

The Jewish Problem

Foreword

Ever since Jews were recorded as interacting with the other peoples of the world, a simple pattern has been repeated time and again. At first, the Jews are welcomed into non-Jewish communities. Then, through means that will be discussed below, they become dominant. As we shall see, this economic (and hence cultural and political) dominance eventually leads the subjected population to rebel against its Jewish rulers, who are then typically expelled. The Jews then move on to another region and the old pattern begins again.

Does human history have to be little more than an attempt by one group to oppress the rest, inevitably to be followed sooner or later by a rebellion of the subject peoples? Clearly, neither group benefits from this cycle in the long term. The Jews have suffered almost endless pogroms and expulsions, while the extent of the non-Jewish peoples' sufferings is demonstrated by the extreme remedies they have felt it necessary to employ. Somehow, for the benefit of all concerned, this tragic cycle needs to be ended.

Yet no progress can occur if it remains impossible to discuss the Jewish problem freely and openly. In any conflict there is more chance of a peaceful resolution if each side can understand the position of the other. If this particular problem can be honestly discussed, then perhaps some sort of resolution might be possible – in a manner that is ultimately beneficial to both parties.

Open discussion of this problem, however, is hard to achieve or sustain. In some nations and states it is illegal even to discuss it. In more tolerant societies many people who are aware of the relevant facts fear to raise them, preferring to remain silent rather than arouse powerful opposition. Yet the subject of this study is a mind-set that has led to great human misery and untold millions of deaths. Legal sanctions and self-censorship on the one side, and hysteria and intimidation on the other, are a betrayal of the need to ensure a decent and dignified life for everyone.

In order to work together for a better human future, both Jews and non-Jews need to clarify several issues. For instance, are the Jews a race? Many prominent Jews have denied that human “races” even exist. On the other hand, Jewish lobby groups have been prominent in campaigning for laws to outlaw anti-Jewish “racial vilification” in most English-speaking nations – suggesting that they believe Jews are, indeed, a racial group.

This brief study tries to investigate these and similar issues in a way that could lead to frank discussion and, perhaps, the beginning of a co-operative approach to a more sustainable future for all of us. Some of the events referred to in the following pages are extremely regrettable; but as Gibbon observed, most history is “little more than the register of the crimes, follies and misfortunes of mankind”. What is called here “the Jewish problem” is no different.

Finally, it should be noted that many of the references cited here are from Jewish writers. This in itself is an acknowledgement that there are Jews who are prepared to approach the current subject with intellectual integrity and genuine good will. They will understand that any negative expressions about Jews in this work relate solely to the historical period that is being discussed.

1. The Jews are a Race

Winston Churchill was a worried man in 1920. As secretary of state for war, he knew more about the savagery into which Russia had collapsed than most people in the West. In the *Illustrated Sunday Herald* of

8 February 1920 he told the nation what he knew. The gruesome nightmare unfolding in Russia was not isolated to that country. It was a

... world-wide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilization and for the reconstitution of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence, and impossible equality ...

Furthermore, it was caused mainly by Jews:

There is no need to exaggerate the part played in the creation of Bolshevism and in the actual bringing about of the Russian Revolution by these international and for the most part atheistical Jews. It is certainly a very great one; it probably outweighs all others. With the notable exception of Lenin, the majority of the leading figures are Jews. Moreover, the principal inspiration and driving power comes from the Jewish leaders. Thus Tchitcherin, a pure Russian, is eclipsed by his nominal subordinate Litvinoff, and the influence of Russians like Bukharin or Lunacharski cannot be compared with the power of Trotsky, or of Zinovieff, the Dictator of the Red Citadel (Petrograd), or of Krassin or Radek – all Jews. In the Soviet institutions the predominance of Jews is even more astonishing. And the prominent, if not indeed the principal, part in the system of terrorism applied by the Extraordinary Commissions for Combating Counter-Revolution has been taken by Jews, and in some notable cases by Jewesses. The same evil prominence was obtained by Jews in the brief period of terror during which Bela Kun ruled in Hungary. The same phenomenon has been presented in Germany (especially in Bavaria), so far as this madness has been allowed to prey upon the temporary prostration of the German people.

When Churchill wrote of “Jews”, “Jewesses” and even “atheistical Jews”, he had no doubt as to the meaning of his words. He was referring to a particular group of people who were easily distinguishable from Russians, or Hungarians, or Germans. In this sense he used the word “race” several times in his article, starting with his opening sentence. Furthermore, Churchill’s readers would have understood what he meant in describing the Jews as a “race” of people. His use of this word was perfectly normal and acceptable at that time.

Yet a mere 32 years later, a UNESCO document flatly declared that: “Muslims and Jews are no more races than are Roman Catholics and Protestants”.⁽¹⁾

Since this declaration clearly contradicted the traditional use of the word “race”, at least in its application to Jews, it can only be assumed that its purpose was polemical. Fortunately for the English language, legal terminology is rather more precise than political propaganda. Any confusion caused by the UNESCO statement should have vanished with the *International Covenant on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination*, a covenant that has subsequently been ratified by most industrialized countries. This document listed the scientific meaning of the word “race” as only one of several terms used to clarify what it meant by the phrase “**racial** discrimination”. In addition to preferences based on race as such, it banned preferences based on “colour”, “descent”, and “national or ethnic origin”.⁽²⁾

The extended legal definition of race embodied in the *International Covenant on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination* has been clarified by courts in the United Kingdom and in New Zealand, two countries where the concepts underlying the international covenant have been enacted in national law.

In a 1972 case in England the House of Lords upheld the phrase “colour, race or ethnic or national origins” as an extended definition of “race”.⁽³⁾

In 1979 the New Zealand Court of Appeal rejected the suggestion of a biological test of race to determine whether people had been **racially** discriminated against. The court decreed instead that

The real test is whether the individuals or the group regard themselves and are regarded by others in the community as having a particular identity in terms of their color or their racial, national or ethnic origins.⁽⁴⁾

The New Zealand case is particularly revealing, in that it was specifically considering the question of whether Jews form a separate racial group within the terms of the *Race Relations Act 1971* (N.Z.). The court ruled that

... a group is identifiable in terms of its ethnic origins if it is a segment of the population distinguished from others by a sufficient combination of shared customs, beliefs, traditions and characteristics derived from a common or presumed common past, even if not drawn from what in biological terms is a common racial stock. It is that combination which gives them an historically determined social identity in their own eyes and in the eyes of those outside the group. They have a distinct social identity based not simply on group cohesion and solidarity but also on their belief as to their historical antecedents.

Interestingly, this New Zealand decision was discussed with approval in a 1983 English case ⁽⁵⁾ in which the House of Lords found that Sikhs were an “ethnic” group and as such protected by the “**Race Relations Act 1976**” (U.K.). Lord Fraser argued that the word “ethnic” included characteristics associated with common biological origin. He also held that an “ethnic group” was protected by the **Race Relations Act** if it met at least the following conditions:

(1) a long shared history, of which the group is conscious as distinguishing it from other groups, and the memory of which keeps it alive; (2) a cultural tradition of its own, including family and social customs and manners, often but not necessarily associated with religious observance.”

The following further conditions were also held to be relevant:

(3) either a common geographical origin, or descent from a small number of common ancestors; (4) a common language, not necessarily peculiar to the group; (5) a common literature peculiar to the group; (6) a common religion different from that of neighbouring groups or from the general community surrounding it; (7) being a minority or being an oppressed or a dominant group within a larger community ...

The House of Lords ruled that the Sikhs were protected in terms of the **Race Relations Act**, even though they were biologically indistinguishable from other peoples in northern India, and even though they were no longer a purely religious community.

Nearly all people who are called “Jews” in popular discourse today match the criteria used by the House of Lords to establish that the Sikhs are a separate group. The New Zealand case and the two British cases confirm that the concept of a Jewish race is meaningful in modern legal terms.

Given that the New Zealand court decision quoted above referred **specifically** to Jews, it is not inappropriate to re-word it slightly in order to create an operable definition of the phrase “the Jewish race”:

Jews are identifiable in terms of their ethnic origins when they form a segment of the population distinguished from others by a sufficient combination of shared customs, beliefs, traditions and characteristics derived from a common or presumed common past, even if not drawn from what in biological terms is a common racial stock. It is that combination which gives them an historically determined social identity in their own eyes and in the eyes of those outside Jewry. They have a distinct social identity based not simply on group cohesion and solidarity but also on their belief as to their historical antecedents.

Clearly a Japanese scholar who happens to convert to Judaism for spiritual reasons is not a Jew according to this definition. An Irishman who may have inherited a Jewish surname many generations ago, but who is otherwise Irish in customs, beliefs, traditions and characteristics, is likewise not a Jew. Similarly, a person whose ancestors matched all the criteria for Jewishness listed above, but who happens to have abandoned the Judaic faith, obviously remains a Jew. So do that person’s descendants, until their group characteristics and their group loyalty have been thoroughly expunged through generations of intermarriage and assimilation.

In other words, recent international covenants and court decisions have restored to the term “Jew” much of the meaning it has always had – a member of an identifiable race of people.

2. What race *are* the Jews?

People known as Jews made their first appearance in the second millennium BCE, when various wandering nomads coalesced into an identifiable nation.

Judah was a district in southern Palestine, near Jerusalem. The Greek form of Judah is Judea, from which comes the term for the traditional Jewish religion, Judaism. The inhabitants of Judah were known in Hebrew as "Jehudi". According to the Old Testament, these Jehudis, or Jews, were descended from a common ancestor known as Judah, from whom both the region and the people obtained their name. This supposed founder appears early in the Bible, in Genesis 29:35.

The Middle East has always been home to many different peoples of varying origins. Divergent languages, races and ethnic groups swirl through the history of the Biblical period in a blur of trade, pillage, conquest and empire building. It is often hard to correlate the various tribal names with specific physical types. Few human remains have come down to us, not least because early archaeologists threw away precious skeletal evidence.⁽⁶⁾

Despite this general confusion and lack of evidence, several groups of ancient middle easterners can be discussed with some confidence.

Egyptian records tell of a people called the Shasu, desert dwellers who formed marauding bands when robbery was easy, or offered themselves as mercenaries when that seemed an easier course. Egyptian paintings show that they looked like modern Bedouins.⁽⁷⁾

The Old Testament frequently mentions a people in Palestine called the Amorites. Egyptian paintings depict the Amorites as a fair race of distinctly European appearance, sometimes even with pale pink skin and blue eyes.^(7, pp. 106-9) They are thought to have spoken a Semitic language, showing that even in that distant period language and biological heritage were not identical.⁽⁸⁾ From about 2000 BCE onwards the Amorites controlled a belt of land stretching from Syria to southern Mesopotamia.

The kingdom of Assyria arose beside the Euphrates river in the 19th century BCE, under an Amorite king named Shamshi-Adad. The greater part of the Assyrian population, however, was of a completely different appearance to either of the groups mentioned so far, the Shasu and the Amorites. The Assyrians have left many portraits in the form of relief carvings, from which it is clear that they resembled modern Armenians, a fact noted as long ago as 1907.⁽⁹⁾

The role of Assyria was taken over by Babylon in the 18th century BCE. Although this was another state originally founded by Amorites, once again the majority of the population was of Armenian appearance.

Babylon was sacked in 1595 BCE by the Hittites. These newcomers seem to have entered the northern part of the Middle East in about 2100 BCE. Their language was deciphered in 1916-17. It was of the Indo-European family, and therefore related to modern English, Russian, Persian and the like. Yet the Indo-European founders of the Hittites must have been vastly outnumbered at an early stage by subjects of a different race, because later Hittite portraits, once again, resemble modern Armenians.⁽¹⁰⁾

To sum up, three modern racial types are evident in the early middle east. Nomadic raiders represented by the Shasu resembled Bedouins. People of western European appearance made up the early Amorites, and probably the original Hittites. Finally, the Assyrians, Babylonians and later Hittites were mostly of Armenian appearance.

Then there were the Jews.

The majority of people called Jews today, at least 90% of the total, are of the branch of Jewry known as Ashkenazim. Most of these people have physical and facial features marking them off from other European types. It is these features that are referred to when it is said that someone "looks Jewish".

J. Fayrer first pointed out that Ashkenazi Jews resemble Armenians, in a discussion paper presented to the Royal Anthropological Society in 1885. This resemblance has been extensively chronicled by Dr John R. Baker, to whom the reader should refer for precise physical details.⁽¹¹⁾

It has been said that the Jews of the early parts of the Old Testament may have looked like modern Bedouins. ⁽¹²⁾ If so, they were presumably related to the plundering Shasu desert people. Certainly they seem to have enjoyed a similar lifestyle, as wandering tent-dwellers gladly seizing any opportunity for personal enrichment that arose.

It is hardly likely, though, that the early Biblical Hebrews were “racially pure” in any biological sense. According to Sigmund Freud, Moses may have been an Egyptian. ⁽¹³⁾ David is said to have been fair in appearance (1 Samuel 16:12 and 17:42). Since he married a Hittite woman, Bathsheba, his own fairness is unlikely to have passed on to his offspring – unless some of these were born to Amorite concubines. Solomon, his legitimate son, is said to have added to the genetic melting pot of this family by collecting a vast multi-racial harem, allegedly containing Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians and Hittites (1 Kings 11:1).

Throughout the Old Testament the Hebrews are depicted interbreeding with non-Hebrew women, so much so that their prophets frequently condemn their own people’s love of mixed marriages. Given that the majority of the available women in the region were of Armenian appearance, the Hebrews must eventually have come to look decidedly Armenian themselves – if they hadn’t in the first place. This is exactly what the monumental evidence indicates:

Among the treasures which the British Museum received from the excavation of the ruins of Nineveh is an obelisk of black marble whereon the Assyrian king Shalmaneser II has described the campaigns and conquests of his reign. Around the upper part of the obelisk run five lines of miniature bas-reliefs representing the tribute-bearers who in the year 842 B.C.E. brought gifts of distant countries to the Assyrian monarch. Among them are the servants of Jehu, king of Samaria. Each is portrayed with features which mark the type which is still regarded in the popular mind as characterizing the “typical” Jew of today. No modern draughtsman could have designed them more characteristically. ^(7, pp. 96-7)

In summary, the typically Armenian appearance of most modern Jews was already fixed among the Hebrews of the 9th century BCE, if not earlier. No doubt they acquired genes from other peoples on their later wanderings, but these have had little effect on the appearance of modern Jews, which has remained remarkably stable for nearly three millennia.

(It is, in passing, necessary to mention the theory that modern Jews originated in the 8th century CE, when the Khazar kingdom between the Caspian and Black Seas was allegedly converted to Judaism. ⁽¹⁴⁾ This theory can be criticized on five grounds. First, it is unnecessary. We have already seen that Old Testament Hebrews were surrounded by people of Jewish appearance, that they interbred with these people, and that by at least the reign of Shalmaneser II they looked like these people. Second, modern blood group analysis shows that Khazars contributed little or nothing to the modern Jewish gene-pool. ⁽¹⁵⁾ Third, the Khazars are said to have looked “perfectly un-Jewish” in appearance. ⁽¹⁶⁾ Fourth, the Ashkenazi Jews speak a hebraized form of German, rather than the Turkic-based dialect that would be expected if there were much truth in the Khazar story. Fifth, many scholars have pointed out that the Khazar claim is advanced by Jews with the intention of serving Jewish nationalism by claiming that Jews have existed in Poland and Russia for as long as Poles and Russians. ⁽¹⁷⁾ In reality, it seems that the Khazar kingdom was destroyed by Norse Russians, and what was left of its population converted to Islam in the 11th century.)

3. The doctrine of “Semitism”

The Bible has proven to be a poor guide for archaeologists who seek to confirm its statements by means of spade and trowel. Nowhere has it been more disappointing than for those who sought to discover the glittering opulence of the reign of Solomon, who is variously said to have constructed fortresses, developed a chariot force and a navy, and altogether to have brought about the golden age of Israel. According to the Biblical account, Solomon imposed tributes on “all the kings of Arabia”. His expeditions to far-off and fabulous lands brought back “gold and silver, ivory, and apes and peacocks” (1 Kings 10:22). He built a magnificent temple, and beside it glittering new palaces for himself and his Egyptian queen.

Significantly, he is said to have re-built the cities of Hazor, Megiddo and Gezer (1 Kings 9: 15-19). These three “cities” have been excavated. The results are disappointing. This is how James Pritchard, a biblical archaeologist, sums up the result:

These 'cities', even by ancient Near Eastern standards ... were far from what one might call urban centers; they were more like villages. Within the walls of roughly cut stones there were floors of beaten earth or plaster. Artifacts of bone, stone, clay, an occasional metal tool or weapon, suggest a cultural level which was apparently lacking in both artistic sophistication and wealth. As yet no evidence has been found for the use of chariotry or for the metal trappings for the harnesses of horses. As for gold and other precious metals, its occurrence is limited to an occasional earring or other article of personal adornment. From the tenth-century level ... at Megiddo not a single gold item is recorded by the excavators."⁽¹⁸⁾

It appears that Solomon's magnificent cities were little more than impoverished shanty towns. Yet while the Bible has been a relatively barren source for physical archaeologists, it is indispensable for anyone seeking to establish how certain modes of thought and patterns of behavior seem to have survived from ancient times to the present day.

