more than a sop to those who have been promoting the treaty.

The first major rebuff which the Genocide Convention received in 1949, even before the commencement of the sittings of the McMahon subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, would have sufficed to knock out any set of political proposals less powerfully and resolutely sponsored: this was the flat rejection of it by the American Bar Association, a rejection to be repeated just as firmly 20 years later.

In 1954 the chairman of the American Bar Association, Frank E. Holman, in an address to the well-known patriotic organization Daughters of the American Revolution, denounced the treaty as "fraudulent," and Leander Perez of Louisiana, chairman of the States Rights Committee described it as "monstrous" and "a dishonest subterfuge." Generally, however, when the convention had been under discussion in the United States, those who criticize it have extended to its promoters and defenders the conventional courtesy of not questioning their *bona fides* and the purity of their intentions.

The Genocide Convention remained in a state of suspended animation until 1970, when it was revived by President Richard Nixon. Again the Senate was asked to confer on it their blessings, and again the Senate handed it over for further examination to a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, this time under the chairmanship of Senator Frank Church and with Senator Jacob Javits of New York, a passionate proponent of the convention, as one of its members.

The weird *unreality* of the convention was never more clearly exhibited than by those who set out to defend it before the Frank Church subcommittee, especially those sent by the State Department.

Senator Church asked at one stage:

Can any of you cite a single instance where any one of the 70-odd countries that have in fact become members of this treaty have proceeded against any citizen within their jurisdiction, charged them with genocide, tried them and convicted them? Has there been a single case where this treaty has actually been invoked on the part of any of the 75 countries that have ratified it?

Charles W. Yost, then United States ambassador to the United Nations, replying for the rest, conceded that he was "not aware" of any such action either, but continued to insist that ratification by the United States was worthwhile.

Senator Church was still baffled:

I find it hard to conceive that any government, even though it might be a signatory to this convention, which actually engages in such practice in the future, is either going to confess to the crime or is going to take any action to punish itself. That exceeds the bounds of realism. Moreover, it is difficult to believe that any government, so inclined, would act against individual citizens within its jurisdiction guilty of genocide.

Had nothing happened since 1949 that could be classified as genocide? How about the Biafra-Nigeria imbroglio, the Indonesian massacre of 200,000 so-called "communists," or the mutual killings in India and Pakistan? The only explanation Ambassador Yost could offer was that "serious arguments" challenging the description of any of these as genocide had stopped any further action at the United Nations.

James Martin, in *The Man Who Invented Genocide*, published in 1984, brings us up to date:

Though there have been many accusations of "genocide" made against a variety of countries in the last 35 years, in the United Nations there has never been a single international indictment, trial or conviction for such a "crime" before that body in all that time, or anywhere else.

Another intriguing feature of the evidence given by the State Department professionals, when their attention was drawn to the serious implications of some of the obligations to which the United States would be bound as a signatory, was the argument that these could be disregarded. One of the principal witnesses before the Frank Church subcommittee, Senator Sam Ervin, himself a lawyer by profession, remarked:

The State Department baffles me why it wants to get a treaty like this ratified and then tries to devise dubious ways to show that we don't have to do what it obligates us to do; that is something I can't comprehend.

A subcommittee member, Senator John Cooper, was also baffled: "One of the problems that concerns me in ratifying the treaty relates to the obligations we undertake in carrying it out. But the arguments we heard concerned methods of evading it."

The thoroughly professional treatment given to the Genocide Convention by Senator Sam Ervin before the Senate subcommittee on May 22, 1970, leaves nothing more to be said or written by way of showing that the convention has no meaning

whatever as an instrument of law aimed at discouraging and punishing acts of genocide either by individuals or nations.

Before proceeding to analyze the conventions' articles one by one, he presented a short history with almost the whole truth compressed into a dozen lines of the printed record:

During the 1940s activists connected with the United Nations engaged in a strenuous effort to establish by treaties *laws to supercede domestic laws of nations throughout the earth*. The Genocide Convention represents one of these efforts. It originated in a resolution of the United Nations condemning genocide as a crime whether "committed on religious, racial, political or any grounds." When reduced to its final form it excluded genocide committed on "political" grounds because some of the parties to it did not wish to surrender, even nominally, their right to *exterminate political groups hostile to their rulers*. (Emphasis added).

Senator Ervin added:

The only argument now advanced for ratification of this convention is that it would improve the image of the United States in the eyes of Russia and other totalitarian parties to the convention which, strange to say, have repudiated by understanding and reservations many of the provisions of the convention.

