

[Top: Jewish References & Documents: The Protocols of the Elders of Zion: Anti-Forgery Arguments](#)

Copyright Disclaimer: The following informational study demonstrates why the Protocols of the Elders of Zion are most likely NOT a forgery. This study was found freely published on the Internet on October 18, 2005 at <http://users.cyberone.com.au/myers/hiding.html> and is provided here under "fair use" provisions of the copyright law Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107 for scholarly, research, educations, and personal use by those previously expressing an interest in viewing this study material.

Hiding Behind Auschwitz (updated to 2004) **This paper puts the case that *The Protocols of Zion* is a genuine document.**

Peter Myers, April 29, 2001; update March 6, 2004. Your comments please, <mailto:myers@cyberone.com.au>.

You are at <http://users.cyberone.com.au/myers/hiding.html>.

I wrote *Hiding Behind Auschwitz* in 1995. Since then, I have discovered more evidence, and considered the counter-arguments of Herman Bernstein and Norman Cohn, but I have decided to leave the original unchanged. I therefore preface it with some additional material (below). Correction (030211): the correct spelling of the name of the author of *Icebreaker* is Viktor Suvorov.

The sequel to *Hiding Behind Auschwitz* (1995) is the *Protocols of Zion Toolkit* (2002) - the most complete study of the *Protocols of Zion* available: [toolkit.html](#).

The *Protocols of Zion Toolkit* does not repeat the material in *Hiding Behind Auschwitz*, but, rather, follows on from it.

(1) New Material on evaluating *The Protocols of Zion* (2) *Hiding Behind Auschwitz*

(1) New Material on evaluating *The Protocols of Zion*

(a) Who Is Norman Cohn?

My main rival, the author whose study of *The Protocols* is now taken as final, is **Norman Cohn**. Not only did Cohn write *Warrant For Genocide* (Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1970); he also wrote the Introduction to Herman Bernstein's book *The Truth About "The Protocols of Zion": A Complete Exposure* (Ktav Publishing House, New York 1971).

This is **how Norman Cohn is described in *Who's Who in World Jewry***, Pitman Publishing Co., New York **1972**:

"COHN, Norman, Eng, author, educator; b. London Eng, Jan 12, 1915; s. August and Daisy (Reimer); MA, Christ Church Sch, Oxford, 1939; DLitt Glasgow; m. Vera Broido, Sep 3 1941; c, Nik. Professorial F, U of Sussex since 1963; found dir, Cen for Research in Collective Psychopath, since 1963; prof, U Durham, 1960-63; F, Cen for Advanced Study in Behavioral Scis, Stanford, 1966. Capt, Brit Army, 1939-46. Author: *The Pursuit of the Millennium* 1957, rev ed 1970; *Warrant for Genocide*, 1970; trans: Goid Khan and Other Siberian Legends; contbr to profsl jours. Mem Athenaeum. Recipient, Wolf-Anisfield Prize for Race Relations, 1968 Hobbies: walking, travel. Home: 61 New End, London NW3, Eng. Office: 3 Henrietta St, London WC2, Eng."

Only a Zionist of high rank would get such a writeup. Since Cohn is such a loyal Zionist, he can **hardly be a neutral, unbiased, observer.** Indeed, **the title of his book *Warrant For Genocide*, is meant to make the *Protocols* itself - the book - responsible for Auschwitz.** What next - book burning? Book-banning? The Suppression of deviant views? **Is this the mark of Intellect, of Reason? Or of Religion, of Propaganda?** In *Warrant For Genocide* Cohn skirts the main issue: **the pages of the *Protocols* which deal with finance, and seem to provide a manual on the operation of the Capitalist System.** This website finally gives me the chance to display the wealth of evidence for my case.

Cohn, the expert on millennial cults, fails to notice that the movement he himself belongs to - **Zionism** - is one of those millennial movements. And yet [David ben Gurion himself articulated](#) the Zionist millennial goal, [sourcing it at the heart of Judaism, the Bible](#). Further, other writers featured on this website, such as [Rabbi Harry Waton](#), clearly present a similar millennial vision. Jaff Schatz, author of [The Generation: The Rise and Fall of the Jewish Communists of Poland](#), attests to the pervasiveness of such views.

(b) J. L. Talmon, the Tsar and the Tsarina

Another leading Zionist intellectual, J. L. Talmon, who receives an equally lavish writeup in the same issue of *Who's Who in World Jewry*, makes the following statement in his book [Israel Among the Nations](#):

"Three years later the Tsar and all his family were helpless prisoners guarded by a Jew and a few Latvian assistants. 'There was grim although probably quite accidental retribution' - says W. H. Chamberlain in his monumental *Russian Revolution* - 'in the fact that **the chief executioner of Tsar Nicholas II and his family** in the Ekaterinburg cellar **was a Jew**', **Jacob Yurovsky** ... As if to heighten the symbolism of that dreadful end of one of the most powerful Royal dynasties in history at the hands of an obscure Jew, **soldiers of the counter-revolutionary army seized Ekaterinburg a short time after, and found in the murdered Tsarina's room a copy of the Protocols of Zion ...** " (pp. 69-70).

Talmon seems to be following Norman Cohn's book *Warrant For Genocide*. Cohn wrote, "Some months before her murder at Yekaterinberg the deposed Empress had received

from a friend, Zinaida Sergeyevna Tolstaya, a copy of Nilus' book containing the *Protocols*. ... the Empress took Nilus's book with her to her last home ... A week after the murder of the imperial family ... the remains of the Tsar, the Tsarina, and their children, dismembered and incinerated, were discovered at the bottom of a disused mine-shaft ... the examining magistrate found three books belonging to the Empress: the first volume of *War and Peace*, the *Bible* in Russian, and *The Great in the Small* by Nilus" (*Warrant For Genocide*, Penguin 1970, p. 126-7)

The Great in the Small was the Nilus edition of the *Protocols*.

If the *Protocols* were a forgery produced by the Tsar's own secret police, why would the Tsarina have kept a personal copy even in her own room, one of three books she took to her death? If it was a forgery, she would have had no use for it.

The *Protocols*' promotion of monarchy & aristocracy is an argument in favour of forgery. If it be a forgery, it would have been done by the Czar's agents who penetrated Jewish revolutionary groups & knew their mindset.

Herman Bernstein wrote in *The Truth About "The Protocols of Zion"*:

"{p. xxx} **Tsar Nicholas himself was also deeply interested in the "Protocols."** In the course of my research, **I discovered a copy**

"{p. xxxi} **of the 1906 Butmi edition of this anti-Jewish document in the private library of the Tsar** acquired several years ago by the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C."