One of the richest sources for this form of psychohistory is the account of the Jews' stay in Egypt, as given in the Biblical books of Genesis and Exodus. The major events of this story form a template on to which many more recent historical events can be over-written: only the names and dates really need to be changed. Since the main themes of this tale are to recur frequently throughout subsequent history, it is worthwhile trying to separate the various strands.

- The original persecution story began when some Jews arrived at the Egyptian border, claiming to be refugees from a drought in Canaan. (Genesis 47:4).
- They had previously agreed to tell lies in order to gain acceptance. (Genesis 46:34).
- This they achieved. (Genesis 47:3).
- The Pharaoh welcomed these mendacious "refugees", and offered them the best Egyptian land. (Genesis 47:6).
- The Jews took advantage of Pharaoh's generosity, and stayed on in Egypt for some time. After a while the Jews "increased abundantly, and multiplied, and waxed exceeding mighty, and the land was filled with them". (Exodus 1:7)
- The hospitality of the Egyptians was well and truly abused. The Jews became "more and mightier" than the Egyptians. (Exodus 1:9)
- A new Pharaoh decided to redress the suffering of his own people at Jewish hands by imposing harsh measures to encourage the Jews to emigrate. He also feared that the Jews might form a "fifth column" should Egypt be attacked. (Exodus 1:10)
- The more the Egyptians persecuted the Jews, "the more they [the Jews] multiplied and grew. And they [the Egyptians] were grieved because of the children of Israel." (Exodus 1:12)
- Pharaoh tightened the screw of persecution, in order to encourage an exodus of the Jews, but they refused to leave except on terms designed to humiliate the Egyptians. (Exodus 3:16 to 5:2)
- Pharaoh indignantly refused an arrogant Jewish ultimatum. (Exodus 5:2)
- The God of the Jews then unleashed terrible pestilences against Egypt. (Exodus 9-11)
- After some magical treatment of lambs by the Jews and their God, all the first-born children of Egypt died. (Exodus 11-12)
- Pharaoh commanded the Jews to leave, and to take with them all their (contaminated?) lambs and cows. (Exodus 12:32)
- The Jews left, but not before stealing from the Egyptians much booty in the form of "jewels of silver and jewels of gold, and raiment". (Exodus 12:35)
- The Jewish God instructed his adherents to celebrate the infanticide of the Egyptians in perpetuity. (Exodus 12: 42-51) This they did. (To the present day, modern Jews continue to celebrate the Feast of Passover, effectively reveling in the deaths of the Egyptian children.)
- For some reason, presumably to do with the looting of Egyptian property, Pharaoh changed his mind. He pursued the expelled Jews with cavalry and chariots. (Exodus 14: 5 to 10)
- The Jews were justifiably terrified (Exodus 14: 10 to 12), but their God miraculously drowned the Egyptian armies, thus saving his worshippers. (Exodus 14: 16 to 31)

This re-telling is necessary because, as stated above, the well-known story forms a classical pattern for future accounts of Jewish persecution. Most of the itemized events in it recur, sometimes over and over again, in later versions. Furthermore, since its memory is still celebrated every year by Jews all over the world, it is clear that Jews themselves regard it as being central to their own concept of what it means to be a Jew.

Were the lessons of this period spent in Egypt lost on the Jews? In a Darwinian sense, only time will tell. Meanwhile, it can be said that the Jews elaborated their Egyptian experience into a doctrine that can be called "Semitism". The logic of Semitism runs like this:

- (1) The collective furtherance of the Jewish people is the highest good. All other peoples are legitimate prey. Anything, including lying, that aids this purpose is acceptable. The Jewish people will not contribute to the well-being or evolution of the people on whom they prey, and will not hesitate to rob them.
- (2) Sooner or later, all host populations will object to this Jewish group-survival strategy. Since they are now opposed to the Jewish dogma of Semitism, they are "anti-Semitic".
- (3) Since the collective furtherance of the Jewish people (i.e. Semitism) is the highest good, people who object to this stratagem, and who are therefore "anti-Semitic", deserve to suffer the fate of Pharaoh's armies.

The immediate consequences of the ideology of Semitism will be examined next. The first major consequence of its *practice*, as we have seen, was the celebrated death of the eldest child in every family in Egypt, as well as all of the horses, horsemen and charioteers of Pharaoh.

4. Early Semitism

Long before the Jewish stay in Egypt, a Jewish leader called Abram (later re-named Abraham) claimed that his god had promised to give to the Jews

"... this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates: the Kenites, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Rephaims, and the Amorites, and the Gergashites, and the Jebusites." (Genesis 15:16)

This promise was extended at a slightly later date, when the same god said:

"And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." (Genesis 17:8)

These pledges were remembered during the time of the Jewish escapade in Egypt. Moses used them to stiffen the resolution of the elders of Israel, to whom, he reminded them, had been promised:

"... the land of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, unto a land flowing with milk and honey." (Exodus 3:17)

Some years after their escape from the pursuing Egyptian army the Jews began to invade the culturally advanced land of Canaan. The date was perhaps about 1250 to 1200 BCE. At this time new material elements were entering Canaanite culture, possibly indicating changes that may have destabilized the various peoples of Canaan – but this cultural enrichment was coming from the north.⁽¹⁹⁾ All that the Jews invading from the south brought with them was destruction.

The invasion was a slow and patchy affair. According to the account of the victors as given in the Old Testament, it involved treachery, betrayal, deceit, and genocide. The numbers of Canaanites said to have been murdered in all the different skirmishes, battles and sackings is obviously exaggerated, but must have been very high. It is impossible, at this stage, to estimate the extent of Biblical exaggeration.

Many more deaths may have been caused by plagues, such as the 150,000 Assyrians who died overnight according to Isaiah 41:14-16. It is even possible that disease was used as a weapon, just as the Black Death of 1348 may have begun when besieging Tartars threw corpses over the walls of a Black Sea town.⁽²⁰⁾ The story of the Ark of the Covenant suggests that its comings and goings may have been associated with the transmission of a plague-like disease. (See 1 Samuel 1:4-5)

At some stage during the course of this long and genocidal campaign, the Jewish dogma of Semitism hardened even further.

The conquered inhabitants of Canaan were first carefully distinguished from Jews in Jewish law. While impoverished Jews could be bought as hired servants, they had to be freed after a specified period of time. (Leviticus 25:40-41). No such provision applied to the people who had made Canaan the original "land of milk and honey". These people were to be enslaved "for ever":

"Both thy bondmen, and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover of the children of the stranger that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen for ever; but over your brethren the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigour." (Leviticus 25: 44-46)

While Jews were forbidden to lend at interest to their fellow Jews, this did not apply to non-Jews:

"Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother; usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of anything that is lent upon usury: Unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury ..." (Deuteronomy 24:19-20)

A list of this nature could be expanded to great length. Far more important than the double standards, however, is the increasing monomania of the cult of Semitism. Joshua was determined to enslave those Canaanites whom he didn't murder. "Let them live," he said of some who had surrendered, "but let them be hewers of wood and drawers of water." (Joshua 9:21)

By the time of the Old Testament book of Isaiah, some of which dates to the eighth century BCE, the Jewish god is promising that all non-Jews will be crawling to "lick up the dust of [the] feet" of the Jews. The bizarre language used at this stage in the history of Semitism suggests a need for therapy:

"Thus saith the LORD God, Behold, I will lift up my hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people: and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers: they shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet; and thou shalt know that I am the LORD: for they shall not be ashamed that wait for me ... And I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh; and they shall be drunken with their own blood, as with sweet wine: and all flesh shall know that I the LORD am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the mighty One of Jacob." (Isaiah 49: 22-26)

"Thou shalt also suck the milk of the Gentiles, and shalt suck the breast of kings: and thou shalt know that I the Lord am thy Saviour ..." (Isaiah 60:16)

And strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and the sons of the alien shall be your plowmen and your vine-dressers. But ye shall be named the Priests of the LORD: men shall call you the Ministers of our God; ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles ..." (Isaiah 61:6)

A modern Jewish anthropologist named Raphael Patai has brought together a swag of non-Biblical Jewish literature which confirms that Isaiah's vision was no unique fantasy.⁽²¹⁾ One of Patai's Jewish documents confirms the foot-licking aspects of Isaiah's vision, and adds more:

"... all of the nations of the world will be in darkness and blackness, ... and they will come and lick the dust under the feet of King Messiah ... And all will come and fall upon their faces before the Messiah and before Israel, and will say to him: "Let us be servants to you and to Israel!" And each one of Israel will have 2,800 servants ..."

The invasion of Canaan must have caused great bitterness. Add to this the extreme triumphalism that had entered the doctrine of Semitism – with prophecies of people from “all the nations of the world” queuing to be granted the privilege of being among the 2,800 slaves to which each Jew aspired. It was inevitable that a reaction would set in.

Sooner or later, the doctrine of Semitism had to create its nemesis: anti-Semitism.

In about 721 BCE, the northern part of the Jewish kingdom was wiped out by the Assyrians. The Jews were deported and their places filled by Mesopotamian immigrants. Twice, in about 597 and 587 BCE, the Babylonians did much the same thing, on the second occasion razing the main buildings of Jerusalem.

These setbacks mattered greatly to the Jews, who wrote agonizing accounts of their miseries, but the rest of the world was relatively unconcerned. In the 5th century BCE the Greek historian Herodotus wrote an ethnographic account of his travels in the Middle East. He made no mention of the Jews. Presumably he thought they were not worth even a footnote in history. Few historians, however, have a good record in predicting future historical trends. Herodotus was no exception. Within a few centuries, the Romans were to decide that the future of civilization depended on destroying the Jewish dogma of Semitism.

5. “IVDEA CAPTA”

To the modern mind, the remarkable tolerance of pagan Rome is highlighted by the few dramatic occasions on which its general policy of benevolent forbearance was relaxed. Despite these exceptions, it is important to remember that the rule of pagan and republican Rome was enlightened to a degree that would have been unthinkable in any of the ancient eastern empires. Furthermore, Rome at this time was not aggressive. Her religious law (the *ius fetiale*) condemned wars aimed at acquiring territory.

The case of Carthage exemplifies Roman forbearance. In 264 BCE Carthage invaded Sicily. The resultant conflict was long and furious, and the Carthaginians were not driven out until 241 BCE. Hannibal then attacked mainland Italy in 218 BCE. This war lasted for fifteen years, only ending when Scipio landed in northern Africa and defeated the Carthaginians on their own territory. For a second time Rome allowed the Carthaginians to live in peace, which they did for another half century. When war broke out yet again, Rome’s patience was at an end. A three-year siege ensued, until, in 146 BCE, Carthage was crushed and razed to the ground.

In the same year, 146 BCE, Rome sacked the Greek city of Corinth. This again followed a long patience on Rome’s part. Her first major dealings with Greece occurred when the Greek king Pyrrhus invaded Italy, to be driven out in 275 BCE. A few generations later Greece was in turmoil, and Rome answered appeals for help from several cities that were under attack from Syria and Macedon. After a successful war that lasted from 200 to 196 BCE Rome withdrew her armies and declared that her policy was one of “freedom for the Greeks”. As soon as Rome’s back was turned, however, Syria attacked Greece again. Once more Rome expelled the invaders and returned to her own affairs. The Macedonians again involved Rome in a war on Grecian soil from 171 to 167 BCE. When yet another Macedonian war loomed, Rome lost patience. Macedonia was annexed and Corinth sacked to demonstrate that Roman clemency was not endless.

Roman religious tolerance was equally remarkable. From an early age, some eastern cults were suppressed because their activities constituted a threat to public order.⁽²²⁾ A western cult, Druidism, was proscribed because it provided a focus for nationalistic resistance in Gaul and Britain. For the rest of the time, Rome was so tolerant of other religions and cults that the poet Virgil felt it necessary to rail against their presence in Rome, where, he said, “Monstrous gods of every shape, and Anubis, the yelping dog, bear arms against Neptune and Venus and against Minerva”.

Rome’s enduring benevolence was to be sorely tested by the Jews.

Jews were expelled from Rome as early as 139 BCE. ⁽²³⁾ They obviously returned illegally, because by the time of Julius Caesar "private banking ... assumed enormous proportions as the Italian merchants vying with the Jews spread over all the provinces and protectorates of the empire" ⁽²⁴⁾ Caesar protected both the Jews and their synagogues. He needed money to finance his campaigns, and it is likely that he may have received financial help from Jewish bankers. Cassius certainly did, when in 43 BCE he obtained money from Jews in Syria to pay his troops.

In 37 BCE Marc Antony installed Herod as king of Judea. When Herod died in 4 BCE the kingdom was split among his sons, the one who ruled Judea proper being so incompetent that both Jews and Samaritans begged Rome to abolish the kingdom and rule it directly. Judea thus became a Roman province in 6 CE.

Augustus confirmed all the Jewish privileges that had been granted by Julius Caesar, and added some more. Jews could worship however they wished, their money didn't have to bear the emperor's image, they were exempt from military service, and so on.

Nevertheless, in 19 CE the emperor Tiberius once again found it necessary to expel the Jews from Rome. He even threatened them with slavery if they defied the law, according to Seutonius.

Many Jews clustered in Alexandria, where their relations with the majority Greek population were strained, partly because Jews were allowed privileges that were not enjoyed by Greeks. The Greek response to Semitism initially took the form of anti-Semitic literature known as the "Acts of the Pagan Martyrs" ⁽²⁵⁾ Soon this was followed by anti-Jewish pogroms. One, in 38 CE, flared up when Herod Agrippa called briefly at Alexandria after having fled the city three years earlier to avoid paying his debts.

Alexandrian Greeks and Jews sent deputations to the emperor Gaius. The leader of the Jewish legation, Philo, was particularly rude and pushy. ⁽²⁶⁾ He also arrived at a bad time. The Greek community in Palestine had recently erected a statue of the emperor Gaius, which the Jews had destroyed. Gaius was toying with the idea of retaliating by erecting a statue of himself in the temple at Jerusalem. Following the visit by Philo, Gaius ordered the statue to be constructed. This project lapsed when the emperor was assassinated in 41 CE.

Gaius' successor, Claudius, restored the Jews' freedom of worship, but the Jewish problem refused to go away. New riots immediately broke out between the Greeks and Jews in Alexandria. Claudius accused the Jews of "fomenting a universal plague" ^(22 p 305) Furthermore, Jews had flooded back into Rome despite Tiberius' decree of expulsion. After a riot in Rome itself, Claudius again expelled the Jews in 49 CE.

Throughout all of this, the Jewish religion had never been persecuted outside of Rome itself, and the Romans had done everything possible to stop the various peoples, groups, classes and cults of Judaea from tearing each other apart. In 66 CE this was no longer possible. A massive revolt erupted. The Roman garrison in Jerusalem was massacred. Once again Rome's patience had been stretched to its limit. Once again it snapped.

30,000 troops were brought in from Syria. Vespasian, a tough soldier, put down the revolt region by region. His son Titus besieged Jerusalem, which fell in 70 CE. Jerusalem was sacked. The temple was torn down. The Jewish priesthood was abolished. Coins were struck bearing the motto "Ivdea Capta" – "Judea Captured". The arch of Titus, erected in Rome a few years later, depicted Roman troops bearing back in triumph the spoils of Jerusalem. The pragmatic and civilized Romans must have thought that they had eliminated Semitism as thoroughly as they had destroyed Carthage.

It was not to be. Jews appear and reappear throughout the decline of Rome. The Jews, of course, rejoiced at the early death of Titus. Romans weren't entirely pleased with Titus, either. Numatinus mourned Titus' victory, saying, "If only Titus had not destroyed Jerusalem we should have been spared from this Jewish pest, and the conquerors would not have groaned under the yoke of the vanquished". Domitian had difficulty collecting taxes from the Jews. Trajan was said to be surrounded by "unholy Jews". During his reign there was another major Jewish rebellion in Cyrenaica, Egypt, Judea and Mesopotamia from 115 to 117. Another revolt in Judea led to the re-capture of Jerusalem in 134.

Racial riots involving the Jews escalated in horror. In the second century, according to Gibbon, Jews were exterminating Greeks all over the Empire. "In Cyrene they massacred 220,000 Greeks; in Cyprus 240,000; in Egypt a very great multitude." Many distinguished Roman writers, including Seutonius, Diodorus, Tacitus, Don Cassius and Pliny condemned Jewish behavior. Tacitus, for instance, described Jewish customs as "base and abominable, owing their persistence to the depravity of the Jews." ⁽²⁷⁾ The general attitude of Romans towards Jews is summarized by Gibbon: "The sullen obstinacy with which they maintained their peculiar rites and unsocial manners seemed to mark them out a distinct species of men, who boldly professed, or who faintly disguised, their implacable hatred to the rest of human kind." ⁽²⁸⁾

The conversion of pagan Rome to Christianity affected this perception in subtle ways. On the one hand, Jews became "the people of the Book", which gave them at least half a passport into the civilized world, and was one factor that caused the early Popes to protect them. On the other hand they were now the killers of Christ. "His blood be upon us, and on our children," they had supposedly said. (Matthew 27: 24 to 25) Furthermore, they stubbornly refused to accept the Christian Messiah. In the past their doctrine of Semitism had often caused the neighbors of the Jews to reject them, but their religion as such had seldom been persecuted. From now on they would also be persecuted on religious grounds.

6. Expulsions

Jews perhaps weathered the decline and fall of Rome better than most other people. They tended to organize into self-governing communities under the direction of a spiritual leader (later called a rabbi) and these communities were often granted special rights and privileges by their secular rulers.