Senator Ervin's comments on one subsection provide a good example of his annihilating analysis of nearly all the convention's clauses:

If the convention is ratified, Article II(c) would impose upon the United States the duty to prevent and to prosecute and punish anyone who deliberately inflicts "on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part." What this means, no mind can fathom. Does it mean that a state or county official who refuses to give to a member of one of the four groups designated in the convention the amount of welfare benefits deemed desirable is to be punished or prosecuted for genocide? Does it mean that the Court of International Justice shall have power under Article IX to adjudge that Congress or a state legislature which does not make available to one of the four groups what the court deems to be adequate welfare benefits has violated the convention?

Senator Ervin read into the record another thorough analysis of the convention in the form of an article by Orie L. Phillips, Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, published in the August 1949 issue of the Journal of the American Bar Association.

All this expert criticism of the Genocide Convention having been strengthened rather than weakened by the searching questions addressed to Senator Ervin by the three members of the subcommittee, Senator Jacob Javits created something of a precedent by asking for and being granted permission to submit later what he called "a point-by-point rebuttal."

This "rebuttal" admits of no possibility of an intelligible replying point-by-point rebuttal, because it draws the whole subject of the Genocide Convention into a kaleidoscopic world of the mind in which all the meanings which form part of the process of coherent thought are so altered by distortion or inversion that they can be handled only by a trained practitioner of a form of intellectual aggression which George Orwell has called *Doublethink*. This is a form of rhetoric in which the promotion of hostile intentions prescribed the subordination of truth to policy; in other words, it is a form of warfare, still to be universally recognized as such, in which physical force, so long the arbiter in any contest of interests between human "groups," is replaced by a "peaceful" application of moral violence.

Therefore, no purpose would be served by trying to summarize Senator Javits's "rebuttal." It has been reproduced verbatim in James Martin's book from the printed record of the subcommittee, where it is available to anyone wishing to sharpen his wits by studying it.²

So, what is the real meaning of a Genocide Convention which evidently means so much to those who invented it and have always been most active in promoting it?

That question has already been partly answered: The convention is a purely Jewish exercise masked only very thinly with tender concern for innumerable unnamed other groups but intended solely to promote and protect the interests of one group: namely, a powerful and highly organized Jewish nation dispersed among other nations, nowhere more plentifully than in the United States of America and Europe.

But why should the Jews attach importance to so flimsy an instrument of international law at a time when their own great power appears to be approaching its zenith and when, as a group, they appear to be less under threat than ever before in their long and troubled history?

The short answer to that question is that in spite of their present great wealth and power the Jews have a haunting fear that they are

headed for trouble; they know that they are exposing themselves increasingly as an indentifiable group with separate interests, and they know that the policies they are now promoting, aimed at placing themselves in a final and unassailable position of power and safety at the apex of a planned new global dispensation, are bound to give rise, sooner or later, to an escalation of alarm and antagonism among other peoples.

For reasons of expediency, the Jews have always pretended not to be able to understand the phenomenon misleadingly labelled "anti-Semitism"; but more than 2000 years of experience will have taught them beyond any shadow of doubt that the antagonism of the peoples among whom they dwell is only part of the price they must pay for the advantages of a heightened sense of group togetherness and the material rewards of a dual code of ethics. They know, also, that the increasing internationalization of Jewish attitudes and activity in the 20th century is being accompanied by a corresponding internationalization of "anti-Semitism," bringing with it the possibility of a disaster of unprecedented magnitude for the Jewish people.

The Genocide convention is thus an exercise aimed at laying the foundations for a system of punitive international law, complete with an international genocide tribunal under Article VI, fortified with the respectability of endorsement by all nations, ready to be invoked and put into use when required.

That explains the almost boundless expansion of the meaning of the word "genocide" in the convention, since the Jews would feel threatened and endangered by virtually any sign of negative reaction which they themselves arouse as they press forward with plans to gain final control of a totalitarian world order now in the process of being set up.

The real meaning of the Genocide Convention also offers to explain a range of other phenomena, including the indefatigability of efforts to secure United States ratification—for of what use are all the other ratifications if this one is still lacking? Another question: How otherwise are we to explain the presence among those who have ratified the convention of many Third World states whose leaders have never ceased inflicting genocidal oppression on dissenting cultural minorities? The fact that the convention could be so readily accepted, with only minor conditions, by notoriously cruel and oppressive totalitarian states like the Soviet Union and Communist China, also brands it as a terrorist instrument for the

control of populations—the very opposite of what it is made out to be.