In 1934-5 the *Protocols* was put on trial at Berne in Switzerland, by Zionists trying to suppress it.

Cohn says (following evidence presented by Vladimir Burtsev at the Berne trial), **that the Tsar was persuaded his by Minister For the Interior, Stolypin, that the *Protocols* was a forgery** (*Warrant For Genocide*, Penguin 1970, pp. 125-6).

In that case, why did the Tsar keep a copy of the *Protocols*? A copy of a worthless document forged by his own secret police? Does this make sense?

Herman Bernstein makes much of Phillip Petrovich Stepanov's affidavit in 1927, that he had been given a copy of the *Protocols* in 1895 (op. cit., p. xxx; a photocopy of Stepanov's hand-written statement in Russian is included at the back of the book).

Yet Cohn argues that the *Protocols* cannot be dated earlier than 1897. He writes, "internal evidence suggests that in saying he received the *Protocols* in 1895 and published them in 1897 Stepanov was erring no more than is to be expected after thirty years." (*Warrant For Genocide*, Penguin 1970, pp. 111).

The *Protocols* correctly anticipates certain phenomena, such as the draconian nature of Bolshevism, and the various attempts at World Government, which maintain the likelihood of it being genuine. **If the Czar's regime wrote the Protocols, how come [Jews owned much of the media in Russia at the time the revolution broke out?](#)**

(c) Hyperbole: exaggerating the Opponent's Argument, in order to Ridicule it:

A reader writes, "I am not prepared to believe that the Elders of Zion sat down in 929BC and decided to carve up the world by sending the symbolic snake of Judaism through its cities and all the other garbage about it. This is not even conspiracy theory, it's mystical crap."

That's not what I believe about it. I believe it genuine, but that does not mean the *Protocols* is right about everything. I don't know anyone who interprets it that way.

Nor does it mean that "there's a Jew under every rock" (another example of hyperbole). It does not mean that all of world history is carried out by Jews, but it does mean that Jewish actions are often "written out" of the historical record, setting others the task of "writing them back in".

(d) The Parallels with Joly

The existence of some parallel passages with Maurice Joly's book *Dialogue aux Enfers entre Montesquieu et Machiavel*, published in 1864, does not necessarily prove the *Protocols of Zion* a forgery.

i. If there is a worldwide conspiracy, then even if kept mainly oral, for co-ordination purposes it would have to be written down at times, and then some persons would have written accounts of it.

The other explanation, then, is that Joly himself may have copied from its text for his book.

The *Protocols*, on its own, cannot be used to establish a world conspiracy. But if such a conspiracy be verified FROM OTHER SOURCES - such as H. G. Wells' book *The Open Conspiracy* [opensoc.html](#)

and Benjamin Ginsberg's admissions [ginsberg.html](#)

and the 1946 Baruch Plan: [baruch-plan.html](#)

... then the *Protocols* can be re-examined in that light, and compared against the historical record.

That is the only way to evaluate it.

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

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

This happened at the Treaty of Versailles: wells-lenin-league.html

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

For all the Czar's toughness, his regime was more lenient than Lenin's; when the Bolsheviks came to power they were much more inclined to *execute* serious opponents.

In the second volume of Alexander Solzhenitsyn's new book *Two Hundred Years Together*, which has not yet been published, he frequently refers to Jews as "[the yeast of the Revolution](#)". For this, he is being labelled Anti-Semitic. Will this book be freely available in bookshops in the West?

The Protocols of Zion Toolkit: Herman Bernstein (1935) and Norman Cohn (1970 and 1971) argue that the *Protocols of Zion* is a forgery; plus arguments that the Bernstein / Cohn "forgery" hypothesis is flawed: toolkit.html.

(e) A Conjunction of Four Indicators

Consider these four Indicators:

i. A major political event occurs in world history, inaugurating a regime aiming to engulf the world, carried out by organised Jews [as documented by Bertrand Russell](#), and by [Robert Wilton and others](#). Even though some Jews opposed the new regime, that does not undo the fact that it was created by Jews.

ii. The Jewish role is hidden, denied, kept invisible. Many of the Jewish participants came from the West - therefore, some Western Jewish groups knew of the Jewish role, yet kept it hidden from non-Jews (e.g. in the public media, partly owned by Jews). There have also been dissident Jewish groups which tried to warn of what was happening.

iii. Non-Jewish supporters of the Socialist movement are led to believe that the new regime is benevolent, and the inauguration of a utopia.

iv. In fact it is a despotic dystopia for the very people among whom it is carried out. Non-Jewish Socialists are deceived and manipulated.

Now this pattern of events was predicted in *The Protocols of Zion*; yet no other type of

literature, e.g. the Socialist literature preceding the event, correctly predicted this conjunction of events.

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

If you know of other literature that correctly predicted this conjunction of events, please let me know <mailto:myers@cyberone.com.au>.

(f) Verification, the limits of Knowledge, and the nature of Proof

The Principle of Verification is incompatible with the Principle of Falsification. These are rival Epistemological Principles, used to evaluate concepts of Metaphysics (what is). **The former is used to enforce official scepticism against dissident ideas**, which are set a high bar to prove themselves. **The Principle of Falsification**, on the other hand, **posits that the onus is on the sceptic to disprove the new idea**: unless disproved, all ideas can be considered.

For more on this see [perspectivism.html](#).

The former is associated with a mood of Certainty, the latter with the idea that our knowledge can, at best, only asymptote into the truth, never quite get there.

A Daoist approach to philosophy: [daoist.html](#).

(2) Hiding Behind Auschwitz: Zion Against the Rest

Peter Myers B. A. Hons B. Sc., 21 Blair St., Watson ACT 2602 Australia. Ph -61-2-62475187. Date 30 May 95; Update 29 Sept. 95.; email: myers@cyberone.com.au

This paper puts the view that the holocaust at Auschwitz, terrible as it was, **is being cynically exploited by the Zionist movement both to motivate its members and to deflect criticism from itself; that it enables a defensive mask to be used as a cover for what is actually an offensive policy, both in the Middle East and abroad.** Further that the *Protocols of Zion* - the most tabooed book in the world - is an authentic document which contains a blueprint for Bolshevik Russia, and explains the terrible Debt crisis in the capitalist countries. The paper locates the *Protocols* within the Western utopian-fundamentalist-millennial tradition, which is the author's concern proper, the *Protocols* being but a sub-theme. As the Roman Empire declined, Christianity grew as a fusion of Hebraic and Greek culture-streams. **The Enlightenment period of the last 500 years has attempted to regain what was lost of the Greek culture-stream, by throwing off the Hebraic strait-jacket. The Zionist movement** assisted this process, because it rejected that particular branch of Hebraism which had led to the formation of the Christian Church; but it **wanted to manipulate the Enlightenment to impose its own brand of Hebraism, secularised as Bolshevism.** It persuaded many intellectuals to identify Bolshevism with Plato's *Republic*, using Socrates and Plato

against Hellenism. Depicting Jesus as a figure like Che Guevara, it used him against Christianity. **Moses Hess is a key link, the "red rabbi" who converted Marx and Engels to Communism, before coming out as a Zionist with his book *Rome and Jerusalem*.** Universal Morality has been a cover for a Tribal Ethic. Now, as the Enlightenment falters, having compromised itself, a new Dark Age threatens. The word-count of this document by computer calculation is 22174 words.