The fall of Rome notoriously led to a so-called Dark Age in much of Europe, during which the banking skills that had advanced Jewish interests in the time of Julius Caesar and Cassius were no longer as relevant. The focus of Semitism then reverted to the Babylonian centers of the Jewish diaspora in Mesopotamia, which were recognized as the spiritual focus of the Jewish world until the tenth century.

Still, the Jews were probably never entirely absent from European countries. We know that they were in Arles, in France, in the fifth century CE: the emperor Valentinian forbade them to have Christian slaves. They are also known in Germany from 368 and in England from 740. ⁽²⁹⁾

Relations between Jews and natives in these and other countries must have fluctuated wildly. Jewish money was presumably helpful to many ambitious kings and politicians, but Jewish means of obtaining money probably didn't endear them to the same extent to the general population.

Sooner or later, wherever Jews settled, the result was the same. Just as the Jews had originally been expelled from Rome in 139 BCE, so they were also expelled from European states, cities, and city-states, over and over again, from the 11th to the 19th centuries. The following list of expulsions is only partial, but it is included because it emanates from a Jewish source ⁽³⁰⁾:

1012	Mainz
1182	France
1276	Upper Bavaria
1290	England
1306	France
1322	France
1349	Saxony
1360	Hungary
1370	Belgium
1380	Slovakia
1394	France
1420	Austria
1420	Lyons

1424	Cologne
1438	Mainz
1439	Augsburg
1442	Upper Bavaria
1444	Netherlands
1446	Brandenburg
1462	Mainz
1483	Mainz
1483	Warsaw
1492	Spain
1492	Italy
1495	Lithuania
1496	Portugal
1496	Naples
1498	Navarre
1498	Nuremberg
1510	Brandenburg
1510	Prussia
1515	Genoa
1533	Naples
1540	Italy
1541	Naples
1541	Prague
1550	Genoa
1551	Bavaria
1557	Prague
1569	Papal States
1582	Hungary
1649	Hamburg
1669	Vienna
1744	Slovakia
1744	Bohemia/Moravia
1891	Moscow

Just as the Jews had kept returning to Rome, necessitating new expulsion decrees, so they now kept ignoring the wishes of other Europeans to be left alone. The Jews just kept coming back. Thus France, for example, had to ban them at least three separate times in 140 years.

Dr Howard F Stein has commented that “the Jewish experience of time itself” is different from that of non-Jews. From the Jewish perspective, according to Stein, “One is either anxiously awaiting persecution, experiencing persecution, recovering from it, or living in a period that is a temporary relief from it”.⁽³¹⁾ It certainly may have seemed that way at times in the Middle Ages. What Stein has omitted from his list, however, is that the Jews were also constantly **provoking** persecution.

We get something of the flavor of those times from medieval chronicles. For lack of space, one example will have to stand as representative.

Jews were probably banished from England by Canute in 1020.⁽³²⁾ Then, after the Norman Conquest of England, Jews were invited across the Channel by the new rulers.

Here is how one historian⁽³³⁾ described their oppression of the conquered Anglo-Saxons:

In the wake of [William I] the Conqueror the Jews of Rouen found their way to London, and before long we find settlements in the chief cities and boroughs of England: at York, Winchester, Lincoln, Bristol, Oxford, and even at the gate of the Abbot of St Edmonds and St. Albans. They came as the king’s special men, or more

truly as his special chattels, strangers alike to the Church and the commonwealth, but strong in the protection of a master who commonly found it his interest to protect them against all others. Hated, feared, and loathed, but far too deeply feared to be scorned or oppressed, they stalked defiantly among the people of the land, on whose wants they thrived, safe from harm or insult, save now and then, when popular wrath burst all bounds, when their proud mansions and fortified quarters could shelter them no longer from raging crowds who were eager to wash out their debts in the blood of their creditors. The romantic picture of the despised, trembling Jew, cringing before every Christian that he meets, is, in any age of English history, simply a romantic picture.

By the mid-12th century there were communities of Jewish money-lenders in every important English town. King John, crowned in 1199, is said to have despised the Jews, but their wealth was useful to him so he protected them while also taxing them so heavily that many gave up and left England.

King Richard I was crowned at Westminster on 3 September 1189. Richard had specifically decreed that Jews were not welcome at his coronation. They came anyway, as might perhaps be expected given their history of provocation.

The coronation proceeded with dignity, after which the new king sat down for the customary banquet, surrounded by his archbishops, bishops and abbots, and earls, barons and knights. They were feasting "magnificently" when the Jews gate-crashed. In the words of the Chronicle: "And since the previous day the king had forbidden by public notice that any Jew or Jewess could come to his coronation, the courtiers laid hands on the Jews and stripped them and flogged them and having inflicted blows, threw them out of the king's court. Some they killed, others they let go half dead." (34)

The Jews had long enjoyed royal protection in England. Yet when the people of London learned of this Jewish outrage and its repercussion they "turned on the Jews of the city and robbed them and killed many of both sexes; they set light to their houses and razed them to ashes and embers".

Pogroms continued throughout the following winter and spring. Preparations were underway at that time for the Third Crusade. According to the Chronicle, "many of those preparing to join the crusade to Jerusalem decided that they would rise up against the Jews before they attacked the Saracens". In February 1190 the Jews of Norwich were massacred. Stamford and York settled their old scores in March. In April another 57 Jews were killed in Bury St Edmunds. "Wherever Jews were found they were slaughtered by the crusaders ..."

In 1262, 700 more Jews were massacred in London. In 1269, they were banned from owning freehold. In 1274, Jews who lent money at interest had to wear a distinctive badge on their chests.

One of the economic activities in which Jews specialized was counterfeiting. This had been penalized in Ethelstan's reign by cutting off the counterfeiter's hand. Under Henry I they were castrated as well. Even this didn't deter them. "A century later, coining was still widespread and, after an inquiry in Edward I's time, 280 Jews were hanged in London for this offence alone." (35)

In 1290, Edward I expelled them.

Edward's action was followed by the greatest cultural efflorescence that England has ever experienced. Chaucer was born in an England that had had no experience of overt Jews – and therefore of Semitism – for fifty years. Marlowe, Spenser, Johnson and Shakespeare lived in a homogeneous nation. So too did Raleigh, Drake, and Frobisher. Likewise Wycliffe, the "Morning Star of the Reformation", and Caxton, and Wolsey.

Queen Elizabeth specifically forbade Jews and negroes from settling in England, but the ban on Jews was lifted in 1650. William of Orange, who succeeded to the throne in 1689, did so with the help of a loan of two million gulden from the Dutch Jewish Lopez Suasso family. He encouraged other Jewish financiers to move to London, including the Machado and the Pereire families. (36) Jews quickly gained influence in financial and therefore government circles. For instance, Sampson Gideon's father (real name Abudiente) arrived in England in the late 17th century. His son, also named Sampson, an immensely rich financier, "was the government's principal mainstay for the raising of loans during the Seven Years' War." (35, p. 318)

The government rewarded him by making his son a baronet. Later Nathan Rothschild arrived in 1797, backed by his family's well-known resources and "was as useful to the government of his day".

The Jews may have traded favors with the government, but they were scarcely accepted at all by the ordinary English people. In 1753 public pressure forced the repeal of an Act permitting Jews to be naturalized, and it was not until 1837 that a Jew, Moses Montefiore, was able to be knighted, or until 1858 that Jews were permitted to sit in parliament.

Nevertheless, by the early nineteenth century British Jews were immensely powerful. In 1840, for instance, some Jews in Syria were arrested on the charge of killing a Christian and baking his blood into bread. Distant Syria was part of the Ottoman Empire. Yet Moses Montefiore's Board of Deputies of British Jews lobbied frantically for the release of their Syrian kinsmen. In the end almost every government in Europe, as well as that of the United States, backed the Jews' cause. The Prime Minister of France, which had supported Syria, told his parliament that the Jews "have more power than they know".⁽³⁷⁾

7. Spain

The course of Semitism in England, as well as its antithesis, anti-Semitism, was paralleled in many parts of Europe. Spain was different. There were vastly more Jews in Spain than in any other advanced European nation. Furthermore, the history of Spain followed a different course, one which provided endless opportunities for Jewish self-promotion at the expense of the host community.

Spain and Portugal had been Roman provinces. When Rome fell, Spain was conquered and ruled by various peoples, of which a Germanic tribe, the Visigoths, became most prominent. They would have constituted a fairly thinly-spread ruling class, dominating a population of largely Mediterranean types together with a heavy sprinkling of Jews. The Visigoths became Catholics in 587, and their persecution of the Jews after that date has been described as "merciless".⁽³⁸⁾

In 675 the Muslims attacked Spain from northern Africa. They were beaten off by the Visigothic fleet. In 711 the Muslims tried their hand again, and this time won nearly all of Spain, except for the northern regions of Asturias and Navarre. The Gothic state collapsed completely. The reason was that the Goths had been undermined by unassimilable minorities within their own lands. The Jews were prominent in this fifth column. As Professor Joseph O'Callaghan tersely notes: "Certainly the Jews and others who had suffered under Visigothic rule welcomed the invaders as liberators and collaborated with them".⁽³⁹⁾ According to Jewish author Bernard Lazare, they did more than welcome the invaders: "They [the Jews] were liberated only by Tarin (sic), the Mohammadan conqueror, who destroyed the Visigothic empire with the aid of the exiled Jews joining his army and with the support of the Jews remaining in Spain."⁽⁴⁰⁾

These Jews were richly rewarded by the Muslims. They were permitted freedom of religion, and they rose to prominence in Muslim society. For instance, in the eleventh century, a Jew named Samuel b. Naghrela became vizier of Grenada. Yequiel b. Hasan achieved a parallel role in Saragossa, as did Abraham b. Muhajir in Seville.⁽⁴¹⁾

The Christian Spaniards had been defeated but not destroyed. Muslim power could not prevent the founding of Aragon, Castile and Léon. The reconquest of Spain began in the ninth century, and with the help of the Germanic Franks it proceeded in piecemeal fashion.

Meanwhile the Jews established themselves in roughly the same niches in both Christian and Muslim Spain, being involved in money-lending, tax collecting, prostitution, slavery, and similar occupations. In the expanding Christian areas they also joined the Church in large numbers, usually after undergoing the most shallow and cynical of "conversions". There they were perceived to be still working for Muslim interests by unraveling the religious fabric that held together the Christian nation. By the 12th century, Jews owned a third of all the real estate in (Christian) Barcelona.

In 1391, pogroms erupted all over Spain. As O'Callaghan says:

"Hostility toward the Jews had often been manifested in the past, chiefly because of their involvement in money-lending and tax-farming. Complaints about Jewish usury and Jewish tax collectors occur again and again in the records of the Cortes ... Though the Crown usually promised to attend to these complaints, Jews continued to figure prominently in the management of royal finances."

Spain was rapidly regaining control of its own destiny. By 1270 Granada was the last Muslim kingdom in Spain. Perhaps now fearing their own fifth columnists, the Muslims of Granada had expelled both their Christians and their Jews in 1232. In 1492 a long siege led to the fall of Granada and the unification of Spain under the Christian monarchs Ferdinand and Isabella. The Spanish people were at last free to express their reaction to Jewish Semitism:

"The tide of national enthusiasm, religious fanaticism and indignation at Jewish financial operations reached its high-water mark about three months after the fall of Granada ..."⁽⁴²⁾

Granada had fallen on the 2nd of January. On March 31 the Jews were ordered to convert to Christianity or to leave the country. Perhaps 165,000 Jews left. The rest "converted" – in many cases, only superficially. A Jewish convert who secretly practiced Judaism was known as a "Marrano" – Spanish for "pig" – while one who didn't was called a "converso". Either way, they often retained their power. "But the majority of the Spanish people, witnessing evidence of Jewish-*Converso* influence ... and simply the numbers of Jews daily discernible in the population – could, and did, view the situation with antagonism."⁽⁴³⁾

This antagonism led to further pogroms. The Inquisition helped to prevent superficial converts from undermining their professed religion. Gradually the Spanish culture found its own feet.

What followed was a flowering of Spanish culture parallel to the renaissance of English culture after the expulsion of Jews from the Sceptred Isle. Lope de Vega, Cervantes and Calderón all flourished in a country that was free from Semitism, if not quite free from all Jews.

For several glorious centuries Spain was free to pursue its own national and cultural impetus. The entire world benefited. Without significant numbers of Jews there was no Semitism, and consequently no anti-Semitism. No doubt the Iberian peoples thought their descendants would be rid of that particular problem forever.

By 1995, though, there were 250,000 acknowledged Jews in Argentina, 100,000 in Brazil, 30,000 in Uruguay, 18,000 in Venezuela, 17,000 in Chile, 15,000 in Spain, 5,000 in Peru, 900 in Paraguay, 700 in Bolivia, 400 in Cuba, 300 in Portugal, 150 in the Dominican Republic, and 120 in Honduras and El Salvador. Buenos Aires was the 9th largest Jewish city in the Diaspora.⁽⁴⁴⁾ The descendants of the subjects of Ferdinand and Isabella once again had a Jewish problem.

8. Betrayal at Rhodes: a cameo

The expulsions of Jews from much of Europe caused some to take refuge in lands that had not yet expelled them, and others to take cover behind facile conversions to Christianity. Many swarmed into Poland and Lithuania. Others went to seek their fortunes in the Ottoman Empire. There they found rich pickings.

The Ottoman rulers favored their Jewish subjects, who had attained high rank by the time Suleiman the Magnificent ascended the throne of the Ottoman Empire in 1520. Jews were particularly prominent at the Imperial Mint, and in the rag trade. In Salonika, about a thousand Jewish families ran the important wool industry. The Jews were also well-placed to act as intermediaries between Turkey and Europe:

"Jews became so prominent as diplomats that Christian ambassadors had to solicit Jewish support before being permitted to approach [Suleiman]."⁽⁴⁵⁾

Constantinople had fallen to the Muslims in 1453. When Suleiman became emperor the Ottoman Empire was one of the world's leading military powers and was seemingly intent on conquering Europe. Greece

and the Balkans had already been overrun. Suleiman was to defeat Hungary in 1526, and besiege Vienna in 1529; but the first shockwaves were felt across Europe when the island of Rhodes fell in 1522.

Rhodes was of no great military or political value. It was a small, independent state run by the Knights of St John. Most of their concern was with medical work, carried out with piety and dedication behind the strong natural defenses of their island. Yet the Knights were recruited from every nation in Christendom, and they were known far and wide for their heroism. Only forty years earlier they had fought against overwhelming odds to beat off a Turkish attack.

In 1522 Rhodes was defended by about 60,000 troops. Nothing that Suleiman tried was successful, until Jewish and Muslim traitors allowed the Ottoman forces to break in. To be fair, the Muslims were only expressing religious solidarity. Not so the Jews, who were posing as Christian converts.

There had been many precedents in which Jews had assisted foreign armies to defeat the hosts among whom they had found refuge. Famously, the Jews of Babylonia appear to have provided special intelligence to Alexander the Great, who apparently rewarded them by allowing them to settle as citizens with favored status in Alexandria.⁽⁴⁶⁾ The Knights should have known better. That they didn't is shown by this little anecdote:

The Jewish spy, Apella Renato, was caught in the act of preparing to fire a bolt from a crossbow towards the enemy lines with a message attached to it, informing them that the garrison was almost at its last gasp. He was dragged before de L'Isle Adam where, after torture, he confessed to having passed a number of other messages to them during the course of the siege. He was hanged, drawn and quartered, but not, according to one source, before confessing his sins and dying "a good Christian".⁽⁴⁷⁾

Suleiman, however, was well aware of the use he could make of the hostility Jews felt toward a Europe that had repeatedly spurned them.

The same pattern was repeated four years later in Hungary:

When Suleiman defeated the Hungarians in the Battle of Mohacs in 1526, the keys of the city were handed to him by a Jew named Joseph B. Solomon Ashkenazi.⁽⁴⁸⁾

In 1529 Vienna under Archduke Ferdinand was in turn besieged by Suleiman. One of the wettest summers that Europe had experienced deprived his army of food, and he was forced to withdraw before it could be known whether some other fifth columnist was waiting to open Vienna's gates to him.

This lucky weather gave Europe time to gain breath after the treachery seen at Rhodes and Mohacs. The Knights of St John re-grouped on the island of Malta, which Suleiman attacked in 1565. This time he was defeated with the loss of 20,000 to 30,000 men. The Turkish tide was beginning to turn. In 1571 an Ottoman armada was defeated by a combination of European powers commanded by Don John of Austria at the Battle of Lepanto. In 1683 the Turks were again before the gates of Vienna, where they were annihilated in crossfire between the city's splendid defenses and the Polish troops of Joseph Sobieski. The Turks fled, leaving 10,000 of their own dead on the field of battle, and their legend of invincibility shattered. What followed was a long decline into stagnation, torpidity, and a faltering state that depended at all levels on bribery and corruption.

In hindsight, the Ottomans may have been better advised to rely on their own native genius rather than on the value of their Jews as financiers, textile magnates, intermediaries, and traitors. Hindsight is a form of knowledge that later generations could perhaps be expected to acquire from a study of history. Yet few people seem to have learned anything of value from the betrayal of the Knights of St John in 1522, or of the Hungarians in 1526, or from the folly of Suleiman the Magnificent.

There is no space here to provide a full account of the betrayal of host populations by Jews, except to list a few specific instances.