Dr. Nahum Goldmann, in his book *The Jewish Paradox*, describes the Jewish people as "the most paradoxical in the world," a description that fully embraces the Genocide Convention, an instrument of international law designed to take the risk out of risky Jewish policies and actions and reconcile two completely contradictory fears: *the fear of being rejected and persecuted and the fear of being accepted and assimilated.*

* * * * *

It would be a gross and misleading oversimplification to suggest that the power nexus now promoting a plan for the centralization of all political power in a new world order is exclusively Jewish. As explained earlier in this book, the plan for world government in its present form first took shape in the 20th century as an "Anglo-American" exercise, promoted from one side of the Atlantic by Cecil John Rhodes and his associates, including Lord Milner, and on the other side by the super-rich White Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) pioneering families headed by banker J.P. Morgan; when this essentially non-Jewish financial elite lost its position at the apex of international finance-capitalism (as recorded by Professor Quigley), it was not wiped out but only drawn into orbit in a constellation of financial power it could no longer control, to be held in position thereafter by strong motives of shared worldly interest. Similarly drawn into orbit in the great 20th century power constellation were successive generations of intellectuals who found in an ideology of universalism and "world order" the double advantage of filling the gap left by a lost religious faith *and* of being richly rewarded in world terms.

Notes

1. *The Man Who Invented Genocide*, James J. Martin, Institute of Historical Review, Torrance, California, 1984.
2. Is there a word for Senator Javitz's kind of rhetoric? There is: "pilpulism," not to be found in most concise dictionaries, but defined in *Webster's* as "casuistic argumentation, esp. among Jewish scholars on Talmudic subjects."

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

George Orwell and the Zionist Factor

A chapter and more having been given to the subject of revolutionary changes in the realm of high finance during this century, more attention must now be given to the other half of that alliance of Money and Intellect which has given the world an age of conflict unprecedented in recorded history, namely, that which has to do with changes in the realm of the mind.

How could it have been possible for the Western collective intellect, so wondrous a performer in science and technology, to perform so dismally in the realm of politics, and even to embrace with enthusiasm a Marxist interpretation of history?

An equally important question: By what mental process was the world's Jewish population, thinly distributed in the countries of the West, able to acquire its present enormous ascendancy, both in terms of wealth and political influence?

A massive 20th century Jewish triumph on the battleground of the mind must therefore be considered under two separate aspects: 1. The failure of the Western intellect to measure up to the challenge of radically changed historical circumstances, and 2. The employment by the Jews of mental skills of a kind which conferred on them an insuperable competitive advantage.

In other words, the disparity cannot be attributed entirely to an exercise by the Jews of some superior mental skill; just as important a factor was the state of spiritual and intellectual disablement prevailing in the West.

Part of the explanation, of course, is the fact that the Western intellect has been almost exclusively outward-looking and therefore correspondingly starved of the insights, value feelings, intimations of instinct which are required if a population is to be fit and *in form* for struggle.

George Orwell, with his two small books *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has made it easier for the people of the West to understand what has been happening on the battleground of the mind. These books contain an account of his own spiritual and intellectual experience, what happened to him and what he was able to find out, presented as modern parables.

Like most of his generation of Western intellectuals, he was one of the "animals" in *Animal Farm*, easily deceived and ever ready to deceive himself. *Animal Farm* is not only a graphic exposé of Marxist Socialism; it exposes also the dangerously delusive character of "idealism"—abstract ideas about a planned future for mankind which have the effect of a mirage on the minds of those laboring under a sense of lost purpose and direction.

Orwell's experience as a Socialist partisan in the Spanish Civil War left him totally undeceived, a man of considerable natural talent suddenly set free from the imprisonment of an entire system of erroneous ideas and beliefs.

Orwell makes no attempt to explain this idealism in which intellectuals seek refuge from an unrelenting reality; all he does in *Animal Farm* is to present a living picture in which idealism and its consequences are interestingly and amusingly exhibited.

A significant feature of the story which might easily be overlooked is that the lords and masters on *Animal Farm* are all of one kind, namely the pigs, who stick together and dominate the rest with the recalcitrant pig Snowball as Leon Trotsky's opposite, the parallel with the Bolshevik drama could hardly be closer.

Toward the end of 1983, as *Time* magazine put it . . .

. . . the imminence of the Orwellian year galvanized a small army of professors, critics and writers, journalists, pundits, social scientists, politicians and professional doomsters; and hardly anyone paid for thinking out loud seemed to have been able to resist the temptation to play with Orwell's numbers.