Breaking the taboo, I must justify myself. It would be assumed that I am racist; in fact I my wife is Asian, and our children have taken leading roles in multicultural performances for many years; we gave two of them names from mainland Asia. I support the Native Title legislation, and immigration except in times of economic depression. I believe that the Sphinx depicts a negro (Fortean Times, Feb 95). I will be accused of "antisemitism", yet the Palestinians and other Arabs are semites more semitic than today's Israelis. Even Karl Marx was accused of "antisemitism"; are all such persons "far right"? It was a leftist, Anarchist leader Michael Bakunin, who first claimed that the Rothschilds were manipulating the Left for their own purposes: Jews, he said, had "one foot in the bank, the other in the Socialist Movement" (quoted in Anthony Masters, *Bakunin*, p.182). The most recent evidence for it is Roland Perry's *The Fifth Man*, which shows that Lord Victor Rothschild was the major British spy for the USSR. This paper argues that **the taboo on the *Protocols* is based on disinformation.** It begins with a statement of **why this book should not be suppressed:**

1. The *Protocols* is a historical document without which the history of this century cannot be understood: it is relevant to World War I, the Bolshevik Revolution and Terror, Nazism, World War II, and the Middle East crisis. A copy was registered in the British Museum in 1906; in Australia, copies are held in the National Library and various university libraries.

2. **The claim that the *Protocols* is a forgery has not been proved. It is based on parallel passages with a book written several decades earlier. Yet in the case of the Gospels, parallel passages are taken as evidence, not of forgery, but of a common source in a third document.** The forgery argument is unsustainable because the *Protocols'* sophisticated language (including words such as "perquisitions", "interpellation", "congizance", "cassate", "rebutment", "apotheosis", "inexpugnable") and its great length show that it was meant for an extremely-highly-educated elite, whereas literature to rouse the masses to anti-semitism would have been much shorter and used simple language - as the *Communist Manifesto* does.

3. Suppressing it on the grounds that it is associated with Auschwitz makes no more sense than suppressing the *Communist Manifesto* because it is associated with Stalin's crimes. In each case the crime is independent of the book and cannot be blamed on the book. The *Communist Manifesto* is not suppressed; why should the *Protocols* be? Should the New Testament be suppressed on account of the Inquisition?

4. **In the first instance the *Protocols* is relevant to Russia not Germany;** specifically, the Bolshevik Revolution and the Terror introduced by Lenin and later

perfected by Stalin; Hitler copied it but did not invent it.

5. The *Protocols* appears to contain a manual on the operation of the capitalist system, which could be of relevance to the third world debt crisis today, and the economic decline of the English-speaking world. **It is a subject which one would not expect the Okhrana** - the Russian secret police accused of forging the *Protocols* to create anti-Jewish sentiment - **to have much expertise at. The material on capitalism is comparable to Karl Marx' papers *On the Jewish Question* and *The Jewish Bankers of Europe* . If the *Protocols* is suppressed, those papers will have to be suppressed too.** So will the writings of Bakunin, Shakespeare, and the New Testament. There is no clear limit at which "the line" might be drawn. Are all these writers blamed for Auschwitz?

6. The *Protocols* could be relevant in understanding the crisis in the Middle East and exploring possible solutions to it which might avert world war; wars in that area tend to drag the great powers in.

7. The techniques of thought control espoused in the *Protocols* are as sinister as those depicted by George Orwell in 1984. Many people feel that we are approaching this condition today. It is reasonable to consider whether there might be any connection.

8. The *Protocols* is one of the earliest historical documents to draft a plan for a world government.

9. The label "antisemitic" is like "Pommie-basher" & "Japan-basher". Chalmers Johnson, expert on the rise of Japan, was labelled a "Japan-basher" for years; his analysis is now widely accepted. When any group feeling offence can take action against an author, scholarship is straitjacketed, the Enlightenment is at risk. Labels and slogans can be used to stop debate; even the Pope did not think of calling Galileo a "church-basher".

10. The chauvinist mentality of the *Protocols*, unbelievable to readers after the '60s enlightenment, was prevalent among the Christian Churches only 30 years ago: the "ghetto" mentality was common. The author must admit that, as a Catholic, he used to think of non-Catholics as "pagans" in need of salvation; only 20 years ago, having left the Church, he encountered a Protestant who yet regarded him as a "Papist". Such considerations should caution the reader from judging the viewpoint of the *Protocols* too harshly.

The *Protocols* was first published in Russia by Professor Sergius Nilus, who stated that he had received a copy via dissident Jews who were privy to a plot to destroy existing societies and create a world government. A copy was registered in the British Museum on 10th August 1906. The original is generally dated about 1897, year of the first Zionist Congress. If authentic it may be but one statement of a plot which has existed for centuries. The main attack on the *Protocols* is Norman Cohn, *Warrant For Genocide*. The *Protocols* had three major distributions: (1) in Russia among the anti-Bolshevik forces during the Revolution, from which it also spread to Japan (2) in Western Europe

and the U.S. during the 1920s and 30s, and (3) by President Nasser in the 1950s & 60s. Jewish author Ben-Ami Shillony writes, in his book *The Jews and the Japanese*, 'In the 1980s the Protocols of the Elders of Zion came to enjoy a new popularity. In 1986 Yajima Kinji, professor of political science at the Christian Aoyama Gakuin University, published a book about how to read the "hidden meaning of the Jewish protocols." He called the Protocols the most mysterious document of the twentieth century, because all its prophecies had been fulfilled, in spite of its being regarded as a forgery. Yajima advised the Japanese to take the Protocols seriously in order to be prepared for the future. His book was a great success with fifty-five printings'(p. 218). The view that the Protocols explains U.S. foreign policy and its economic and social decline, freely expressed in Japan, is suppressed in Australia. The author obtained a copy of the translation from the Russian by Victor E. Marsden and from this produced a transcript for computerised analysis.