Early in the 5th Century CE Jews attempted to betray a Byzantine city to the Persians, and were slaughtered in consequence.⁽⁴⁹⁾ They did the same in the 7th century, in the process massacring a hundred thousand Christians.⁽⁵⁰⁾ Early in the 12th century, the Jews in Byzantium “sprang rapidly to the assistance” of the Turkish invaders.⁽⁵¹⁾ Perhaps most tellingly of all, the fall of Constantinople in 1453 may not have occurred without the active betrayal of the Jews – the Ottomans entered the city through the Jewish quarter with the active assistance of the Jews.⁽⁵²⁾

9. “Jews actually govern us now”

Jews were so powerful in Germany by the 18th century that Shakespeare’s *Merchant of Venice* “could be performed in Berlin only if preceded by an apology to Jewish members of the audience”.⁽⁴⁹⁾

In the 19th century, however, Jews, both wealthy and poor, swarmed over Germany. No German had more dealings with them than Prince Otto von Bismarck. Bismarck is credited with the unification of Germany. He certainly could not have done so without the assistance of Jews.

The first thing that should be said about Bismarck is that he liked Jews. In his own words:

They also have their own special virtues. They are credited with respect for their parents, faithfulness in marriage, and benevolence.⁽⁵³⁾

Bismarck’s personal doctor was a Jew, Dr Cohen. After the latter’s death Bismarck was treated until his own demise by another Jew, Dr Ernst Schweningen, a portrait of whom Bismarck hung in his country home at Varzin. His personal lawyer was another Jew named Phillip.

Bismarck even believed that interbreeding with Jews improved the genetic stock of noble German families:

In the Reichstag he extolled the Jews on account of their “especial capacity and intelligence for affairs of State” ... He advocated marriages between the nobility and Jews; and he referred to the Lynars, the Stirums, the Jusserows, and other houses, in which Jewish alliances “have led to the birth of extremely sensible, excellent persons ... Conversely, it is better still when a Christian stallion of German stock enters into a union with a Jewish mare. Money must be freely circulated, and there is no such thing as a bad race.”⁽⁵⁴⁾

One of Bismarck’s greatest political heroes was Benjamin Disraeli, twice prime minister of Britain and favorite of Queen Victoria.⁽⁵⁵⁾ Bismarck was also no stranger to the Rothschild family, telling his wife “I like the Baron [Amschel Mayer Rothschild] ... he’s a real old Jew peddler and does not pretend to be anything else.”⁽⁵⁶⁾

Many prominent Jews also liked Bismarck, among them Gustav Mahler, Sigmund Freud and Theodore Herzl,⁽⁵⁷⁾ the founder of the Zionist movement, who wrote of the German state created by Bismarck:

To live under the protection of this strong, great, moral, splendidly governed, tightly organized Germany can only have the most salutary effect on the Jewish national character.⁽⁵⁸⁾

Prominent Jewish politicians also supported Bismarck politically, including Eduard Lasker, Eduard Simpson, Friedrich Stahl and Ludwig Bamberger. Before being elected to parliament Bismarck had declared

I am no enemy of the Jews ... and if they are hostile to me I forgive them. I love them ... under every circumstance. For my part I would grant them all rights, save only the right of holding the chief offices in a Christian State.^(58, p. 356)

Even that last caveat was not to last. As Chancellor, Bismarck appointed to his cabinet Jews like Heinrich Friedberg (Minister of Justice), Rudolph Friedenthal (Minister of Agriculture) and Paul Kayser (Director of the Colonial Office).

In short, no-one could argue that Bismarck was hostile to Jews. Neither could it be said that Bismarck was unaware of the involvement of Jewish finance in the politics of the era – the era of which he was the dominant political figure.

His own banker, Gerson Bleichröder, handled all Bismarck's personal financial affairs. The richest banker in Berlin, Bleichröder was a former Rothschild agent who could still tap into the massive spy network run by that family. Bleichröder funded the Prussian war against Austria by brokering the privatization of the Cologne-Minden railway.

He was to specialize in shady deals involving railways, one of which he used to pressure a foreign nation to be kinder to its Jews. Bismarck and Bleichröder had invested in a railway scheme run by another Jew, Bethel Henry Strousberg. When the railway was left uncompleted, the Romanian government refused to pay for it. Bleichröder brokered a deal by which state funds were used to bale out Strousberg on condition that Romanian Jews were emancipated.⁽⁵⁹⁾

Bleichröder also had a unique way of dealing with the media. At one stage Prussia's leading news agency, the Wolff Bureau, was almost bought out by foreign investors. Bleichröder advanced money to turn it into a state propaganda outlet. Bismarck, Bleichröder and another Jewish banker, Louis Mayer, also perfected a scam to bribe newspaper editors and journalists: the money was simply sequestered from the estate of King George V of Hanover.

Bismarck was therefore not a naïve political player. We have seen that he was right in the thick of shady Jewish financial dealing and trafficking. (So much so that a newspaper he had helped found, *Der Kreuzzeitung*, stated in 1885 that "Jews actually govern us now".) Therefore when Bismarck chose to comment on the influence of Jewish finance on other world events not affecting Germany or himself, his statements must be treated as the simple, unvarnished truth.

This is what Bismarck, an expert witness if ever there was one, had to say about the origins of the American Civil War:

It is not to be doubted, I know of absolute certainty, that the division of the United States into two federations of equal power had been decided upon well in advance of the Civil War by the top financial powers of Europe. These bankers were afraid that the United States, if they were to remain entirely one and were developed into one Nation only, would achieve economic and financial independence, and this latter would completely upset the capital domination of Europe throughout the world.

Of course, within the "inner circle" of finance, the voice of Rothschilds dominated. They foresaw the chance of prodigious booty if they could substitute two weak democracies, burdened with debt, imploring the aid of Jewish financiers, in place of the vigorous Republic, confident and proud, sufficient unto herself. Consequently, they put their emissaries in the field to exploit the question of slavery, to open up the abyss between the two sections of the Union ... the rupture between the North and the South became inevitable; the masters of European Finance employed all the forces at their disposal in bringing it about and to turn it to their account.⁽⁶⁰⁾

It would be hard to explain more succinctly than Bismarck the role of the Jews in causing the American Civil War. Of course, soldiers and civilians in that conflict made noble sacrifices to support one side or the other, to preserve their culture, or their economy, or for racially idealistic reasons – but it is doubtful that they would have done so had they understood the sordid powers that had schemed for this catastrophic war "well in advance".

Using the issue of slavery to advance Jewish financial interests was particularly cynical, since the Jews had been dealers in slaves from Biblical times. We have already seen that Valentinian banned Jews from having Christian slaves. So did Pope Gregory the Great, to no lasting avail:

The principal cargo [of Jewish exports] may have consisted of slaves. We know that household and agricultural slavery was still widespread after the 5th century ... The Barbarian [i.e. Germanic] peoples constituted the great source of slaves ... many merchants were engaged in the slave trade. They seem to have been principally Jews.⁽⁶¹⁾

During the Barbary pirate era the same trade continued, involving the same peoples. Europeans were

Stripped and subjected to humiliating public inspection ... Their inspection ... was a skilled business in which Jewish middlemen specialized. ⁽⁶²⁾

These were white slaves. Jews no doubt made far more money from their subsequent move into supplying black African slaves to America, a role which has been extensively chronicled in recent black American sources. ⁽⁶³⁾ Yet they used this issue to encourage a war that resulted in an estimated 618,222 deaths. ⁽⁶⁴⁾

The behavior of Jewish camp-followers and carpetbaggers during and after the Civil War was as unsavory as that of their financial elite who had sought it. The dishonesty and deceit of Jewish war profiteers disgusted the ordinary combatants. One, Captain Elijah P. Petty of the 17th Texas Volunteer Infantry Regiment, summarized this repugnance in a letter to his wife:

A lot of Jews are running the blockade and bringing out goods and some medicines for the army. I look upon it as an infamous trade contrary to the law and demoralizing in its consequences and if I were in command a little while I'd rid the country of both the trade and the Jews that carry it on. They take the oath (I suppose) to both governments so they can pass in & out and smuggle and steal. They care nothing for obligations or anything else but the almighty dollar. They have neither country, character nor honor. These are the fellows that get all the contracts and feather their nests with the profits. ⁽⁶⁵⁾

Major General Ulysses Grant was aware of this vulture-like profiteering from the carnage, and on 17 December 1862 had the following order issued:

The Jews, as a class violating every regulation of trade established by the Treasury Department and also department orders, are hereby expelled by the department within twenty-four hours from receipt of this order. Post commanders will see that all of this class of people be furnished passes and required to leave, and everyone returning after such notification will be arrested and held in confinement until such an opportunity occurs of sending them out as prisoners ... No passes will be given these people to visit headquarters for the purpose of making personal application for trade permits. ⁽⁶⁶⁾

Southerners disliked Jewish predators just as intensely. One, John Beauchamp Jones, attached to the Confederate War Department, succinctly predicted what he saw as the likely result of the war:

The illicit trade with the United States has depleted the country of gold and placed us at the feet of the Jew extorters. These Jews ... have injured the cause more than the armies of Lincoln. Well, if we gain our independence, instead of being the vassals of the Yankees, we shall find all our wealth in the hands of the Jews. ⁽⁶⁷⁾

2% of the American population died in the American holocaust of 1861 to 1865, while a handful of billionaire Jews based in Europe was enriched, together with those of their brethren who systematically looted the corpse-strewn land. The American Civil War was by no means the first massive human sacrifice to benefit the cause of Semitism, but it was the first in which the slaughter was almost mechanized. Its horror may have seemed unique at the time. It was soon to be surpassed.

10. The Janissary of the Jews

The first war between the British Empire and the Boers of South Africa took place from 1880 to 1881. Beginning with British attempts to protect the Transvaal from a threatened Zulu invasion, it escalated into war largely due to misunderstandings on both sides. It concluded with a relatively honorable peace in the 1881 Convention of Pretoria. The Transvaal was conceded self-government under the "suzerainty" of the Crown – and the term "suzerainty" was later dropped at the 1884 Convention of London.

In 1886 the discovery of massive goldfields on the Witwatersrand altered the equation completely. This led to the most disgraceful war ever waged by the world's greatest empire. The Second South African War was to be the conflict that ushered in all the horrors of subsequent 20th century barbarism.

The war of 1899 to 1902 is of crucial historical importance. It was not the first war fought primarily to further enrich wealthy Jewish financiers. It was, though, the first in which a substantial peace movement within the belligerent nation clearly recognized Semitism as the cause of hostilities.

Jewish power in Britain at the time of the Anglo-Boer War was not unique. No major European government was able to function without Jewish finance. The Rothschilds, in particular, lent money to various governments, without regard to the political aims of those governments, and made profits from both war and peace.⁽⁶⁸⁾ As a modern (Jewish) writer has pointed out:

By mid-century, the entire European state system was dependent upon the international financial network dominated by the Rothschilds.^(49, p 18)

Yet Jews in Britain had achieved enormous wealth, power and position by the late 19th century. Benjamin Disraeli, for instance, had been prime minister in 1868 and again in 1874-80. He was the son of one Isaac Disraeli, whose own father had been driven out of Spain in 1748. Queen Victoria regarded Disraeli as her intimate friend and adviser, and on his advice she assumed the title "Empress of India" in 1876, the year Disraeli was created an earl.

Victoria's oldest son was Edward, who succeeded to the throne in 1901 at the age of sixty. Disraeli may have never needed to bribe Victoria. Jewish interests took no risks, though, with regard to Edward, for so many long years the heir to the throne. Baron Maurice de Hirsch "lent" him £60,000, then wrote it off as a gift. The Rothschilds performed similar favors. Sir Ernest Cassell gave Edward £20,000 on his coronation and another £10,000 on his deathbed. Edward also had a Jewish doctor, Sir Felix Semon, and a Jewish lawyer, Sir George Lewis.⁽⁶⁹⁾ Also in his inner circle were such prominent Jews as the Sassoons, Edward Levy-Lawson (later Lord Burnham), and others. "It is indubitable, wrote Cecil Roth, "that the association of the Jews in this manner with unornamental aristocracy around the throne and their association with superabundant wealth, played a considerable part in the development of Anglo-Saxon anti-semitism,"⁽⁷⁰⁾

Jewish financiers were drawn to London, the imperial capital. These included the Rothschilds, in addition to the already-mentioned Sassoons, Cassells and Semons. They then encouraged imperial expansion to protect their capital investments overseas. Disraeli's acquisition of the Suez canal, for instance, came about through the influence of Henry Oppenheim and a £4 million loan from Lionel Rothschild.

The very highest levels of society in the heyday of Imperial Britain, from Edward down, were thus in hock to Jewish finance. In 1899 that debt was to be called in.

Among the many Jews who had flocked to the recently-discovered South African goldfields were:

- Barney Barnarto, whose gold-based fortune enabled him to expand into land speculation and diamonds. Through Barnarto's Diamond Trust he held a virtual monopoly over the world's diamond industry, until Cecil Rhodes bought out his shares. Barnarto suicided eight years later.
- Alfred Beit, who arrived in 1875 to buy diamonds for a Hamburg firm. His Rothschild links enabled him to run the most powerful South African financial firm, Wernher, Beit & Co.

Barnarto and Beit were in many ways typical of the "... hundred or so Jewish merchants who have gathered [on the Rand] like eagles over their prey", as the English historian J. A. Froude wrote in 1882.

Beit and another Jewish financier, Lionel Phillips, were renowned for using their immense wealth in ways approved by the doctrine of Semitism. They thought nothing of bribing the local government to the tune of £25,000 to settle just one issue in their favor.⁽⁷¹⁾ In 1895-6 they spent £200,000 to induce a raid by 600 British mercenaries under Dr (Sir Starr) Jameson, to seize Johannesburg and hold it until the British government would feel obliged to take over administration of the goldfields capital. The Jameson Raid failed, and Phillips was arrested. He confessed his guilt and was sentenced to death. Freed as a result of British protest, he returned to England where he was rewarded with a knighthood.

In 1897 the German-educated Alfred Milner was appointed high commissioner for South Africa and governor of Cape Colony. He pretended to favor peace, but actually advanced the cause of a war that was designed to deliver the mineral wealth beneath the Boers' feet into Jewish hands. The revered Boer leader, Paul Kruger, saw through this charade and famously remarked, "It is our country that you want!" Kruger was wrong. Boer tradition stressed the spiritual links between the Boer people and their land. All that the Jews were after was money.

The British advocates of Jewish interests were aware of the racial nature of the coming conflict. Thus Lord Kitchener confided that the Boers were "afraid of getting into the hands of certain Jews who no doubt wield great influence in the country".⁽⁷²⁾

The Jews, in turn, whipped up war-fervor through their media outlets. Of these they had an abundance. One of the largest circulations was achieved by London's first penny newspaper, the *Daily Telegraph*, owned by Lord Burnham (who began life as Edward Levy) Others included the *Sunday Times*, owned by Rachel Beer (nee Sassoon) who also had a major financial interest in the *Observer*; the *Financial Times*, founded and edited by Harry Marks in 1884; Harry Oppenheim's *London Daily News*; Marks' *Evening News*; Sir Alfred Mond's *Westminster Gazette* and the *English Gazette*; and Steinkopf's *St James Gazette*. Furthermore, the Reuters news service, founded by Paul Julius Reuter (born Israel Beer Josaphat), supplied the news that the papers published – and that the government often relied on.

British troops were accordingly sent to South Africa. Kruger demanded that they leave. They didn't, so the Boers declared war. Britain had 200,000 trained troops in the field. The Boers had, at most, a total of 50,000 men of fighting age. They were therefore forced to use irregular methods, which the Empire countered with a policy of total war.

General Jan Smuts summed up the brutality of British policy:

Lord Kitchener has begun to carry out a policy in both [Boer] republics of unbelievable barbarism and gruesomeness which violates the most elementary principles of the international rules of war. Almost all farmsteads and villages in both republics have been burned down and destroyed. All crops have been destroyed. All livestock which has fallen into the hands of the enemy has been killed or slaughtered. The basic principle behind Lord Kitchener's tactics has been to win, not so much through direct operations against fighting commandos, but rather indirectly by bringing the pressure of war against defenseless women and children.

Future British prime minister Lloyd George confirmed this in parliament on 18 February 1901: "It is a war not against men, but against women and children". Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, who was to become prime minister in 1905, spoke for many when on 14 June 1901 he declared in parliament: "When is a war not a war? When it is waged in South Africa by methods of barbarism."

An Irish Nationalist member of parliament, John Dillon, railed in the House on 20 January 1902 against the Empire's

... wholesale violation of one of the best recognized usages of modern war, which forbids you to desolate or devastate the country of the enemy and destroy the food supply on such a scale as to reduce non-combatants to starvation.

What would have been said by civilized mankind if Germany on her March on Paris [i.e. 1870] had turned the whole country into a howling wilderness and concentrated the French women and children into camps where they died in thousands? All civilized Europe would have rushed to the rescue.

The trade union leader, John Burns, was member of parliament for Battersea from 1892 to 1918. He had no delusions about the reasons for the war. On 6 February 1900 he told the House, "Wherever we examine, there is the financial Jew, operating, directing, inspiring the agencies that have led to this war. The trail of the financial serpent is over this war from beginning to end." He added that the British army had always been the "Sir Galahad of History". Now it was reduced to being the "janissary of the Jews".