There was no need to speculate about the date "1984" because Orwell was not offering a glimpse into the future, but only an insight into what was actually happening, and continues to happen, as the 20th century world revolution continues to expand its dominion over mankind.

What many of those pundits, social scientists, etc., still do not realize is that there had emerged out of the luminous intelligence and illuminating experience of George Orwell weapons of the mind to match all those which during this century have given the Jewish

people a competitive edge over the rest of mankind.

What he did was to isolate and give names to meanings which had hitherto formed no part of the mental processes of the people of the West, making them more easily thinkable and communicable. Most of those new names or words are now part of the English language, expressions like "Big Brother," "Goodthinker," "Doublethink," "Newspeak," "Crimestop," "Memory Hole," etc.

We are taken on a conducted tour through the morally insanitary world to which all those concepts belong and must harden ourselves against squeamishness as, with Orwell as guide and mentor, we familiarize ourselves with "Doublethink" and find out what it means to "Know and not know," to "be conscious of complete truthfulness while telling carefully constructed lies," to "hold contradictory opinions and believe them both," and "even use logic against logic"—devices which cannot be practiced with real skill and safety except by those who have been trained to practice them like second nature.

All people are, of course, capable of some degree of "Doublethink," but none can bring it to so high a degree of perfection and practice it like second nature except those who, from an early age, have lived simultaneously in two mental worlds. It is an attitude and set of mental skills which, for the Jews, makes possible the implementation of what Prof. Sir Arthur Keith has called a "dual moral code"; that is to say, a moral code which, for the Jews, clearly distinguished "us" and "our" interests from "them" and "their" interests.

This Doublethink is practiced more easily and with more safety by the Jews because, as Jung has pointed out, Jews acquire an expanded area of consciousness and find it easier to attach a negative value to the Unconscious. However, even for the Jew, there is a penalty to be exacted, that of partial alienation from nature, a diminished interest in things for their own sake with loss of creativeness—all of which adds up to cultural sterility. The gentile, on the other hand, practices at his peril a science of dissimulation which depends entirely on a willingness to put reality "on hold" and of then trying to retrieve it after unreality has accomplished its adversative purpose. The penalty for failure to accomplish this trick completely can be a chronic weakening of the hold on reality, a condition of psychic disturbance with alarming personal implications.

What we see in the application of "Doublethink," both in politics and in commercial transactions, is a substitution of *moral aggression* for physical aggression; and in public affairs *moral terrorism* replaces physical intimidation.

"Doublethink" has two aspects: Positive and Negative, representing on the one hand those who use it and, on the other, those against whom it is used, the aggressors and the victims. The first and simplest state of the discipline, as Orwell puts it, and one that can be taught even to young children, is called, in "Newspeak," "Crimestop." This "Crimestop" means the faculty of stopping short, as if by instinct, on the threshold of any dangerous thought. It includes the power of not grasping analogies, of failing to perceive logical errors, of misunderstanding the simplest arguments if they are inimical to the prevailing orthodoxy. Orwell calls it "protective stupidity."

What Orwell calls "Crimestop" is a device of moral terrorism designed to circumscribe the area of permissible inquiry and debate, the equivalent of an electrified fence in the realm of the intellect.

The area of inquiry and debate most rigorously circumscribed by "Crimestop" today is that which has to do with the power, political role, history and commercial practices of the Jewish people. There is, in fact, no other area of strictly proscribed inquiry and debate. Churchmen in senior positions are free to call into question long established articles of orthodoxy, and newspaper editors and politicians can agitate for the abolition of the monarchy, without fear of personal consequences. There never was more freedom of public utterance—but with one area excepted, anything with a bearing on the role of the Jews in modern history, as Orwell must well have known.

Orwell, therefore, instead of flouting that prevailing Crimestop, thereby also frightening off scores of thousands of potential readers of his books, circumvents it by means of a clever trick of "Doublethink." He presents the forbidden truth in an inverted form, inside out or upside down, as it were. And so, just as in his imagined Oceania the tyrant is presented as the caring "Big Brother," the daily falsification of news is carried out by the "Ministry of Truth," and the secret police are run by the "Ministry of Love," Orwell cunningly presents the Jew Emmanuel Goldstein as the would-be liberator of the oppressed population. Goldstein

then proceeds to expose the entire technology of the system of population control.