The authenticity of the Protocols has not been thoroughly investigated; the following pages establish a context in which this may be considered, encompassing (i) a study of the capitalist system, in which the analysis of Karl Marx figures prominently - this is a quite unLeninist Marx (ii) an examination of the secular mutation of the millennial-utopian myth from the time of the Enlightenment (iii) an examination of how the millennial-utopian myth entered Judaism from the Zoroastrian religion of the Persian Empire (iv) assessments of the decline of the U.S. and rise of Japan, in relation to Paul Kennedy's theme of the rise and fall of empires (v) the situation in the Middle East, and its connection to Zionism as a form of religious fundamentalism.

Geopolitics: Decline of the Empire

This paper is an analysis of Geopolitics from a Daoist point of view. Whereas the libertarian asserts the freedom of the individual and the authoritarian asserts the authority of social structure (family, state), the Daoist view affirms both sides of this Aristotelian contradiction: freedom is compatible with structure and both are necessary. Within that "whole", the Daoist emphasises freedom while the Confucian emphasises structure. This paper also has a somewhat Marxist perspective, but it is a Bakuninist Marx not a Leninist one: Bakunin saw human society as subject to Nature (the Dao, the Biological Inheritance), but Lenin, Nietzsche, Hitler and the Radical Feminists emphasise human will, humanity as maker of itself, society as malleable. This paper is not pro-Nazi, pro-British Empire, or religious-fundamentalist. It argues that the decline of Anglo-America cannot be understood without a study of the "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion".

"Anglo-America's ebb in the half century since 1945 exceeds any full century in the long-ago pullback of Rome", writes Kevin Phillips in his book *Arrogant Capital* (p.140); Jacques Attali expresses similar sentiments from a European perspective in his book *Millenium*. Zbigniew Brzezinski admits to a crumbling of the United States in *Out of Control*. James Davidson and Lord William Rees-Mogg say that we are in a great depression, in *The Great Reckoning*, - a depression denied by our intellectual leaders and media. In the 1988 American elections, the impending \$200 billion bailout of the

Savings & Loans societies was concealed from the American people by both major parties and the major newspapers, until after the elections. The very same newspapers that had pursued Watergate with glee, turned down the chance to expose the Iran-Contra scandal. The fall in the American dollar has received virtually no analysis in depth. In *The Confucian Renaissance*, a study of the rise of East Asia, Reg Little and Warren Read accuse Western academics of "a spiritual and intellectual failure" in not understanding - even denying - what is happening to their society. It once seemed that the problem lay in Japan, but there is increasing recognition that it lies in the West itself.

The United States has the world's biggest foreign debt, and may be attempting to pay it by printing dollars; this may be the reason for the ongoing devaluation of the dollar which may prompt East Asia and Europe to adopt regional currencies - the ECU and the Yen - in place of the dollar. Zbigniew Brzezinski writes of "indebtedness - which has already generated a cumulative national debt in excess of \$4 trillion, which involves a budget deficit in the neighbourhood of some \$400 billion in 1992, which imposes an increasingly critical - potentially even devastating - burden on America's future" (*Out of Control*, p. 104). According to Chalmers Johnson, by the Presidential election of 1996 "the United States' relative economic decline may be so marked as to require an end to its business-as-usual trade policies", in effect precipitating a break in the world trade system which would be a trauma comparable to the reversion of Hong Kong to China in 1997 (in *The Empowerment of Asia*, a paper either given in his 1994 tour of Australia, or thereabouts). As the American empire fragments, Britain is joining Europe, feeling as if it lost the Second World War. Australia is joining Asia, and the U. S. is withdrawing its zone of hegemony from the Western Pacific to the Americas, but also facing the prospect of civil war as the repercussions of the defeat ripple through the American people.

When I read the Protocols of Zion late in 1994, many missing pieces of the jigsaw seemed to fall into place; yet I find that this book is unmentionable, almost unobtainable, and close to being censored. What had started my interest in Zionism was a quarrel between Prime Minister Paul Keating and his predecessor Bob Hawke, over the support of the Zionist Federation of Australia, reported in the media in mid 1994. Thinking it strange that they should be jostling for favours in this way, I decided to research Zionism. Prior to that I had no interest in this subject, and had never read or seen the Protocols. The common objection "I don't believe in conspiracies" need not be taken seriously, since every meeting behind closed doors is a conspiracy. All diplomacy, foreign policy, business decisions and political strategies are done in this way. Conspiracies happen every day.

The Forgery Hypothesis Disproved

The Protocols refers to Goyim (gentiles) as if written by Jews; yet it has a number of passages in parallel with a book by French socialist Maurice Joly, *Dialogue aux Enfers entre Montesquieu et Machiavel*, published in 1864, in which the Goy/Jewish terms are omitted. There is also some continuity with a book *Machiavelli, Montesquieu et Rousseau*, by socialist Jack Venedey; the latter was Jewish but the former was not. The

realisation that the end-justifies-the-means methods of gaining and holding power depicted by Machiavelli might be usable by the revolutionary movement goes as far back as Rousseau, who stated that "Machiavelli's Prince is a handbook for republicans" (Social Contract, Penguin, p. 118; also see p. 131n). If a forgery, the Protocols would have been done by the Okhrana, the Russian secret police, as propaganda to stir up anti-semitism amongst the masses. If authentic, then it could have been produced either (i) by Zionists making use of secular socialists to further their cause or (ii) by Bolsheviks making use of Zionists to further their cause.

There is no proof that the Protocols is a forgery or is authentic; yet much knowledge is probabilistic. But the claim that the Protocols has been proved to be a forgery can easily be shown to be false, on four grounds.

1. Norman Cohn argues in Warrant For Genocide that parallel passages with earlier books show that the Protocols is a forgery. The Gospels are the most studied of parallel texts, but scholars do not argue that the Gospel of Matthew is a forgery just because it has parallel passages with Mark and Luke; most argue instead that the parallels point to a common source in a third document. Examples are John Crossan's "left" study Jesus: a Revolutionary Biography which puts the case for an underlying document called "Q", and Robert Funk et. al., The Five Gospels, which also infers the "Q" manuscript. Cohn fails to even consider such broader textual analysis. He knew his conclusion before commencing to write; that is why he chose such a polemic title.