One of the few newspapers not owned or run by Jews, the *Manchester Guardian*, sent an investigative reporter named John A. Hobson to South Africa in 1899 to study the conflict. Hobson's conclusion was that

We are fighting to place a small international oligarchy of mine-owners and speculators in power at Pretoria. Englishmen will surely 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 chiefly British. ⁽⁷³⁾

He added that in addition to their exploitation of the goldfields, the Jews controlled the dynamite monopoly and the Johannesburg press, and dominated the stock exchange, the liquor trades and the loan and mortgage business. Of their role in South Africa, he wrote:

The Jews are par excellence the international financiers ... They fastened on the Rand ... as they are prepared to fasten upon any other part of the globe ... Primarily they are financial speculators, taking their gains not out of the genuine fruits of industry, even the industry of others, but out of the construction, promotion and financial manipulation of companies.

The British soldiers used as janissaries of the Jews in this war were almost entirely working class young men. In 1868 the previous generation of British workers had organized the first meeting of the Trade Union Congress. In September 1900 the same T.U.C. condemned the war in South Africa as being designed:

... to secure the goldfields of South Africa for cosmopolitan Jews, most of whom had no patriotism and no country. ⁽⁷⁴⁾

The Social Democratic Federation, a Marxist-left organization, protested that:

It is high time that those who do not think that Beit, Barnarto, Oppenheim, Rothschild and Co. ought to control the destinies of Englishmen at home, and of their Empire abroad, should come together and speak their mind ⁽⁷⁵⁾

One innovation in this disgraceful war, the use of concentration camps, particularly smacks of the Semitist mentality. In a mood of hatred that goes right back to the genocide of the Canaanites, over a hundred thousand Boer women and children – a quarter of the total population – were rounded up into squalid camps, in which over twenty thousand were to die.

The other consequences of the war are easily summarized. About 4,000 Boer fighting men were killed. 6,000 British officers and men suffered the same fate, while a further 14,000 died of fever and 30,000 more were wounded. The British taxpayer spent £200,000 to enrich a handful of Jews. Alfred Milner was made governor of the Transvaal and Orange Free State in 1902, from which position he imported Chinese labor to work the mines. He was created a baron in 1901, and a viscount in 1902. In 1918 he became, fittingly, secretary of state for war.

A suitable epitaph to the innocent victims on both sides was provided by the *Labour Leader*, a publication of the Independent Labour Party founded by Keir Hardie in 1893:

Modern imperialism is really run by half a dozen financial houses, many of them Jewish, to whom politics is a counter in the game of buying and selling "securities" and the people are convenient pawns. ⁽⁷⁶⁾

This was not an isolated or particularly controversial analysis. In J. A. Hobson's main work, *Imperialism: A Study*, he wrote that "the central ganglion of international capitalism" was made up of "men of a singular and peculiar race, who have behind them centuries of financial experience". ⁽⁷⁷⁾

Readers who may be inclined to criticize the European imperial powers would do well to remember that by the turn of the century their leaders were mere pawns in the game of financial Semitism, and their armies, although brave, had been reduced to "janissaries of the Jews".

11. "The most terrible of wars"

No national leaders particularly wanted World War I. Several crises that could have led to the outbreak of war were in fact averted, and it was not inevitable in 1914. Sooner or later, however, it was bound to occur. A series of bizarre alliances and military pacts had locked the nations of Europe into a massive political boiler, under which the financial heat was building up and up. Eventually the boiler had to burst.

The Kaiser blamed his uncle, Edward VII, who had ruled Britain from 1901 to 1910. (The reader will recall that Edward was surrounded by, and financially indebted to, rich Jews.) Although Edward was now dead, in August 1914 the Kaiser blamed the system that he had created for the terrible situation in which Europe now found itself:

The world will be engulfed in the most terrible of wars, the ultimate aim of which is the ruin of Germany. England, France and Russia have conspired for our annihilation ... that is the naked truth of the situation which was slowly but surely created by Edward VII ... The encirclement of Germany is at last an accomplished fact. We have run our heads into the noose ... The dead Edward is stronger than the living I! ⁽⁷⁸⁾

There is no doubt that many of the main players in the lead-up to war would have liked to see Germany reduced to a large number of petty states that could never present a threat to the dominant financial networks. On the other hand, the leaders of all the nations involved trod the road to war with a heavy heart. The Czar made a last-minute, and fruitless, appeal to the Kaiser. ^(78 p. 93) The British prime minister, Asquith, asked in his diary for 31 July 1914, "Are we to go in or stand aside?" Answering his own question he continued, "Of course everybody longs to stand aside" ^(78 p. 101) French Premier Viviani was "haunted by a fear that war might burst from a clump of trees, from a meeting of two patrols, from a threatening gesture ...". ^(78 pp. 90-91) The vacillating Kaiser even contemplated ordering his first million troops to turn back as soon as they had been ordered west. ^(78 pp. 81-86)

Yet nothing that anyone could have done was likely to have averted the conflict for long. There is no real need to go into minute details. As the *Labour Leader* had said, politics had become "a counter in the game of buying and selling 'securities'". ⁽⁷⁶⁾ The essential factor was that a stable European order that worked well for the Jews was threatened by the rise of Germany.

Sometimes the writers of fiction can express the mood of their times more succinctly, more vividly, and with greater insight, than many journalists or historians. Victor Yeates achieved this in *Winged Victory*, the only novel he had time to write before his premature death. ⁽⁷⁹⁾ During World War I Yeates had been, in Henry Williamson's words, an "experienced and valiant pilot" with the Royal Flying Corps. His novel is based on those experiences, although to call it a novel fails even to hint at the qualities that led T. E. Lawrence to call it "one of the most distinguished histories of the War".

In Chapter VII one of the leading characters, a Royal Flying Corps pilot, is asked why America entered the war. This is his answer:

"Inevitable sooner or later. The immediate cause was the Russian collapse putting the Allies in danger of defeat. You see, this war is being financed for the Allies by an international gang that works London, Paris, and New York. It was getting hold of Berlin as well. It dominated St. Petersburg completely, pensioning the government. Roughly it ruled the roost in the whole of so-called western civilization and its dependencies, except the central European block against which we are fighting. It was getting a grip on these, and that is the fundamental cause of the war. For there's one thing financiers cannot or will not see. They have visions of a frontierless world in which their operations will proceed without hindrance and make all human activities dependent on them; but their world state is impossible because finance is sterile, and a state living by finance must always have neighbours from which to suck blood, or it is like a dog eating its own tail. And as the financiers widen their influence it is the ever-lessening group of nations to which they are fastening tentacles that bears the ever-increasing brunt. In a sense, then, this war is a Germanic revolt against the international Jew. In another sense it is a clash of financial despotism with industrial despotism. In another it is a conflict of incompatible imperialisms. In another, a struggle for land for national expansion. But the side on which America has been brought in is the side of international finance. Enormous sums have been invested in this war, and an Allied victory is essential to preserve them as capital. You must understand that all this money that is being lavished on war supplies is not wiped out as it is spent; not a bit of it; it's mounting up as national debt, huge blocks of debt which are held by members and nominees of the gang. When the Associated Powers have

been defeated at the cost of a few million more lives, including ours, and peace has been dictated to them, the gang will own a further hold over the Allies in the form of millions of pounds of gilt-edge security. And you may be sure Germany will be held down in the mud and kicked. There'll be a famous orgy of money-snatching over our bones.

"To return to America, the danger of an Allied defeat, that is to say, of the collapse of all that gilt-edge security, had to be averted. Those awful Russians! They let down their masters as much as their masters let them down. So the American politicians were told to be ready for a change of popular feeling, and an intense war-fever inoculation was carried out by the press. It took rather less than three months, I believe, to make the popular demand for war irresistible. That is the reason for the entry of America into our wonderful war. You asked me."

The broad sweep of this answer is worth far more than any number of details. Some of the machinations that brought the US into the conflict will be discussed in Chapter 14, but Yeates' character sums up that process in two masterful sentences, the import of which is confirmed by Samuel Landman's comments quoted in Chapter 14 below.

Three of the outcomes of World War I will be examined in the following pages. These are the Russian Revolution, the campaign to keep Germany "held down in the mud and kicked", and the irresistible bribe that was offered to American Jewry to involve the U.S. in the criminal carnage of Europe.

Meanwhile, a body count. The war that was fought largely in order to put down "a Germanic revolt against the international Jew" resulted in the following estimated deaths:

Russians: 1,700,000; Turks: 325,000; Rumanians: 158,000; Bulgarians: 49,000; Greeks: 5,000; Serbs: 322,000; Austro-Hungarians: 1,050,000; Germans: 1,950,000; Italians: 533,000; French: 1,500,000; Portuguese: 7,222; Japanese: 2,000; Belgians: 41,000; Americans: 116,000; British (including Imperial troops): 1,000,000.⁽⁸⁰⁾

13. Semitism Triumphant

Karl Marx was not, as many suppose, the son of a rabbi. His father was a lawyer, originally known to the world as Hirschel ha-Levi Marx. Hirschel, or Heinrich as he was later known, "converted" to Christianity to comply with a Prussian law of 1816 banning Jews from senior positions in law and medicine. Hirschel's father had been a rabbi. So had the father of Karl's mother, Henrietta Pressborck.

The family was well connected, within Jewish circles as well as outside them. Both the family rabbis had been descended from famous Talmudic scholars. Karl's uncle in Holland, Lion Philips, was the creator of the Philips Electronic Company.

Marx's first important written works were two essays "On the Jewish Question". They were a response to an essay by Bruno Bauer who believed "that the anti-social nature of the Jew was religious in origin and could be remedied by tearing the Jew away from his faith".⁽⁸¹⁾

Marx replied that the problem of the Jews lay in their economic clout. He talked about the "real Jew" and "the everyday Jew", and he asked, "What is the worldly cult of the Jew? **Huckstering**. What is his worldly god? **Money**." Here is how Marx teased out that gnomic statement:

Money is the jealous god of Israel, beside which no other god may exist. Money abases all the gods of mankind and changes them into commodities. Money is the self-sufficient value of all things. It had, therefore, deprived the whole world, both the human world and Nature, of their proper value. Money is the alienated essence of man's work and experience: this essence dominates him and he worships it. The god of the Jews has been secularized and has become the god of the world."⁽⁸²⁾

Since Marx's "money-Jew" was the "universal **anti-social** element of the present time", it was necessary to destroy the "preconditions" that led to his dominance. "In emancipating itself from **hucksterism** and **money**, and thus from real and practical Judaism, our age would emancipate itself," wrote Marx.

These thoughts form the kernel from which Marx derived his entire philosophy. Since the middle classes had imbibed the decadence of Semitism from their Jewish leaders, they too had to be purged. Since anything like this could only happen through violent means, a messianic force was needed for the "total redemption of humanity". This messianic force was to be the industrial working class.

Such, essentially, was Karl Marx's philosophical baby, communism. It proclaimed that the spirit of Semitism had to be swept away in a sea of blood unleashed by the proletariat. In this process the bourgeoisie would also perish. The result was to be the end of history, which Paul Johnson calls "in itself, curiously enough, a very Jewish concept". ^(81 p58)

Marx understood little of the practical functioning of capitalism, but he certainly tapped a widespread human aspiration when he proposed to eliminate Semitism. Arthur Hertzberg, for instance, characterized Marxism as having "a marked and lasting tradition of imagining a new heaven on earth without Jews". ⁽⁸³⁾ The irony was that when people who called themselves communists came to power they were not sturdy representatives of the redeeming proletariat. They were Jews.

The Jewish dominance of Russian communism has been the subject of so many books and articles that even a representative reading list is beyond the scope of this brief study. A few snapshots will have to try to encapsulate the enormous canvas of the Soviet Union. Thus:

In 1917, Lenin was smuggled into the country with four Jews, Leiba Bronstein (*alias* Leon Trotsky), Apfelbaum (*alias* Zinoviev), Rosenfeld (*alias* Kamenev), and Sobelsohn (*alias* Radek), with the help of the Germans and a Jewish banking house in New York, and through the agency of Israel Lazarevitch Helphand, *alias* Parvus, a Russian Jew who made his fortune in Denmark out of German coal ...

According to the Rev. George A. Simons, of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Petrograd, out of the 388 members of the first Bolshevik Government which met in Petrograd in December, 1918, no less than 265 were Jews from the Lower east side of New York City. There were 106 European Jews, one North American negro, and only 16 genuine Russians. Sixteen Russians, a negro, 371 Jews! The president of this collection of aliens was the Jew Zinoviev. ^(29 p. 180)

And:

During his travels along the border districts of the U.S.S.R., M. Jean Fontenoy found that 90 per cent of the directors and secretaries of the collective farms he visited were Jews. ... The words Communist and Jew were synonymous with the peasants: they thought that the Jews were the rulers of the land. ^(29 p. 180, with the Fontenoy reference on p. 64)

The author of the last two quotations, F Yeats-Brown, had no personal hostility to Jews. The writer of the following lines, Benjamin Ginsberg, is a prominent Jewish academic:

If the distinctive contribution of Jews to the absolutist state was in the realm of finance, and their singular role in liberal regimes was the mobilization of opinion, the special contribution of the Jews to the Bolshevik state involved the organization of coercion. From the beginning, the Soviet state relied heavily upon military, police, and security services to sustain itself, and Jews were active in these agencies ...

During the 1920s and 1930s, Jews were a major element in the secret police and other Soviet security forces. Genrikh Yagoda, for instance, served as chief of the secret police during the 1930s. Yagoda had been a pharmacist before the Revolution and specialized in preparing poisons for his agents to use in liquidating Stalin's opponents. Other high-ranking Jewish secret policemen included Matvei Berman and Naftali Frenkel who helped to expand and institutionalize the slave labor system. ... Another Jewish security officer, K.V. Pauker, served as chief of operations of the secret police in the 1930s. Lev Inzhir was chief accountant for the Gulag. M.T. Gay headed the special secret police department that conducted the purge of the 1930s. In what came to be called the "Great Terror" he supervised the mass arrests, trials and executions of Stalin's opponents. Two other Jewish secret policemen, A.A. Slutsky and Boris Berman, were in charge of Soviet terror and espionage abroad during the 1930s. ^(49 pp. 30-1)

Jews were not only prominent in the higher ranks of the dreaded secret police. Jews had taken a hands-on role in the murders and arrests from the beginning.

A striking imbalance manifested itself particularly in the Ukraine, where in early 1919 the Chekas contained an extraordinarily high proportion of Jews: 75 per cent of the personnel of the Kiev Cheka, and seven out of its ten collegium members, were Jews. ⁽⁸⁴⁾

The fact that Jews were unable to retain control of the Soviet Union was due almost entirely to the efforts of one man, Stalin. Succeeding Lenin in 1924, Stalin didn't begin to purge the Jews until the late 1930s. In 1933 Jews still "held top positions in every major ministry". ⁽⁸⁵⁾

Despite the occasional purges, Stalin believed that Jews could be used by a leader – like himself – whose own ruthlessness matched theirs. As a last resort – at least in such a highly centralized state – they could perhaps be disposed of, if and when they became too much of a threat.

Stalin's own relative, Lazar Kaganovitch, typified the viciousness that made many Jews useful to Stalin. On taking over the Transport Ministry, Kaganovitch's first act was to liquidate its entire management. Kaganovitch was also, according to Solzhenytsin, one of the six Jews in charge of the White Sea Canal project, which killed over 200,000 workers.

The largest slave-camp system in history, dubbed by Solzhenytsin "The Gulag Archipelego", was also a suitable proving-ground for Semitist talents. Of the twelve main complexes in the Gulag, eleven were run by Jews, who were "monsters ... rightly hated and despised by their millions of slaves" ⁽⁸⁶⁾

History proved Karl Marx to be a poor prophet. Communism failed completely in its original purpose, which was to redeem the world from the Jewish mentality of Semitism. Instead it installed Jews as lords over millions of non-Jews. The former Russian Empire became their new promised land. They proceeded to devour it, and its children.

Worse, through eliminating all intelligent and educated opposition, they ensured that the ideology of Semitism would prevail, despite the purges, despite even the ultimate unraveling of the Soviet Union. In order to stand up to the Jews, and eventually to outgun them, Stalin had to adopt the cold-blooded disdain for all other human life that is endemic in Semitism. Stalinism was Semitism with a Georgian face. The killings went on, as they had in Canaan, as they had in Hungary in 1919 under the short lived communist regime of Bela Kuhn, and as we shall shortly see they were to do in the former Third Reich after 1945.

In one respect, though, Marx's vision was clear. Referring to the bloodbath of the French Revolution he had written: "It will be necessary to repeat the year 1793. After achieving power we'll be considered monsters, but we couldn't care less". The system that this Jew of Trier dreamt up, the system that was brought into being by Jewish revolutionaries and enforced by Jewish commissars, the system that could fairly be described as Semitism in action, was monstrous beyond comprehension.

No-one will ever know how many people were murdered in the name of communism. A conservative 1978 estimate from *Figaro* ⁽⁸⁷⁾ runs like this:

THE HUMAN COST OF COMMUNISM

1. Human cost of communism in U.S.S.R. (1919-1959)	66,700,000
2. Human cost of communism in U.S.S.R. since 1959 (minimum estimate)	3,000,000
3. Human cost of communism in China	63,784,000
4. Massacre of Katyn	10,000
5. German civilians killed during expulsions of 1945-1946	2,923,700
6. Cambodia (April 1975-April 1978)	2,500,000
7. Suppression of uprisings in E. Berlin, Prague, Budapest, Baltic States 1945-1975	500,000
8. Communist aggression in Greece, Malaysia, Burma, Korea, Philippines, Vietnam,	

Cuba, Black Africa, Latin America

3,500,000

Minimum human cost of communism to 1978 142,917,700

(Many more deaths occurred after 1978, and many other pre-1978 deaths have since been discovered. It seems appropriate, though, to quote a respected French publication on the "minimum" figures.)