We read of this "liberator" in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*:

A day never passed when spies and saboteurs acting under his directions were not unmasked by the Thought Police. He was the commander of a vast shadowy army, an underground network of conspirators dedicated to the overthrow of the state. The Brotherhood its name was supposed to be. There were also whispered stories of a terrible book, a compendium of all the heresies, of which Goldstein was the author and which circulated clandestinely here and there. It was a book without a title. People referred to it, if at all, simply as *the book*. But one knew of such things only as vague rumors.

It was this "book," supposedly written by the Jew Goldstein, which came into the possession of the story's hero Winston Smith, laying bare the secret of "Doublethink" as key to the enormous power of the Socialist totalitarians.

And so, Orwell got his book past that worldwide system of informal censorship which forbids the discussion of the Jewish role in history, past or present; all he had to do was to attribute this brilliant exposure of the forbidden truth to the benevolence of a Jewish "liberator." Not only was "Crimestop" switched off throughout the book trade, but it was switched off also for scores of thousands of readers who might have been scared at the idea of reading a detailed exposition of a system of psychological warfare which has conferred on the Jewish nation an insuperable competitive advantage in the 20th century.

As was only to be expected, many of those who recognized and fully appreciated this brilliant analysis of population control as practiced in the modern world, wondered how he could have made the blunder of choosing an obviously Jewish character in his book to articulate it.

For example, a reviewer in the CDL Report, the journal of the Christian Defense League of America, in its issue of February 1984, had this comment to make:

A major fallacy of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, as we patriots would view it, is the designating of a Jew, "Emmanuel Goldstein," as the would-be "savior of the people." One contemplates whether Orwell had an inkling in the 1940s that Jews were documentedly the prime source of revolution in the world. To make a Jew appear as the beacon of light against tyranny, as Orwell did, goes beyond the ridiculous. It detracts considerably from the writer's credibility.

The Jewish writer, T.R. Fyvel, seems to have suspected that Orwell had some ulterior motive in choosing so conspicuously a Jewish name for the "liberator" who reveals the entire truth about "Doublethink":

As a friend one took George Orwell as he was; and, as if to show that he knew more about such things than one might think, he did call his last rebel in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* Emmanuel Goldstein, and modelled him on Trotsky.

The key to the Orwellian riddle is easily missed, as in any allegorical handling of a highly abstract theme. It can be found on page 267 where the rebellious Winston Smith, bent on preserving his mental integrity and sanity by insisting on the truth, is interrogated and bullied by the inquisitor O'Brien:

As you lie there, said O'Brien, you have often wondered—you have even asked me—why the Ministry of Love should expend so much time and trouble on you. And when you were free, you were often puzzled by what was essentially the same question. You could grasp the mechanics of the society you lived in, but not its underlying motives. Do you remember writing in your diary: "I understand *how*; I do not understand *why*"? It was when you thought about *why* that you doubted your own sanity. You have read the book, Goldstein's book or parts of it at least. Did it tell you anything you did not know already?

"You read it?," said Winston.

"I wrote it. No book is produced individually, as you know."

What Orwell reveals here is that Emmanuel Goldstein, although continually represented by the Ministry of Truth (Minitru) as the archenemy of the Socialist state of Oceania, is, in fact, the personification of the inner core of the ruling party. In other words, Goldstein and Big Brother are interchangeable terms.

Orwell never discussed Zionism in his writings, but his literary contemporaries have left us in no doubt that he was decidedly against it. Fyvel, himself a fervent Zionist, has this to say:

I know that Orwell completely disagreed with me; to him the Palestine Arabs were colored Asians, the Palestine Jews the equivalent of the white rulers of India and Burma, and oversimplification from which he was not to be budged . . .

Like all those who declare themselves against Zionism, Orwell was accused of being anti-Semitic. Fyvel writes:

Our differences over Jewish issues went beyond Palestine and Israel. In a letter Orwell wrote to Julian Symons, he said: "I have no doubt Fyvel thinks I am anti-Semitic." Well, no, I never would have

said that. Orwell's friend Malcolm Muggerridge, however, did. In his reflections on Orwell's funeral service he wrote: "Interesting, I thought, that George Orwell should have so attracted Jews, because he was at heart strongly anti-Semitic."

The fact that nearly all of Orwell's early supporters were Jews is hardly surprising since the Socialist movement in Britain was at the leadership level largely a Jewish enterprise, prominent among the front runners being the likes of Victor Gollancz, proprietor of the Left Book Club, and Prof. Harold Laski, who quickly recognized Orwell's great value as a proselytizer of Socialist idealism.