2. The financial expertise of the Protocols is a subject which one would not expect the Okhrana to have much mastery of. Russia had considerable foreign debt, which the Protocols depicts as a trap. Cohn does not consider this at all; he completely omits to investigate the plausibility of the Protocols' financial statements.

3. The Protocols' length and complexity attests its orientation to an educated elite, whereas Okhrana propaganda would make more sense if oriented to the masses, shorter and simpler. The language of the Protocols is far too sophisticated for a book designed for the masses. Examples of its very difficult words are:

¥ "cassate": "If, however, anything like this should occur, we shall ourselves cassate the decision, but inflict therewith such exemplary punishment on the judge" (Protocol 15)

¥ "perquisitions": "This will give us the pretext for domiciliary perquisitions and surveillance on the part of our servants from among the number of the goyim police . " (Protocol 10)

¥ "cognizance ": "For our policy it is of the greatest importance to take cognizance of this detail" (Protocol 18)

¥ "rebutment ": "to which we shall respond either by accommodating them or by a wise rebutment to prove the short-sightedness of one who judges wrongly." (Protocol 19)

¥ "interpellation": "Besides this we shall, with the introduction of the new republican constitution, take from the Chamber the right of interpellation on government measures" (Protocol 10)

¥ "apotheosis": "Sulla enjoyed an apotheosis for his might in the eyes of the people" (Protocol 15); "They will acknowledge our ruler with a devotion bordering on apotheosis" (Protocol 15)

¥ "aureole": "The aureole of power requires for its existence ..." (Protocol 18).

¥ "inexpugnable": "They should recognise once for all that we are so strong, so inexpugnable" (Protocol 11).

Is this the language of the masses, or of an exceptionally highly educated elite? The Protocols' length (about 26,500 words by computer count) also shows that it was meant for an elite rather than stirring the masses.

4. Protocol 5 says, "We have set one against another the personal and national reckonings of the goyim, religious and race hatreds, which we have festered into a huge growth in the course of the past twenty centuries" (emphasis added). But the Protocols was written about 1897. If this was a reference to the struggle with Christianity, the period would have been about 1850 years - not more than 19 centuries. If Christians had written it, then its origin-point would have been the Jews' rejection of Jesus, i.e. the end of the Old Covenant and start of the New (until then, from a Christian view, the Jews were still the Chosen People). If the Okhrana had written the Protocols, this anomaly of dating would not have occurred. It is more likely that the 2000-year period referred to, begins not with Christianity but with the Zealot struggle which, from the Jewish point of view, began with the Maccabean War (which started about 167BC) or alternatively the hated Roman invasion (63BC). It was against the goy Romans, not the early Christians, that the Jews had struggled so bitterly, culminating in Masada. This dating is another argument against the forgery theory.

The Expulsion From Spain

This expulsion, in 1492, was remembered by Jewry in 1992; there had also been an expulsion from parts of France in 1489. Norman Cohn, in *Warrant For Genocide* (pp. 50-52), reports that a Rothschild publication *Revue des etudes juivres* (Review of Jewish Studies) published in 1880 a reprint of two famous letters relating to these expulsions: "they are known as The Letter of the Jews of Arles (or, in some versions, of Spain) and The Reply of the Jews of Constantinople; and they read as follows: "Honourable Jews, greetings and blessings! This is to tell you that the King of France, who is again master of Provence, has ordained by public proclamation that we must become Christians or leave his territory. And the people of Arles, Aix and Marseille want to take away our belongings, they threaten our lives, they wreck our synagogues, they cause us much vexation; and all this makes us uncertain what we ought to do to keep the Law of Moses. This is why we ask you to be so good as to let us know, in your

wisdom, what we ought to do. Chamor, Rabbi of the Jews of Arles the 13th of Sabath, 1489". "Well-beloved Brethren in Moses, we have received the letter in which you tell us of the anxieties and adversities you are suffering. The advice of the grand satraps and rabbis is as follows: You say that the King of France demands that you become Christians; do so, since you cannot do otherwise, but keep the Law of Moses in your hearts. You say that you are forced to surrender your belongings: then make your children merchants, so that, little by little, they may strip the Christians of their belongings. You say that attempts are made against your lives: then make your children doctors and apothecaries, so that they may deprive Christians of their lives. You say that they are destroying your synagogues: then make your children canons and clerics, so that they may destroy their churches. You say that the people are vexing you in many other ways: then see to it that your children become advocates and notaries, so that you will get the Christians under your yoke, you will dominate the world, and you will be able to take your revenge. Do not depart from this order that we give you, for you will see by experience that, from the abasement in which you now find yourselves, you will attain the summit of power. V.S. S.V.F.F. Prince of the Jews of Constantinople the 21st of Casleu, 1489."

Cohn says that these letters "were meant as a joke - the signature Chamor, for instance, is simply the Hebrew for donkey!" (p. 52). But why were they republished in a Rothschild publication in 1880? - on this, Cohn is silent. Karl Marx put a different view of the expulsions. In *The Russian Loan*, he wrote, "the Jews ... monopolise the machinery of the loanmongering mysteries by concentrating their energies upon the barter of trade in securities, and the changing of money and negotiating of bills in a great measure arising therefrom. Take Amsterdam, for instance, a city harboring many of the worst descendants of the Jews whom Ferdinand and Isabella drove out of Spain, and who, after lingering awhile in Portugal, were driven thence also, and eventually found a safe place of retreat in Holland. ... The smartest highwayman in the Abruzzi is not better posted up about the locale of the hard cash in a traveller's valise or pocket than those Jews about any loose capital in the hands of a trader". This does not mean that Marx supported the expulsions, because he wrote other articles criticising discrimination against the Jews, but it does hint that the aggravation between the Christian and Jewish communities was not only caused by Catholic intolerance of "infidels"; Jewish moneylending also contributed. In their book *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*, Therese and Mendel Metzger write, "However, the Jews were the first people to understand the importance of credit, and as early as the eleventh century they were engaged in providing loans auxiliary to their commerce" (p. 59). As friction between Jews and Christians grew, "in the end money-lending became the last economic link between Jewish groups and the majority of the Christian population" (p. 152). The "religious war" mentality of that time is strongly present in the Protocols.

Funding a Chinese or Japanese Military Buildup

The Protocols says that Japan or China might be funded to make war against unco-operative European governments: "At the present day we are, as an international force, invincible, because if attacked by some we are supported by other States" (Protocol 3).