14. The Coming of the (Money) Lords

In the chaos following the American Civil War there were endless opportunities for personal enrichment through dubious means. From the lowest carpetbagger to the financier who was able to capitalize on the incompetence and corruption of Reconstruction-era governments, fortunes were there to be made. That these could be enormous fortunes was guaranteed by the huge industrial and commercial expansion of the U.S. in the late 19th century.

The devastated Southern state governments, in particular, needed huge public works programs, but lacked the capital to fund them. They had to borrow. "As a result, Reconstruction-era Southern governments often found themselves turning to sources that had access to European capital. This, of course, included the German Jews." (49 p. 66)

The largest industrial expansion in this period took the form of railroad building. The U.S. government made huge grants of land to companies which then had to raise the finance to lay the actual rail lines. This they did by offering bonds on the value of the land they had been granted. It was a license to print money, and the big Jewish financial houses of Europe were quick to come to the party.

Joseph Seligman, who made a fortune through financial dealings during the Civil War, was one of the main players in the railroad deals. His story is told in Stephen Birmingham's *Our Crowd*.⁽⁸⁸⁾ For a concise account of the process, though, it is hard to go past Benjamin Ginsberg's account of Jacob Schiff:

Among the German-Jewish bankers active in railroad finance was Jacob Schiff. Schiff's clients came to include the Pennsylvania Railroad; the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul; the Baltimore and Ohio; the Chesapeake and Ohio; the Denver and Rio Grande; the Great Northern; the Gulf, Mobile and Northern; the Illinois Central; the Kansas City Southern; the Norfolk and Western; the Missouri Pacific; the Southern Pacific; the Texas and Pacific; and the Union Pacific.

Schiff generally marketed these railroad securities in Europe, serving as a major conduit for European capital into the United States. Among Schiff's principal European banking partners was Sir Ernest Cassell, one of London's most prominent German-Jewish bankers. Schiff and Cassell, working together, provided the capital for E.H. Harriman's reorganization and expansion of the Union Pacific Railroad in the 1890s. (49 p. 69)

The Panama Canal scam is a good example of the methods of Joseph Seligman. In 1880 the French Panama Canal Company trusted him to raise the money required to build the canal. Seligman hired prominent former politicians to lobby for public acceptance. (Former U.S. president Grant refused a bribe of \$24,000 a year, but others accepted.) In 1885 the French company collapsed amid a major scandal involving well-known Jewish financiers. The U.S. government then decided that the canal should go through Nicaragua. The Seligman family was left holding an expensive tract of land along the original proposed route. Through lobbying, bribing and lying, the Seligmans managed to overturn the government's decision. The Panama route, though, ran through Colombia, the government of which was not interested in a canal. Seligman therefore financed some "Panamanian" rebels to secede from Colombia. President Roosevelt was persuaded to send warships to enforce this secession.

Seligman was a sordid inside-trader and asset-stripper, as a U.S. Congressional investigation established. That he also involved the U.S. in a wild imperial adventure, solely to enrich himself, is a measure of the power that Jews like him exercised.

Schiff and Seligman were far from alone. Other American Jews of German origin who enriched themselves in this period included Philip Heidelberg, Lewis Seasongood, Solomon Loeb, the Lehmans, the Warburgs,

the Lewisohns and the Guggenheims. They are prominent in Birmingham's *Our Crowd*. Below them there were many lesser-known Jews who acquired fortunes on a less fabulous scale.

Americans did not fail to notice the role of the Jews. Brooks Adams, the grandson of former U.S. President John Quincy Adams, warned Americans in an 1896 book that Jews throughout history had used their money power to exploit and oppress others. The U.S. and Britain, he argued, were ruled by parasitical, capitalist Jews.⁽⁸⁹⁾ His brother Henry went further. In 1893 he had yearned for the entire Jewish financial system to collapse, because "In [the present] society of Jews and brokers I have no place".⁽⁹⁰⁾

All this Jewish wealth and financial power opened up the U.S. for massive Jewish immigration. In 1880 there were 3,000 Jews in the entire United States. By 1918 there were 1½ million Jews in New York alone.⁽⁹¹⁾

America now hosted one of the world's largest, richest and most powerful Jewish communities. It is therefore not at all surprising that – as we have seen – New York Jews figured so prominently in Russia's communist revolution. Another political revolution had been on the agenda of many Jews for some time. This was Zionism. The Zionists wanted to form an exclusive Jewish state in Palestine, from which their activities in the rest of the world could be directed. Many Zionists were secular, but the basic principle is also central to Jewish religious tradition. For two thousand years Jews everywhere had prayed three times a day for the re-building of Jerusalem in a Jewish-controlled Palestine.

Unfortunately Palestine was under Turkish rule. The Turks had no intention of giving it up. In August 1897 the Jews established a Zionist Congress, which met in Switzerland under the leadership of Theodor Herzl, whose Zionist gospel *Der Judenstaat* had been published the previous year. Herzl pointed out that Turkey was unlikely to co-operate, but

This will not discourage us. We will seek other means to accomplish our end. ... The great European war must come. With my watch in hand do I await this terrible moment. After the great European war is ended the peace conference will assemble. We must be ready for that time.⁽⁹²⁾

So the Zionists awaited their opportunities in the carnage of World War I, a war which "must come". Come it did, and by 1916 the belligerent nations were exhausted. Despite the heroism of troops on all sides, the war had ground to a bloody stalemate. Only the intervention of a new and powerful nation could tilt the scales. The only such nation that existed was America, which was committed to neutrality.

In autumn 1916 the British Foreign Office Undersecretary, Sir Mark Sykes, received a curious proposal:

... an Armenian Jew, James A. Malcolm, who was giving expert help and advice to the Government about Middle Eastern matters, approached Sykes and urged that the Allies should capture the sympathies of American Jewry – at that time tending to favor Germany – by a declaration of support for the Zionist cause. Sykes saw the possibilities of the suggestion, and laid it before Lord Milner, who took it up with the Cabinet ...
... Secret assurances were given to the Zionist leaders through Sykes that the British government would support their cause if the consent of their Allies could be obtained. A message to this effect was sent to Judge Brandeis, the American Zionist, who was a close friend of President Wilson, and the help of leading Zionists in all the Allied countries was mobilized.⁽⁹³⁾

In 1916 Samuel Landman was secretary to Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann, who was widely acknowledged as one of the "backroom boys" during World War I and who became first president of Israel in 1948. Landman later became general secretary of the World Zionist Organization. He commented on how quickly the Jews were able to change American opinion:

An interesting account of the negotiations carried out in London and Paris, and subsequent developments, has already appeared in the Jewish press and need not be repeated here in detail, except to recall that immediately after the "gentleman's" agreement between Sir Mark Sykes, authorised by the War Cabinet, and the Zionist leaders, cable facilities through the War Office, the Foreign Office and British Embassies, Legations, etc., were given to the latter to communicate the glad tidings to their friends and organizations in America and elsewhere, and the change in official and public opinion as reflected in the American press in favor of joining the Allies in the War, was as gratifying as it was surprisingly rapid.⁽⁹⁴⁾

Both parties to this contract honored their word. The Jews went to work on U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, who then proceeded to engineer the entry of America into the First World War on the British side. Britain, for its part, formalized its commitment to the Jews on 2 November 1917 in the form of the Balfour Declaration. This was a statement by British Foreign Secretary Arthur Balfour to Lord Lionel Rothschild which read:

His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

"It was important for us," Lloyd George told the House of Commons on June 19, 1936, "to seek every legitimate help we could get. We came to the conclusion, from information we received from every part of the world, that it was vital that we should have the sympathies of the Jewish community."

Nothing could better demonstrate the power of the Jews in 1916 than this. Britain abandoned its promises to the Arabs – who under the leadership of T. E. Lawrence had bravely fought the Turkish enemy – in order to secure the support of the Jews. Jews in America leaned on a weak President, who happily obliged their interests, to the tune of 3,800,000 troops, of which 116,000 died – to give the Jews a national state that belonged to others.

Further comment seems superfluous.

15. "Germany Must Perish"

1917 was the year of the Communist take-over in Russia. It was also the year of the Balfour Declaration, and the consequent and decisive entry into World War I of the United States. Meanwhile, a young Austrian soldier was brooding on the relationship between the Germanic and the Jewish world-views.

It is significant that Adolf Hitler was born in Austria, a country with a burning experience of both Semitism and its result, anti-Semitism. Jews were not allowed to own land in the Austrian empire until 1848, but subsequent improvements in their status enabled them to plunder the Austrian land, people and economy. So much so that even a philo-Semitic author, whose hatred for all things Austrian runs through practically every paragraph, is obliged to concede that:

In the cities their propensity for making capital and their enthusiasm for speculative projects resulted in a number of unpleasant consequences for any businessman who competed against them. Savage price-cutting and the use of sweated labor put whole streets of gentile artisans out of work. Their sporadic and sudden profits promoted instability on the stock market and a number of crashes occurred which left many gentile businessmen penniless.

In the country an indolent aristocracy was happy to place the management of their estates in the hands of a Jewish manager, who would drive the laborers to the very extremes of physical endurance in order to allow the absentee landlord to gamble another few thousand crowns a night in the casinos of Vienna or Budapest. As a usurer this Jewish factotum made himself doubly unpopular by forcing slow-witted peasants into a situation whereby when a harvest failed they inevitably had no other recourse than to borrow money from their manager. Punitive rates of interest, as high as 500%, meant that the peasants were in debt for years afterwards.⁽⁹⁵⁾

The author of these lines, Richard Bassett, had been the Vienna correspondent for *The Times*, and at the time he wrote them, 1988, he was its Central and East Europe correspondent. Even so, he felt it necessary to include corroborating statements about the Jews in Austria written by one of *The Times'* leading journalists before World War I – Wickham Steed, who went on to become editor of *The Times* in the 1920s. Thus, Wickham Steed, writing in 1914:

When, as in the Habsburg Monarchy, the press is entirely Jewish, the press deprives the Jews of the educational influence of fair criticism and removes from their path those minor checks and warnings that might otherwise induce them to practice the, for them, supremely difficult virtues of self-restraint and moderation ...

Centuries of segregation and – as regards the mass – of pauperism, working upon non-European temperaments, have prevented the Jews from knowing instinctively how much Jewish influence a non-Jewish public will tolerate. They unconsciously violate the unexpressed canons of non-Jewish taste and are filled with amazement and a sense of injustice when an outburst of violent anti-Semitism in word or deed reminds them too pertinently that the days of persecution may not be past.

Not surprisingly, the young Hitler concluded that Austria, especially Vienna, was hopelessly Semitized. It was as much this Austrian background, with first-hand experience of living under Jewish control, as any other factor that caused Hitler to lead National Socialism along a firmly anti-Semitic path.

Not that Germans hadn't had their own close encounters with Jews. Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and Klara Zetkin had directed communist opposition to the German war effort from 1914. Under communist direction strikes broke out all over Germany in 1917, culminating in a naval mutiny at Wilhelmshaven in August 1917. Undermined at home, the German war effort collapsed. Following the armistice, communist riots and uprisings became the order of the day, with the loss of many lives, and a brutal communist dictatorship was established in Bavaria. It was controlled by Jews:

Eugen Levine was head of the short-lived Bavarian Soviet Republic, Gustav Landauer was its commissar for propaganda and cultural affairs, and Ernst Toller commanded its "red army". (49 p. 29)

After this wave of Semitist terror was beaten back the Weimar Republic came into being, in which Jewish morés were everywhere dominant.

It is sometimes supposed that Hitler merely aimed to set the clock back to 1914. Nothing could be further from the truth. As Rudolf Hess wrote, "For Adolf Hitler the revolt of 1918 was a necessity of Fate, for, despite its criminal leadership, it swept away many survivals of a time that was outlived, survivals that would have created obstacles to the National Socialist revolution".⁽⁹⁶⁾ Anti-Semitism was an essential part of this process. For the first time ever, a broad-based movement for national redemption was openly, firmly and knowingly based on opposition to Semitism.

That is why the Third Reich is so important to the psychohistory of Jews today. It is also why Jews were determined to destroy it from the beginning. Finally, it explains the genocidal viciousness that we shall see was to be exhibited toward Germans by the Jews.

Adolf Hitler was sworn in as Chancellor on January 30, 1933. Less than two months later, on Friday, March 24, 1933, the London *Daily Express* carried the banner headline, "JUDEA DECLARES WAR ON GERMANY". Perhaps fearing that the word "Judea" might be unfamiliar to readers, the sub-heading proclaimed "Jews Of All The World Unite In Action". This was followed, in large capitals, by "BOYCOTT OF GERMAN GOODS". Then, in smaller capitals, by "MASS DEMONSTRATIONS IN MANY DISTRICTS"; and then, in bold, "DRAMATIC ACTION". Finally, the article began:

All Israel is uniting in wrath against the Nazi onslaught against the Jews in Germany.

Adolf Hitler, swept into power by an appeal to elemental patriotism, is making history of a kind he least expected. Thinking to unite only the German nation to race consciousness, he has roused the whole Jewish people to a national renaissance.

The appearance of the swastika symbol of a new Germany has called forth the Lion of Judah, the old battle symbol of Jewish defiance.

Fourteen million Jews dispersed throughout the world have banded together as one man to declare war on the German persecutors of their co-religionists. Sectional differences and antagonisms have been submerged in one common aim – to stand by the 600,000 Jews of Germany who are terrorised by Hitlerist anti-Semitism, and to compel Fascist Germany to end its campaign of violence and suppression directed against its Jewish minority.

The aim of the Jewish boycott was threefold: to prevent German goods being sold anywhere in the world, to prevent the use of German vessels for shipping, and to make no loans to the German government or to German businesses.

The sanctions were very real, and began to bite almost immediately. On March 31, 1933, Goebbels announced a one-day retaliatory boycott of Jewish stores in Germany. On May 10 he again spoke of the ongoing Jewish boycott, warning German Jews to behave like guests.⁽⁹⁷⁾

Not all Jews responded as they had been directed by their nominal leaders, so the World Jewish Economic Federation held a special International Jewish Boycott Conference in Amsterdam in July. It was presided over by Samuel Untermyer, an American Jew who had made his name as the lawyer who frightened Henry Ford into withdrawing his book *The International Jew*. Untermyer returned to New York in early August. On August 7 1933 the *New York Times* carried the text of his speech on the Jewish declaration of war against Germany. He said it was a "... holy war ... a war that must be waged unremittingly" against a "Hitlerland", in which Jews were being herded into "vile concentration camps" with "the avowed aim of exterminating them".

No modern historian accepts Untermyer's bizarre account of the Germany of 1933. In fact, he gave the game away by complaining about Jews who were still "willing to travel on German ships" where they were waited on by German servants – which would have been incomprehensible if the Germans of "Hitlerland" were trying to exterminate them. Furthermore, twelve years later the German army had scarcely surrendered before Jews themselves published details of the secret wartime agreement that had allowed German Jews to settle in Palestine and take their wealth with them.⁽⁹⁸⁾ Still, neither truth nor consistency mattered. Untermyer's lies were justifiable from the perspective of Semitism.

The important points here are that within two months of Hitler's accession the Jews had declared war on Germany, and in less than seven months one of the world's most prominent Jews was inventing ludicrous atrocity tales that were published in the world's leading mainstream (but Jewish-owned) newspapers. The Jewish "declaration of war" was not just a matter of rhetoric.

The tangle of diplomacy and intrigue that led to World War 2 is beyond the scope of this short work. Yet one speech by Hitler before the war began needs to be born in mind. In January 1939 he warned that:

If the international finance-Jewry inside and outside Europe manages just once more to precipitate the world into war, the outcome will be, not the bolshevization of the earth and the consequent triumph of Jewry, but the annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe.⁽⁹⁹⁾

It is also important to remember that there was a strong peace movement on both sides. Britain was only dragged into the war that would destroy her empire over the wishes of many in the government. The most determined war-monger was Winston Churchill, who was by now in debt to the Jews.⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ Prominent citizens including John Gielgud, Sybil Thorndyke and George Bernard Shaw wrote to the prime minister in March 1940 urging him to end the war.⁽¹⁰¹⁾ Commonwealth leaders agreed, including Australia's Robert Menzies⁽¹⁰²⁾ and Canada's William McKenzie King.⁽¹⁰³⁾ On the German side, Hitler's many appeals for peace with the empire were dramatically endorsed on 10 May 1941 when his deputy Rudolf Hess flew to Britain on a personal peace mission.⁽¹⁰⁴⁾

Hess was arrested on landing, and imprisoned for the rest of his life. The Jews had decreed that there was to be no peace with Germany, or with Germans.

In 1941 an American Jew named Theodore Kauffman published a book called *Germany Must Perish!*⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ This work of gloating Semitism looked forward to an Allied victory, after which "Germany must perish forever!" Kauffman pointed out that he meant this: "In fact – not in fancy". The method of destroying Germany "for ever" was to be the "summary sterilization" of all Germans. He called for the post-war mobilization of 20,000 doctors who would each sterilize 25 German men and women a day. In just three months, he gloated, there would not be a single German able to reproduce, and in sixty years the race itself would be extinct. This book was not a hare-brained pamphlet written by a lunatic. This cold-blooded proposal to sterilize every member of the German nation was endorsed, on its cover, by *Time* magazine, the *Washington Post*, and the *New York Times*.