But was Orwell anti-Semitic in the sense of being actually hostile to Jews? Fyvel reveals more perhaps than he himself realized when he discusses a somewhat heated argument he had with Orwell over an article entitled *Revenge is Sour*, in the *Tribune* of November 9, 1945:

In this he described how, shortly after the fighting ended, he was shown around a prisoner-of-war camp in south Germany by a young Viennese Jewish officer in a U.S. Army captain's uniform, whom he tried hard to like but clearly did not. He related how he watched this officer shout at and kick a captured SS officer who, one-time torturer though he probably had been, now looked to Orwell only a pitiful being in need of psychological treatment.

What upset Fyvel was this brief passage in Orwell's article: "It is absurd to blame any German or Austrian Jew for getting his own back on the Nazis."

Fyvel continues:

That was all he wrote of the background, which I thought quite out of proportion. I said to Orwell that here in Hitler's so-called "final solution of the Jewish question" one had the greatest deliberate crime committed in man's history, yet all Orwell did was to mention it in one brief and dismissive sentence in a lengthy article telling how one Jewish officer kicked one SS man, an action Orwell referred to as "getting his own back." That was surely standing history on its head. How conceivably could the relatives of the six million murdered Jews "get their own back?"

Fyvel admits that his remonstrance had no effect whatever on Orwell's views. Indeed, instead of sharing Fyvel's indignation about German "war crimes," Orwell has in the same article called on the British Government to protest against the Soviet expulsion of Germans from East Prussia as a crime against humanity.

There is only one conclusion to be drawn from all this: Orwell did not believe the story of the gas-chamber killing of six million Jews.

And his experience in the Spanish Civil War, faithfully chronicled in his book *Homage to Catalonia*, would have left him with little or nothing to learn about the Jewish role in modern wars and revolutions.

Moreover, Orwell's reference to the officer "he tried to like but did not" shows that he was unfavorably impressed by the innumerable young Jews in American army uniforms, most of them more fluent in German than English, who swarmed all over Germany almost from the moment the shooting stopped.

So was George Orwell anti-Semitic? In an essay written in February 1945 titled *Anti-Semitism in Britain*, he declares that anti-Semitism should not be "Why does this obviously irrational belief appeal to other people,?" but rather "Why does anti-Semitism appeal to me?"

Orwell's entire approach to the subject of the "Jewish mystique" is exactly the same as that of William Shakespeare; he recognizes the existence of an almost universal negative response to the Jewish presence and practice, but is free from any animosity towards Jews as fellow human beings. Both are concerned only with revealing and explaining a nationalism which, unlike all other nationalisms, is practiced in geographical dispersion and which sets the Jews in a continuous relationship of antagonism towards the populations among whom they dwell—an antagonism which can never be wholly concealed.

The choice for the Jewish people, therefore, is either to triumph over all other populations, one nation presiding over the ruin of all the others, or they must submit to assimilation, as many Jews continue to do.

Shakespeare, in his *Merchant of Venice*, by marrying Shylock's daughter Jessica to one of Antonio's Christian friends and by inviting Shylock to be converted, makes a plea for assimilation as the only feasible solution of a problem which has plagued Jew and gentile alike for many centuries. What is more, he demonstrates that, strictly speaking, there is no such thing as "anti-Semitism," since it is primarily the practice of discrimination by the Jews that sets up the antagonism. The Jewish establishment strongly opposed the presentation of *The Merchant of Venice* on the stage, or through the medium of film or television, not because of any fear that it might incite hostility towards the Jews, but only because it would enhance assimilatory influences.

George Orwell was more interested in the grand drama of modern power politics and, in particular, with the Jewish role in the power-concentrating process of Socialism. If it is true, therefore, as Malcolm Muggeridge believed, that he attracted the interest and attention of Jews, the explanation, possibly, is that he was himself intensely interested in them and because, moreover, his attitude towards them has no trace of personal animosity. Orwell's writing, especially in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, would also have evoked a sympathetic resonance in the minds of Jewish readers because, in effect, it helps to explain the Jew to himself.

The message for the peoples of the West to be drawn from Orwell's two books, *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, and reinforced by all his other writings, is that the present imbalance in the relations of Jew and gentile can be redressed in only one way: host populations must learn how to cope. And there is only one way in which they will ever be able to cope: by matching those weapons of the mind and techniques of *non-violent aggression* which now confer enormous competitive advantage on the Jewish people. The gentiles do not need to be able to use such weapons of the mind; the only defense they need is to know and understand them, depriving their opponents of the ability to use them.