"In a word, to sum up our system of keeping the governments of the goyim in Europe in check, we shall show our strength to one of them by terrorist attempts and to all, if we allow the possibility of a general rising against us, we shall respond with the guns of America or China or Japan" (Protocol 7). Japan was funded by Jewish bankers for its 1904-5 war against Russia, which led to an attempted revolution in Russia after its defeat, a defeat desired by Russian Jews. Jewish author Ben-Ami Shillony writes, in his book *The Jews and the Japanese*, "The Jewish resentment against czarist Russia produced financial support for Japan. The phenomenon of Jewish financiers raising loans for Japan out of a special attraction to that country started in 1894, when Albert Kahn, director of the French bank Goudchaux and later head of his own bank, helped to float a Japanese loan in Paris to finance the Sino-Japanese War, which broke out that year ... When the Russo-Japanese War broke out Jewish financiers in Europe and the United States, including the Rothschilds, refrained from extending assistance to Russia but were willing to give aid to Japan. This assistance, crucial in preventing a Japanese defeat, was initiated and engineered by Jacob H. Schiff (1847-1920), a leading Jewish-American figure" (pp. 147-8, emphasis added).

Subway Terrorism?

Norman Cohn ridiculed the sentence in the Protocols about subway terrorism, but the recent gas attacks in the subways of Japan show that it is not as far-fetched as it seemed. Whether they were done by the "far right" or the "far left" is too early to say (things are not always what they seem) but the Protocols is the first historical document to contemplate subway terrorism, as follows: "You may say that the goyim will rise upon us, arms in hand, if they guess what is going on before the time comes; but in the West we have against this a manoeuvre of such appalling terror that the very stoutest hearts quail - the undergrounds, metropolitans, those subterranean corridors which, before the time comes, will be driven under all the capitals and from whence those capitals will be blown into the air with all their organizations and archives" (Protocol 9).

Plan For a World Government

The Protocols, dated about 1897, Cohn agrees, the year of the first World Zionist Congress, is the first historical document to depict a plan for a world government (Protocol 6 and others); not a forum for discussion but a government, as the League of Nations attempted to be (Schiff's original name for it was "League to Enforce Peace"). Article 10 provided for a World Army, overriding member sovereignty; the United States chose not to join the League, on this account; Gareth Evans has called for a U.N. standing army, in an article in *Foreign Policy* magazine. In the October 1994 issue of *Round Table*, journal of the Institute of Commonwealth Studies (a descendant of the Milner Group, on which see below) Australian contributor Sir Zelman Cowan wrote that the UN charter provides for a world army, with the Security Council overriding the sovereignty of member countries: "member-states are enjoined to make armed forces available to the Security Council itself, so that it could 'take such action by air, sea or land forces as may be necessary' (Article 43)". Recent literature of the United Nations Association of Australia calls the UN a "global administration". But there is no proposal

that the UN be democratic. In the General Assembly, China has one vote, and Vanuatu has one vote, despite the difference in population; the Security Council makes most of the big decisions, the General Assembly only being empowered when one of the permanent members exercises a veto. The move to abolish the veto is probably aimed at outvoting China in the Security Council. Those who talk of "one world or none" do not consider transferring the Security Council's power to a General Assembly directly-elected by proportional representation. This would give power to China and the third world; that is why it will not happen.

Economic Rationalism (Thatcherism) and Other Platonic Forms

On this the Protocols says, "The goyim have lost the habit of thinking unless prompted by the suggestions of our specialists" (Protocol 3). "these specialists of ours have been drawing to fit them for rule the information they need from our political plans from the lessons of history, from observations made of the events of every moment as it passes. The goyim are not guided by practical use of unprejudiced historical observation, but by theoretical routine without any critical regard for consequent results. We need not, therefore, take any account of them - let them amuse themselves until the hour strikes, or live on hopes of new forms of enterprising pastime, or on the memories of all they have enjoyed. For them let that play the principal part which we have persuaded them to accept as the dictates of science (theory). It is with this object in view that we are constantly, by means of our press, arousing a blind confidence in these theories. The intellectuals of the goyim will puff themselves up with their knowledge and without any logical verification of them will put into effect all the information available from science, which our agentur specialists have cunningly pieced together for the purpose of educating their minds in the direction we want" (Protocol 2, bold emphasis added). "In order that the true meaning of things may not strike the GOYIM before the proper time we shall mask it under an alleged ardent desire to serve the working classes and the great principles of political economy about which our economic theories are carrying on an energetic propaganda" (Protocol 6).

The Foreign Debt Crisis Explained

The Protocols boasts, "Economic crises have been produced by us from the goyim by no other means than the withdrawal of money from circulation. Huge capitals have stagnated, withdrawing money from States, which were constantly obliged to apply to those same stagnant capitals for loans. These loans burdened the finances of the States with the payment of interest and made them the bond slaves of these capitals" (Protocol 20). "Every kind of loan proves infirmity in the State and a want of understanding of the rights of the State. Loans hang like a sword of Damocles over the heads of rulers, who, instead of taking from their subjects by a temporary tax, come begging with outstretched palm of our bankers. Foreign loans are leeches which there is no possibility of removing from the body of the State until they fall off themselves or the State flings them off. But the goy States do not tear them off: they go on in persisting in putting more on to themselves so that they must inevitably perish, drained by voluntary blood-letting. What also indeed is, in substance, a loan, especially a foreign loan? A

loan is - an issue of government bills of exchange containing a percentage obligation commensurate to the sum of the loan capital. If the loan bears a charge of 5 per cent., then in twenty years the State vainly pays away in interest a sum equal to the loan borrowed, in forty years it is paying a double sum, in sixty - treble, and all the while the debt remains an unpaid debt. From this calculation it is obvious that with any form of taxation per head the State is bailing out the last coppers of the poor taxpayers in order to settle accounts with wealthy foreigners, from whom it has borrowed money instead of collecting these coppers for its own needs without the additional interest. So long as loans were internal the goyim only shuffled money from the pockets of the poor to those of the rich, but when we bought up the necessary person in order to transfer loans into the external sphere all the wealth of States flowed into our cash-boxes and all the goyim began to pay us the tribute of subjects. If the superficiality of goy kings on their thrones in regard to State affairs and the venality of ministers of the want of understanding of financial matters on the part of other ruling persons have made their countries debtors to our treasuries to amounts quite impossible to pay it has not been accomplished without on our part heavy expenditure of trouble and money" (Protocol 20, bold emphasis added). The Protocols itself advocates the Social Credit economic system.