The book had one immediate effect. On 18 August 1941 Goebbels showed it to Hitler, who gave him permission to force Jews to wear a yellow star with the word "Jude" on it. ^(97, pp. 372-3) In the longer term, though, it at least heralded, and perhaps fanned, the hatred and brutality that was to be exhibited toward the vanquished Germans by all the major Allied leaders.

Some of the innumerable war crimes committed against Germany by the "janissaries of the Jews" are well known. The campaign of terror bombing, in which some 600,000 German civilians were incinerated, has since been widely and justly condemned. Some even worse Allied war crimes were planned, but could not be implemented for one reason or another. For instance, in January 1944 Churchill ordered from America 500,000 1.8 kilogram anthrax bombs, which were intended to be dropped on Germany. Every 100 of these bombs would have wiped out all life over a 65 square-kilometer area. Churchill's full order would have destroyed 325,000 square kilometers – or 201,945 square miles – all of Germany, and almost twice the area covered by the modern USA state of Colorado. Fortunately, production delays prevented this attempted act of genocide. ⁽¹⁰⁶⁾

By contrast with the aims of Kauffman and Churchill, the Morgenthau Plan was almost benevolent. The original plan of Henry Morgenthau, the Jewish U.S. treasury secretary, was to reduce "Germany to an agrarian economy wherein Germany would be a land of small farms, without large-scale industrial enterprises". He also wanted millions of Germans to be used as slave laborers, perhaps in Central Africa. This slave labor was to be made up of all surviving members of the "S.S., the Gestapo, and similar groups". On September 15, 1944, Churchill condemned Morgenthau's plan as not being drastic enough. At the same time Henry L. Stimson, U.S. secretary of war, correctly regarded the plan as "Semitism gone wild for vengeance". ⁽¹⁰³⁾ Stimson was the odd man out. In August 1944 his own president, Roosevelt, toyed with the idea of mass castration of Germans. "You either have to castrate the German people," Roosevelt told Morgenthau, "or you have got to treat them in such a manner so they can't go on reproducing people who want to continue the way they have in the past." In other words, the Germans were to have a choice: either submit to Semitism or submit to castration. ^(103 chapters 2-3)

In the event, a modified version of the Morgenthau plan was issued as the Joint Chief of Staffs directive 1067, which authorized up to two million Germans to be rounded up as criminals. Misery and starvation were imposed on the German people until JCS 1067 was repudiated by the Truman regime in July 1947.

JCS 1067 did not include the list of "major criminals" that Churchill in November 1943 had suggested should "be compiled by the United Nations." These people were to have been "declared world outlaws". They were then to be shot without trial:

"As and when any of these persons falls into the hands of any of the troops or armed forces of the United Nations the nearest officer of the rank or equivalent rank of Major-General will forthwith convene a Court of Inquiry, not for the purpose of determining the guilt or innocence of the accused but merely to establish the fact of identification. Once identified, the said officer will have the outlaw or outlaws shot to death within six hours and without reference to higher authority." ^(103 p. 14)

The reason that this provision was not included was that Stalin had vetoed it as being unseemly from a propaganda viewpoint. Not that Stalin had any qualms about whipping up hatred against Germans. He had not held back his chief wartime propagandist, the Jew Ilya Ehrenburg, who made this infamous appeal in October 1944:

Kill, kill! There are no innocent Germans, among the living, or among those yet to be born! Carry out Comrade Stalin's instructions to crush the fascist beast in his lair. Shatter the pride of the Germanic women with violence. Take them as lawful spoils. Kill, kill, valiant soldiers of the Red Army ... ⁽¹⁰⁷⁾

This the Soviet troops did with a vengeance. For instance, the East Prussian town of Nemmersdorf fell to the Red Army in 1944. Five days later the battered but gallant Fourth Army under General Friedrich Hossbach retook the town. What they found can scarcely be described. Almost every inhabitant had been murdered. "Women had been nailed to barn doors and farm carts, tanks had crushed those who had tried to flee, children had been shot." ⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ This was not an isolated incident. It was part of the holocaust that was raging throughout East Prussia. As town after town fell, Soviet troops even raped the children before

murdering them. In the grim words of Alexander Solzhenitsyn, "... all of us knew very well that if the girls were German they could be raped and then shot. This was almost a combat distinction." ⁽¹⁰⁹⁾

Everyone who was able to walk tried to flee. The nearest port of escape was the harbor at Gdynia. On 30 January 1945, 8,000 refugees swarmed on to the *Wilhelm Gustloff*, a pleasure ship designed for 2,000. Their escape was brief. The *Gustloff* was torpedoed the very next night by Soviet submarine S13. Another refugee ship, the *General Steuben*, was sunk on 9 February 1945, killing 3,700. On 16 April 1945 the *Goya*, packed with 6 to 7,000 refugees, met the same fate. In these three atrocities, 18,000 German women, children and wounded men were killed – twelve times the number lost on the Titanic. ⁽¹⁰⁸⁾

The Soviets were not alone. The Western allies were also determined to punish the Germans for rising against Semitism. April 17, 1945, was a momentous occasion for Western Jews. On this day an enormous American concentration camp for the extermination of Germans was set up at Rheinberg, under the control of General Dwight Eisenhower. ⁽¹¹⁰⁾ One of several, it was six miles in circumference, with no food, water, or latrines for the German inmates. One of the very few survivors, Heinz Janssen, described the conditions:

Amputees slithered like amphibians through the mud, soaking and freezing. Naked to the skies day after day and night after night, they lay desperate in the sands of Rheinberg or slept exhaustedly into serenity in their collapsing holes.

Germany surrendered on May 8, 1945. The U.S. State Department immediately dismissed Switzerland as the official Protecting Power for German prisoners – in open breach of the Geneva Convention. The International Red Cross was also banned from the camps.

On August 30 Max Huber, head of the International Red Cross, complained to the State Department that Americans were preventing his efforts to save the starving Germans in the American camps. He even organized a food convoy of thousands of train cars, which was turned back by Eisenhower's men. Probably over a million surrendered Germans died in Eisenhower's death camps.

Things were no better in the occupied East, where Jews ran concentration camps in which many thousands of Germans were murdered. Part of the story was revealed by John Sack, who in 1993 revealed the story of the Schwientochlowitz concentration camp in Poland, run by Solomon Morel. Although his book *An Eye for an Eye* was published by Basic, a highly-regarded firm, it was ignored by the media – and banned in ES-occupied Germany. Morel was still alive, and the book provided gruesome evidence against him. For instance, at one drunken orgy he forced Germans to lie on top of each other in the form of a human cube, then laid into them with clubs:

"You! Lie on top of them crosswise! No!" he cried, clubbing the man. "I said crosswise! You!" he continued, and he kept pulling up Germans, three this way, three that, till he had a human cube as high as a hand could reach. "All right!" Solomon said, and his guests started swinging their clubs, whacking away at the cube as if they were hunters and it were a pod of Canadian seals. In the high tiers the Germans cried '*Bitte!* Please.' The Germans in the centre tiers moaned, but the Germans in the lower tiers were mute, for the weight of the two dozen people on top had pushed their viscera out and [they] were dying.

Sack's research was ignored to protect Morel and others. Other books detailing further post-war crimes committed against Germans by Soviet Jews may never appear. We know that at least 60,000 to 80,000 Germans were murdered in Jewish-run concentration camps in the east. The true figure is probably much higher.

Kaufmann had written that, "Germany must perish!" Germany – in the sense of an independent, self-determining nation – did indeed perish. Even after the demolition of the Berlin Wall, it is not a unified nation. Poland still controls much traditionally German territory. The rump state is still occupied by Allied troops. It has never been offered a peace treaty. Its victor-imposed laws are now more draconian than they were before its partial "re-unification". It is also still paying "reparations" to the Jews, which is one of the main points of the exercise. Any German who objects to all this as being Semitism-in-action can be thrown in jail without even the semblance of a fair trial.

Dismembered, raped, robbed, murdered, and still suppressed over fifty years later, the fate of the Germans is meant to be an example of what happens to people who oppose the Semitist demand that the rest of humanity should gladly submit to Jewish rule.

From a Semitist perspective the humiliation of the Germans was the significant outcome of World War Two. From the opposing perspective, it is significant that the non-Jewish casualties of that struggle are estimated at 54,800,000, including 25,000,000 Soviet citizens and 7,800,000 Chinese sacrificed to Semitism. Of the pre-war Polish population, 22.2% was killed.⁽¹¹¹⁾

16. “Unquestioned hatred of non-Jews”

One of the strangest documents ever to have exercised an influence on intelligent minds is *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. This purports to be a treatise written in perhaps 1897 by Jewish leaders who are plotting to gain control of the entire world and to enslave the rest of humanity.

An odd thing about *The Protocols* is that naïve anti-Semites still see it as confirming their fears. Such readers busily underline the passages, for instance, where Jewish control of the press is plotted or admitted. Yet we have already seen that by the 1890s the Jews already largely controlled the British press, and that this was common knowledge. The same applied elsewhere. In 1870s Berlin, for instance, there were twenty-one daily newspapers, of which thirteen were owned outright by Jews while most of the others were heavily Jewish-influenced.⁽¹¹²⁾ In Habsburg times the Austrian press was “entirely Jewish”, according to Wickham Steed.⁽⁹⁵⁾ The *New York Times* was bought in 1896 by the Jew Adolph Ochs. Currently the most influential newspaper in the world’s most powerful nation, it is still owned by Adolph’s descendants in the Ochs-Sulzberger clan.

The same applies to most of the plans and schemes of the Jews in *The Protocols*. By and large, by 1897 they were no longer a plot for the future, but rather a truism. Readers of *The Protocols* had – and have – only to look around to see the reality of Jewish cultural, economic and political domination in Europe and the United States. That domination, as Bismarck pointed out, led to the American Civil War. It caused the Boer War. It was soon to contribute greatly to World War 1, and to the various communist revolutions of the early 20th century, and to World War 2.

Philo-Semites often imply that *The Protocols*, which they usually describe as “a notorious forgery”, are a “cause” of anti-Semitism. As we have seen, anti-Semitism is simply a recurring, rational and logical response to the “chosen people” or “master-race” doctrine of Semitism. Rather than blaming particular books, writers, musicians, film-makers or politicians for anti-Semitism, both Jews and non-Jews alike need to recognize that reaction to Semitism is a human constant. Whenever and wherever Jews achieve immense power, their Semitist scorn for the rest of humanity soon causes resentment.

Interestingly, Jewish domination has grown more and more transparent throughout the 20th century. Given the international dominance of the U.S. and therefore of American thinking, it is not unreasonable to focus on Jewish control of the American power elite – which is largely a function of Jewish dominance in the particular media which influence that elite. W.D. Rubinstein has argued that “in most societies” the echelons of the most powerful elite number “about 1,000 people”. These people include:

The President or Prime Minister and the Cabinet, the major opposition figures, the most important (or possibly all) members of the national legislature, the high court, the chairmen or managing directors of the largest business enterprises, the heads of the major trade unions, leading civil servants, media and communication leaders and editors, major religious leaders and spokesmen for the most influential lobbying and interest groups. It also encompasses a nation’s 200-300 wealthiest men and women, the presidents or vice-chancellors of the leading colleges and universities, the most distinguished scientists and thinkers and the most important opinion-makers, however defined.⁽¹¹³⁾

Members of this elite group talk mostly to other members. To determine who sets the tone, one only has to poll them. This has been done. A 1970 survey of American intellectuals revealed that in terms of peer assessment fifteen of the most prestigious twenty intellectuals were Jews.⁽¹¹⁴⁾

It is not surprising that ordinary Americans consistently over-estimate the percentage of Jews in the U.S. population. According to Jewish figures the correct answer is one in forty. Yet when asked in 1992 to guess the Jewish percentage, two-fifths of Americans believed that at least one in every five Americans was a Jew. ^(37, p. 64) People outside the U.S. might be forgiven for guessing an even higher figure, given that American cultural exports feature Jews so prominently.

A few incidents can sum up the control by Jews of the post-war American elite. Let Gore Vidal, for instance, explain how America came to recognize the State of Israel:

Sometime in the late 1950s, that world-class gossip and occasional historian, John F. Kennedy, told me how, in 1948, Harry S. Truman had been pretty much abandoned by everyone when he came to run for president. Then an American Zionist brought him two million dollars in cash, in a suitcase aboard his whistle-stop campaign train. "That's why our recognition of Israel was rushed through so fast." ⁽¹¹⁵⁾

In January 1991 America was the world's only superpower. America was sending \$3 billion a year to Israel, as it had done since the days of President Nixon. J. J. Goldberg puts this in perspective: "Fully one fifth of America's foreign aid has gone to a nation of barely 5 million souls, one tenth of one percent of the world's population". ^(37 pp. 4-5) A similar amount was also being sent to Egypt to ensure its submission to Zionism. The only half-credible military threat to Israel at that time was Iraq. Gladly seizing the pretext of a conflict between Iraq and Kuwait over oil reserves, America led a United Nations force in a short and astonishingly brutal war against Iraq.

The Iraqis were unable to offer any resistance, but tried to show the world what the war was really about by lobbing a few ineffectual missiles against Israel. U.S. Presidential candidate Pat Buchanan commented that the war was promoted by the Israeli Defense Ministry and its "Amen corner" in the U.S. He identified four prominent American Jews as having played the main role in launching the war. These were former *New York Times* editor A. M. Rosenthal, former assistant secretary of defense Richard Perle, journalist Charles Krauthammer and former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger.

Following the war, President George Bush had the huge public approval rating of 70%. In the summer of 1991, Israel wanted a \$10 billion loan from America to build houses for newly-arrived Russian Jews. Bush decided to delay this loan for four months in order to stop Israel building new settlements on Arab land. According to polls, Americans supported the President's action by a ratio of 3 to 1. A large majority of voters even believed Israel should give up its stolen territories. The loan went through, but the American Jewish lobby wailed loudly about anti-Semitism. With elections due in November 1992, Republican members of Congress urged Bush to placate the Jews. ⁽¹¹⁶⁾ On 12 September 1992 Bush tried to curry Jewish favor by referring to American soldiers who had "risked their lives to defend Israelis in the face of Iraqi Scud missiles". This was true, but those who controlled American public opinion didn't want to hear it. Two months later, predictably, Bush lost office.

The incoming President, Clinton, knew better than to repeat Bush's mistake. He immediately packed his administration with Jews to demonstrate his "sensitivity" to Israeli and Jewish interests. This Presidential reconciliation with the Jews was celebrated in an orgy of Semitism on 22 April 1993, with the opening of the four-story "United States Holocaust Museum", built on federal land by congressional mandate. (Presidential candidate Pat Buchanan then described Congress as "Israeli-occupied" territory.)

President Clinton and his wife were not just philo-Semitic. Apparently they even belonged to a bizarre Jewish cult. Ambrose Evans-Pritchard revealed some of the details in an article in the *Sunday Telegraph* on 20 June 1993:

The full story is beginning to come out. The President and First Lady of the United States are followers of an eccentric cult, a Jewish heresy no less, that mixes the Old Testament with a dash of medieval cabbala mysticism and a good deal of 1960s campus Marxism. ... now we learn that [the Clintons] have been drawing their philosophical inspiration for the past five years from *Tikkun*, an obscure Left-wing Jewish magazine.

The word Tikkun apparently means “to mend, repair, and transform the world”. Semitism is certainly planning to “transform” the world. Many Jews believe that their Messiah is overdue. When he comes they plan to build a new temple on the Dome of the Rock, after which Jewish rule over the rest of the world will be made formal and complete.

Some religious Jews believe that a sign that this is about to happen is the birth in Israel of a pure red heifer. They draw this belief from the Book of Numbers, 19, 2-7. Interestingly, the *Sunday Telegraph* reported on 16 March 1997 that a pure red calf born in Israel six months earlier had attracted Jewish religious interest. Since this alleged event was of no interest to the rest of the world, it can only be assumed that the report was intended as some sort of “signal” to devoted Semitists that their time was perhaps at hand. No doubt there will be similar reports in the future.

If the plans of the Semitists ever came to fruition, what sort of world could we expect to inhabit?

Quite simply, one in which Semitist Jews lord it arrogantly over the rest of humanity. Some righteous Jews have even gone out of their way to explain the Semitist mentality to non-Jews. These include Raphael Patai, whom the reader has previously met.⁽²¹⁾ Another is Israel Shahak, an Israeli human rights activist who has tried to warn the world about the murderous teachings of Judaism.⁽¹¹⁵⁾ Thus, to give just one example:

[a] Jew who murders a Gentile is guilty only of a sin against the laws of Heaven, not punishable by a [Jewish] court. To cause indirectly the death of a Gentile is no sin at all.

In another work co-authored with Norton Mezvinsky,⁽¹¹⁷⁾ Shahak quotes the late, hugely influential Rabbi Schneerson:

The entire creation [of a non-Jew] exists only for the sake of the Jews.

This last is not the view of some vulgar and obscure extremist, but of a Rabbi who until recently had enormous influence over fundamentalist Jews in Israel, America, and the rest of the world. It is also, according to Shahak and Mezvinsky, in accordance with the Jewish Cabbala, according to which “every non-Jew” is “an earthly embodiment” of Satan.