The Destruction of History

Australian writer Keith Windschuttle wrote a book titled *The Killing of History*, about the insidious effect of the postmodernist deconstruction movement in our universities. On this topic the Protocols says, "Classicism, as also any form of study of ancient history, in which there are more bad than good examples, we shall replace with the study of the programme of the future. We shall erase from the memory of men all facts of previous centuries which are undesirable to us, and leave only those which depict all the errors of the governments of the goyim" (Protocol 16, bold emphasis added).

Destroying Family Life

The Protocols says, "by inculcating in all a sense of self-importance, we shall destroy among the goyim the importance of the family and its educational value and remove the possibility of individual minds splitting off, for the mob, handled by us" (Protocol 10, bold emphasis added). It says that the party system is largely controlled by backing all sides. That activists infiltrate Left movements, attempting to steer naive utopians via slogans and block-voting towards the plot's goals. But that these plans and plots are confined to a few Zealots, that moderate Jews are as much manipulated by them as are gentiles, and that anti-semitism is useful to the zealots for bringing the Jewish masses under their influence.

The Next Cold War?

Leading U.S. theoretician Samuel Huntington has published a blueprint for a new Cold War against China and the Islamic block, in the Summer 1993 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, journal of the Council On Foreign Relations, the leading agenda-setting forum of the U.S. *Foreign Affairs* bills itself as "the most influential periodical in print". Huntington

says that individual nation-states can no longer withstand the internationalist pressures emanating from New York and Washington, and that they are coalescing into civilisation blocks for self-defence; those chiefly resisting are the Confucian and Islamic blocks. A U.S. alignment with Israel is implicit, and this is the basis of its opposition to Islam: it is central to the new "cold war" scenario. The U.S. is already implementing Huntington's blueprint: last December an American warship bailed up a Chinese submarine in international waters, and humiliated it; the Chinese government said that if this happens again its commanders will have orders to fire. President Clinton recently announced an embargo on Iranian oil, at a meeting of the World Jewish Congress; he earlier agreed to supply nine supercomputers to Israel "to simulate a nuclear weapon's launch, delivery and detonation, and complete its design without actual tests" (Canberra Times, 27/2/95). If the Huntington blueprint takes hold, as George Kennan's earlier one did, all of the world's major powers could get sucked into the Middle East conflict, on one side or another, with unpredictable results. Japan will leave its options open for as long as possible. It is too close for comfort to the scenario depicted by Nostradamus. Israel is a major nuclear power, with about 200 nuclear bombs, which it probably developed in conjunction with the apartheid regime of South Africa; Mordecai Vanunu is still in gaol for revealing this.

Ari Ben-Menashe, an Israeli military intelligence officer, exposed the Iran-Contra scandal in *Profits of War*. This story of the decade was turned down by U.S. newspapers; he reveals that Israel and the U.S. supplied both sides in the Iran-Iraq war, to get those countries to destroy each other. Victor Ostrovsky, a former Mossad agent, also makes such revelations in *By Way Of Deception* and *The Other Side of Deception*. In the former, he says that Mossad's motto is, "By Way Of Deception, Thou Shalt Do War"; in the latter, that Mossad engineered the Gulf War, and killed Robert Maxwell because he threatened to reveal a meeting "that he had arranged between the Mossad liason and the former head of the KGB, Vladimir Kryuchkov ... at which Mossad support for the coup to oust Gorbachev was discussed ... [because] if the Soviet Union were to stop being the enemy, there'd no longer be a threat from the east, and the strategic value of Israel to its greatest ally, the United States, would diminish. Alliances between the United States and the Arab nations in the region would then be a realistic prospect" (pp. 285-6). Huntington's paper shows that that risk has been eliminated.

A Medieval Movement Masquerading as Part of the Enlightenment

The Protocols appears to be a record, for insiders' purposes, of a plot against the churches and governments, that would seem to have emerged from the religious warfare of medieval Europe. It has a distinctive anti-Enlightenment feel consistent with both Christendom and Lenin's Russia: its most direct application is as a blueprint for the latter revolution and social experiment. The Anarchist leader Prince Kropotkin wrote to Lenin in December 1920, concerning his ruthless and merciless measures, "Is there none among you to remind his comrades and to persuade them that such measures are a return to the worst times of the Middle Ages and the religious wars, and that they are not worthy of people who have undertaken to create the future society?" (Volkoganov,

Lenin: Life and Legacy, p. xxix-xxx). Such ruthlessness is prescribed in the Protocols.

The psychology of the Protocols is behaviourist and inquisitorial, decades before "Behaviourism" was invented. Subjects (the goyim) are conditioned, using praise as positive reinforcement, rather than related-to as fellow human beings with whom one feels some empathy. Instead of debating an opponent, one "negatively reinforces" him by criticism. Any strong points in the opponent's favour are ignored; attention is instead focused on any defects in his character. This method is also used against organisations such as governments & churches. **This lack of empathy with the goyim is the coldest and most terrifying aspect of the Protocols.** Volkoganov says that Lenin's sister Anna wrote that Lenin's Jewish origins "'are further confirmation of the exceptional abilities of the Semitic tribe, [confirmation] always shared by Ilyich [Lenin] ... Ilyich always valued the Jews highly'. Anna's claim explains, for instance, why Lenin frequently recommended giving foreigners, especially Jews, intellectually demanding tasks, and leaving the elementary work to the "Russian fools"' (p. 9, emphasis added). This attitude of Lenin towards his own Russian people, is that of the author of the Protocols towards the goy.

The Protocols claims that the plotters' financial control of the media allows them to work against existing society from the inside, using a few well-placed agents and the gullibility and trust of the upholders of the social order. So preposterous is it that the targets do not recognise that they are being conditioned to do the plotters' bidding; the Enlightenment is threatened with a new Dark Age. The plotters have been assisting the Enlightenment's rebellion against Christendom, only to subvert it in turn, leading to another theocracy, this time in their hands rather than the Christians'. This is a theocracy in which even atheists can participate however, because Jewry is a tribe, that tribe which is the people of God. The "godness" is preserved in the tribe itself; thus the connection with this-worldly dictatorship (Marx noted such "practicality"). The plot of the Protocols involves the control of a majority by a tiny minority, via a concept of power, "underground" or "bottom-up" power whose strength lies in its weakness. Such paradoxes feature in the Chinese Daoist classic The Tao Te Ching, Sun Tzu's The Art of War, in Zen, the martial arts of East Asia, and some passages in the Gospels. To understand it requires "dialectical" thinking; "linear" thinking cannot do so. The best example of linear thinking is Clausewitz, whose ideas led to the carnage of World War I in which Germany and the British Empire bled to death, whereas the Zionist movement, using a dialectical approach, gained Palestine with very little effort on its part but by allowing others to use their strength. Hitler made a special mention of Clausewitz in his last testament, showing that he too was a linear thinker; Stalin was much more sophisticated. The Japanese "miracle-makers" have similarly baffled the Americans.