Evelyn Kaye is another righteous Jew who has given us many insights into the repugnant attitudes many Jews hold toward the rest of the world.⁽¹¹⁸⁾ This is what she says of Semitism:

The mark of a truly devout Hasidic or Orthodox Jew, as well as many other Jews, is an unquestioned hatred of non-Jews. This is the foundation of ultra-Orthodox and Hasidic philosophy.

Jesus, who may or may not have been a Jew, is supposed to have taught that “A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit; neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. ... Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them” (Matthew 7, 18-20). If that test were applied to the Semitist ideology over the last century and a half, the results might begin with a sum of the following kind:

Minimum deaths in the American Civil War	618,000
Minimum deaths in the South African War	50,000
Minimum deaths in World War 1	8,758,000
Minimum deaths from communism	143,000,000
Minimum deaths in World War 2	54,800,000

That comes to a total of more than 206 million deaths, but it is just the start. To these figures should be added all the victims of late European imperialism, which as we have seen served purely Jewish interests. Then there are all the people who have died in wars of colonial liberation, which was fostered when Imperialism was no longer necessary to protect Semitist interests; and those who have died and are still dying in the civil wars and ethnic conflicts that have followed de-colonization.

Even that is still only a beginning. The exploitation of the Third World by the present Jewish-controlled financial system and its multinational companies has been accompanied by untold millions of deaths from starvation and disease.

Furthermore, the lowering of First World living standards through the informal equivalent of a latter-day Morgenthau Plan to de-industrialize Western nations has caused birth-rates to plummet below replacement levels. In other words, Semitist policies have not only led to an inestimable number of deaths, but they have also caused millions not to be born.

The entire world has a problem. It afflicts every nation, every race, every people. As the “evil fruits” of Semitism are tasted more and more throughout the world, anti-Semitism will also grow in consequence. Furthermore, as the messianic plans of Semitism for world domination based on Jerusalem become better known, non-Jews will become more determined to resist a world order that would resemble an international “Gulag Archipelago”. Yet even if those whom many Jews call “the nations” ever have the resolve and the power to deal with the problem of Semitism, it is difficult to foresee any humane approach that could succeed.

Expulsion has been tried. It has never worked in the past, largely because it could only ever operate on a piece-meal, national basis. The Jews fled from one country, found refuge in another, became rich through criminal or corrupt means, and were sooner or later expelled again, following which the cycle was repeated over and over. Expulsion is not the answer.

Zionism might seem promising, even though it has never been taken seriously by the majority of Jews, who prefer to thrive in lands “of milk and honey” created by the hard work of others. Yet even if a suitable Jewish homeland existed, and all Jews could be persuaded to move there, they could not be compelled to stay there. Sooner or later there would be another “drought in Canaan”, and Jews would again be begging for admission to other nations. The cycle would then repeat itself yet again, as it has throughout recorded history.

Karl Marx believed that “the Jewish problem” could be solved by destroying the Semitist monetary system that enables Jews to thrive. He was wrong. Jews in the Soviet Union proved to flourish even better on terror, brutality and murder. Much later, Jews after the collapse of the Soviet Union managed to take over many of the formerly state-owned industries at fire-sale rates.

The average citizen, at least in English-speaking countries, is so alienated from his or her own long-term interests that few can see anti-Semitism as a rational and moral response to Semitism. Heavy legal penalties often apply merely for questioning the role of Jews in the life of the nation. Some countries in the developing world enjoy far greater legal freedom, but their response to the Semitist threat is frequently naive. Yet the problem of Semitism, “the Jewish problem”, must be resolved. The alternative would be to abandon future generations to what the inimitable historian Gibbon called the “implacable hatred [of Jews] to the rest of human kind”. Even after more than a century of dreadful, mechanized wars – planned and executed without reference to those who did the heroic fighting and the tragic dying – humanity still has its claims in an increasingly Semitised world.

That is why the righteous Jews who have been quoted in this work have tried to alert us to the true nature of Semitism. Their honesty should inspire us all to accept that there is a problem, to seek a deeper understanding of it, and to work together toward achieving a fair and workable solution to one of humanity’s most enduring and fratricidal curses.

References

1. UNESCO (Anon), 1952, *The Race Concept: results of an enquiry*, Paris (UNESCO)

2. *International Covenant on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination*, 1966, articles 1 and 4
3. *Ealing London Borough Council v. Race Relations Board* (1972) A.C. 342, p 362
4. *King-Ansell v. Police* (1979) 2 N.Z.L.R. 531
5. *Mandla v. Dowell Lee* (1983) 1 All E.R. 1069
6. Lundman, B., 1963, "The racial history of the near east", *Mankind Quarterly*, 3, 179-88
7. Sayce, A. A., & Peterson, R., 1993, *Race in ancient Egypt and the Old Testament*, Washington (Scott-Townsend) pp 103-5
8. Parlett, D. S., 1967, *A short dictionary of languages*, London (The English Universities Press)
9. Hamy, E. T., 1907, "La figure humaine dans les monuments chaldéens, babyloniens et assyriens", *Bull. Soc. D'Anthrop. Paris*, 4, 13-28
10. Luschan, F. V., 1911, "The early inhabitants of western Asia", *J. Anthropol Inst.*, 41, 221-44
11. Baker, J. R., 1974, *Race*, London (Oxford University Press), Ch. 14
12. Haddon, A. C., 1924, *The races of man and their distribution*, Cambridge (University Press)
13. Freud, S., 1951, *Moses and Monotheism*, trans. K. Jones, London (Hogarth Press)
14. Koestler, A., 1976, *The thirteenth tribe*, New York (Random House)
15. Mourant, A. E., 1978, *The genetics of Jews*, Oxford (Clarendon Press)
16. Jacobs, J., 1885, "On the racial characteristics of modern Jews", *J. Anthropol Inst.*, 15, 23-62
17. See, for instance, Litman, J., (1984), *The Economic Role of Jews in Medieval Poland: The Contribution of Yitzhak Shipper*. Larnham, MD: University Press of America.)
18. Pritchard, J. B., 1974, *Solomon and Sheba*, London (Phaidon)
19. James, P., 1991, *Centuries of Darkness*, London, (Jonathan Cape Ltd), p. 194
20. Cartwright, F.F. & Bildiss, M.D., *Disease and History*, New York (Barnes and Noble)
21. Patai, R., 1979, *The Messiah Texts*, Wayne State University Press
22. McDonald, A.H., 1944, in *Journal of Roman Studies*, p 26 ff
23. Scullard, H.H., 1976, *From the Gracchi to Nero: a history of Rome from 133 B.C. to A.D. 66*, London (Methuen & Co)
24. Mommsen, T., 1961, in *The History of Rome* (eds Saunders & Collins), New York (Meridien)
25. Musurillo, H.A., 1954, *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs*, Oxford University Press
26. Smallwood, E.M., 1961, *Philo's Legation ad Gaium*, Leiden (E.J. Brill)
27. Grant, M., 2000, *The World of Rome*, (Phoenix Press)
28. Gibbon, E., *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*
29. Yeats-Brown, F., 1939, *European Jungle*, London (Eyre & Spottiswoode), p. 192 ff
30. Siegel, R. & Rheins, C., 1980, *The Jewish Almanac*, New York (Bantam Books)
31. Stein, H.F., 1980, "The Holocaust, and the Myth of the Past as History, *Journal of Historical Review*
32. Brendon, J.A., 1937, *A Dictionary of British History*, London (Edward Arnold & Co) pp. 296-7
33. Freeman, E., 1882, *The Reign of William Rufus and the Accession of Henry the First*. Oxford: (Clarendon Press.)
34. Hallam, E. M., 1988, "The Deeds of King Henry II and King Richard I", in *The Plantagenet Chronicles*, London (Macmillan)
35. Hibbert, C., 1987, *The English: A Social History*, London (Grafton Books), p. 142
36. Johnson, P., 1987, *A History of the Jews*, N.Y. (Harper)
37. Goldberg, J.J., 1996, *Jewish Power: Inside the American Jewish Establishment*, Reading, Massachusetts (Addison-Wesley) p. 96
38. Grabois, A., 1980, *The Illustrated Encyclopedia of Medieval Civilization*, Jerusalem (The Jerusalem Publishing House Ltd)
39. O'Callaghan, J.F., 1975, *A History of Medieval Spain*, Ithaca (Cornell University Press)
40. Lazare, B., 1967, *Antisemitism: its history and causes*, London, (Britons Publishing Company)
41. Stillman, N., 1979, *The Jews of Arab Lands*, Philadelphia (Jewish Publication Society)
42. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1963 edition, vol. 21, p. 122
43. Powell, P.W., 1971, *The Tree of Hate: Propaganda and Prejudices affecting United States Relations with the Hispanic World*, New York (Basic Books)
44. World Jewish Congress, "Where the World's Jews Live", *A special supplement to the Jerusalem Report*, 4 May, 1995
45. Goldberg, M. Hirsch, 1977 *The Jewish Connection*, New York (Bantam Books)
46. Bury, J.B., 1967, *A History of Greece to the death of Alexander the Great*, London, (Macmillan), pp. 774-5
47. Bridge, A., 1966, *Suleiman the Magnificent, scourge of heaven*, New York (Dorset)
48. Chetkin, L., 1985, *Guess Who's Jewish (You'll Never Guess)*, Schiffer Pub Ltd
49. Ginsberg, B., 1993, *The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State*, Chicago (University of Chicago Press), p. 57
50. Parkes, J (1934) *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue: A Study of the Origins of Antisemitism*, London, (The Soncino Press)
51. Grant, M (1973) *The Jews in the Roman World*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons
52. Shaw, S.J. (1991) *The Jews of the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic*. New York, (New York University Press)

53. Busch, M., *Bismarck: Some Secret Pages of His History*, London (Macmillan) Vol I, p. 157
54. Ludwig, E., 1927, *Bismarck: The Story of a Fighter*, Boston (Little, Brown & Co), p. 320
55. Davis, R.W., 1976, *Disraeli*, Boston (Little, Brown & Co), p. 206
56. Morton, F., 1962, *The Rothschilds: A Family Portrait*, New York (Atheneum), p. 98
57. Beller, S., 1971, *Herzl*, N.Y. (Grove Weidenfeld), pp. 4-5
58. Stern, F., 1977, *Gold and Iron: Bismarck, Bleichröder and the Building of the German Empire*, N.Y. (Knopf), p. 467
59. Sampson, A., 1981, *The Money Lenders: Bankers and a World in Turmoil*, N.Y. (Knopf)
60. Grieb, C.K., 1947, *Uncovering the Forces for War*, New York (Examiner Books)
61. Pirenne, H., 1957, *Mohammed and Charlemagne*, New York (Meridian Books)
62. Clissold, S., 1977, *The Barbary Slaves*, London (Paul Elek)
63. See Martin, T., 1993, *The Jewish Onslaught: Dispatches from the Wellesley Battlefront*, Dover, Mass (The Majority Press); or *The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews*, Nation of Islam, 1991
64. Randall, J.G., & Donald, D.H., 1973, *The Civil War and Reconstruction*, rev. 2nd ed.
65. Brown, N.D., 1982, *Journey to Pleasant Hill*, San Antonio (The University of Texas, Institute of Texas Cultures), p. 324
66. Simmons, H.E., 1965, *A Concise Encyclopedia of the Civil War*, N.Y. (Bonanza Books) pp. 91-92
67. Jones, J.B., 1958, *A Rebel War Clerk's Diary of the Confederate Capital*, N.Y. (Sagamore Press)
68. Davis, R., 1983, *The English Rothschilds*, Chapel Hill (University of North Carolina Press); Chapman, S.D., 1977, *The Foundation of the English Rothschilds*, N.Y. (Knopf)
69. Allfrey, A., 1991, *Edward VII and his Jewish Court*, London (Weidenfeld and Nicholson)
70. Roth, C., "The Court Jews of Edwardian England", *Jewish Social Studies IV*, 1943
71. *Report of the Select Committee of the Cape of Good Hope House of Assembly on the Jameson Raid*, London, 1897
72. Pakenham, T., 1979, *The Boer War*, N.Y., p. 518
73. Hobson, J.A., 1900, *The War in South Africa – Its Causes and Effects*, 2nd edn, London
74. *Westminster Gazette*, 17 September 1900
75. *Clarion*, 25 April 1896. (*Clarion* also referred to Johannesburg as Jewhannesburg.)
76. Massingham, H. W., quoted in *Clarion*, 24 February 1900
77. Hobson, J.A., 3rd ed., 1938, *Imperialism: A Study*, London (Allen and Unwin) pp. 56-7
78. Tuchman, B.W., 1987, *August 1914*, London (Papermac), p.81
79. Yeates, V.M., 1963, *Winged Victory*, Suffolk (The Reprint Society)
80. Barraclough, G. (Ed), 1982, *The Times Concise Atlas of World History*, London (Times Books Ltd.), P.118
81. Johnson, P., 1988, *Intellectuals*, London, (Weidenfeld and Nicholson), p. 57
82. *Karl Marx-Engels Collected Works*, (London, 1975), vol. iii, pp146-174
83. Hertzberg, A., *Liberalism and the Jews*, quoted in Rubinstein, W.D., 1982, *The Left, the Right and the Jews*, (Croom Helm Ltd)
84. Leggett, G., 1981, *The Cheka: Lenin's Political Police*, Oxford (Clarendon Press), p. 262
85. Sudoplatov, P., 1994, *Special Tasks: The Memoirs of an Unwanted Witness*, N.Y. (Little Brown & Co)
86. Vaksberg, A., 1995, *Stalin Against the Jews*, New York (Vintage)
87. *Figaro Magazine*, 19-25/11/78
88. Birmingham, S., 1967, *Our Crowd: The Great Jewish Families of New York*, New York (Harper)
89. Adams, B., 1896, *The Law of Civilization and Decay*, N.Y. (Macmillan)
90. Mayo, L., 1988, *The Ambivalent Image: Nineteenth Century America's Perception of the Jew*, Rutherford, N.J. (Farleigh-Dickinson University Press) p. 58)
91. Torrey, E.F., 1992, *Freudian Fraud*, (HarperCollins)
92. *American Jewish News*, New York, 7 March 1919
93. Thomson, M., 1957, *David Lloyd George, the Official Biography*, London, (Hutchison)
94. Landman, S., 1936, *Great Britain, the Jews, and Palestine*, London, (New Zionist Press)
95. Bassett, R., 1988, *The Austrians: Strange Tales from the Vienna Woods*, London, (Faber and Faber)
96. Heiden, K., 1969, *Der Fuhrer*, Boston, (Beacon Press)
97. Irving, D., 1996, *Goebbels: Mastermind of the Third Reich*, London, (Focal Point Publications) pp.163-167
98. Cohen, I., 1946, *The Zionist Movement*, N.Y., (Zionist Organization of America), pp. 210-211
99. Irving, D., 1977, *Hitler's War*, N.Y. (The Viking Press) p. 12
100. See Lamb, R., 1991, *Churchill as War Leader: Right or Wrong?*, London, (Bloomsbury). In 1938 Churchill "had just lost large sums by gambling in shares on Wall Street and the London Stock Exchange. So Chartwell was put up for sale for £25,000. Bernard Baruch, a multi-millionaire American Jewish friend of Churchill's, bailed him out from his Stock Exchange losses. ... Now, in 1938, another close Jewish friend and a prominent member of Focus, Sir Henry Strakosch, Chairman of Union Corporation, who had made an immense fortune in South African gold, rescued Churchill for the second time. Chartwell was saved, and Strakosch continued to visit Churchill at Chequers throughout the war."
101. Charmley, J., 1993, *Churchill: The End of Glory*, London, (Hodder & Stoughton)
102. Day, D., 1986, *Menzies and Churchill at War*, Australia, (Angus & Robertson Publishers)

103. Irving, D., 1996, *Nuremberg: The Last Battle*, London (Focal Point Publication), pp. 121-2
104. Hess, W.R., 1986, *My Father Rudolf Hess*, W.H. Allen & Co. Plc
105. Kaufman, T.N., 1941, *Germany Must Perish!*, Newark, N.J
106. Bernstein, B.J., in *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, Jan/Feb 1987
107. Quoted in Dönitz, J., 1967, *Zehn Jahre und Twanzig Tage*, Frankfurt
108. De Zayas, A., 1989, *Nemesis at Potsdam: The Expulsion of the Germans from the East*, University of Nebraska Press
109. Solzhenitsyn, A., 1974, *The Gulag Archipelago*, New York
110. Bacque, J., 1989, *Other Losses*, Prima Publishing
111. Russell, A., 1987, *The Guinness Book of Records*, Guinness Books, p. 193
112. Pulzer, P., 1988, *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria*, Cambridge, Mass. (Harvard University Press)
113. Rubinstein, W.D., 1982, *The Left, the Right and the Jews*, Croom Helm Ltd
114. Kadushin, C., 1974, *The American Intellectual Elite*, Boston, p. 24
115. Vidal, G., introduction to Shahak, I., 1996, *Jewish History, Jewish Religion*, Pluto Press
116. Friedman, T., "Senators Press Baker on Help to Israel", *New York Times*, 26 February 1992.
117. Shahak, I., & Mezvinsky, N., 1999, *Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel*, London (Pluto Press)
118. Kaye, E., 1987, *The Hole in The Sheet: A Modern Woman Looks at Orthodox and Hasidic Judaism*, (Lyle Stuart Publishers)