In The Zionist Revolution, Jewish writer Harold Fisch explains that Zionism first appeared to be a national-liberation movement, attempting to create a nation-state in the Enlightenment Project. This, however, clothed a religious interior. He points out that "Ben Gurion would say, 'The Bible is our mandate- - meaning that it constitutes the basis of the Jewish claim to the land of Israel. ... Ben-Gurion ... was not capable of convincing the sceptic that he was talking about something as potent, say, as Mao's

Little Red Book" (pp. 9-10, emphasis added). This statement of Ben-Gurion shows that Zionism is basically independent of antisemitism, i.e. it would exist even if there were no antisemitism, to recover the "promised land" on the basis of Bible texts; and secondly that Zionism does not shirk from violent means, as used in Mao's cultural revolution. In Israel today there is no civil marriage for Jews, only marriages performed by rabbis after tests of Jewishness, and a woman can only get a divorce if her husband agrees. The religious parties assume that the Bible is literally true, have forced the government to stop the national airline from operating on Saturdays, and have banned certain archaeological investigations. So much for Enlightenment Israel; shades of Khomeini's Iran. Fundamentalist Zionism has generated fundamentalist Islam, from the 1920s on, a clear example of the Hegelian dialectic.

Karl Marx: Philosopher of Capitalism

Although Leninism was despotic, Marx remains relevant as the philosopher of capitalism. Like all of us, he was right about some matters and wrong about others; I reject his millenarianism and his advocacy of civil war. Unlike Lenin, he did not hide his Jewish identity or do deals with Jewish financiers. Marx would complete the attack on authority Luther had begun: "As the revolution then began in the brain of the monk, so now it begins in the brain of the philosopher"; in *The Criticism of Religion is the Presupposition of All Criticism*, Karl Marx Library, Vol. 5, pp. 35-37. This sentence shows that Marx thought of himself as a philosopher, not an economist, and as being within the Western European tradition, whereas Lenin's Terror shows that he was outside the Enlightenment tradition and a major threat to it. A final point in Marx' favour is that he dissociated himself with the movement calling itself "Marxist", stating, "I am not a Marxist".

Marx On the Jewish Situation

Paul Johnson, who gave a major address to the Conservative Party to help launch Thatcherism, says in his book *A History of the Jews*, "Marx was not merely a Jewish thinker, he was also an anti-Jewish thinker ... the roots of Marx's anti-Semitism went deep" (p. 348); however to Johnson, no criticism of Jewish culture is legitimate; it is all "anti-semitism". Marx wrote, "Money is the zealous one God of Israel, beside which no other God may stand. Money degrades all the gods of mankind and turns them into commodities. Money is the universal and self-constituted value set upon all things. It has therefore robbed the whole world, of both nature and man, of its original value. Money is the essence of man's life and work, which have become alienated from him. This alien monster rules him and he worships it. The God of the Jews has become secularised and is now a worldly God. The bill of exchange is the Jew's real God. His God is the illusory bill of exchange" (*On the Jewish Question*, in Dagobert Runes, ed., *A World Without Jews*. In the T.B. Bottomore translation of this paper one reads, "From the beginning, the Christian was the theorizing Jew; consequently, the Jew is the practical Christian. And the practical Christian has become a Jew again." Marx says that Christians learned the techniques of capitalism from the Jews; today he would say that the Confucians have followed suit. He wrote articles about the Jewish Bankers of

Europe; in *The Russian Loan* (in Saul K. Padover (ed.) *The Karl Marx Library*, Vol. 5, p. 221) he wrote, "This Jew organisation of loanmongers is as dangerous to the people as the aristocratic organisation of landowners ... Let us not be too severe upon these loanmongering gentry. The fact that 1855 years ago Christ drove the Jewish moneylenders out of the temple, and that the moneylenders of our age enlisted on the side of tyranny happen again chiefly to be Jews, is perhaps no more than a historical coincidence. The loanmongering Jews of Europe do only on a larger and more obnoxious scale what many others do on one smaller and less significant. But it is only because the Jews are so strong that it is timely and expedient to expose their organisation."

Marx' Theory of Capitalism

The Protocols seems to include a manual on the operation of the capitalist system; Marx would have used this material. He invented the word "capitalism", after previously using "hucksterism", to describe what we now call the Economic Rationalist economy. According to him, its defining feature is usury, i.e. the charging of interest for money-lending. In practice, real interest rates of 1-2% must be accepted; what really characterises capitalism is real interest rates significantly above this range (the real interest rate is the nominal interest rate minus the inflation rate). In the capitalist economy, according to Marx, the whole economy operates not for the benefit of society as a whole, but for the benefit of the money-lenders - who do no real work. Marx concluded that the capitalist system had been invented by Jews, and they were at the forefront of keeping it operating; not ordinary Jews, just the big financiers in the league of the Rothschilds, the George Soros etc.

Most "leftists" misunderstand Marx' concept of Capitalism. They think they should encourage a struggle between "workers and bosses" or "men and women", a civil war which could hurt them all, whereas the real struggle Marx had in mind was that between the victims of usury and the promoters of usury - between those caught in the insecurity of the Economic Rationalist economy, and those doing well out of it. The struggle Marx wrote about is still going on, especially in the heavily indebted "South". In the capitalist system, one man's wealth is another man's debt: it is in this lien over the helpless poor, that the cruelty of capitalism is located. The media avoids mentioning the causes which keep the South in bondage; the Rwandan massacre was preceded by a Structural Adjustment Program of the World Bank, which exacerbated tensions in that country, yet this was not reported. Marx said that the payments going to the moneylenders amounted to taxes, taxes which should go to the government for spending on the people, but taxes instead diverted to the pockets of a financial aristocracy which had displaced the landed aristocracy, and which ruled society, controlling opinion through its ownership of the media and its influence on the political parties. This diversion of taxes is also done by the Mafia, and that is what the financial aristocracy is, a mafia, in whose grip we languish.

Marx could see what was wrong with capitalism, but he did not have sufficient skill in economics to provide the blueprint for an alternative finance system; that was later done

by Keynes, but to win support for it he disguised it as a form of capitalism ("counter-cycle spending") as shown in Paul Ormerod, *The Death of Economics*. Most "leftists" failed to realise that in Marx' time the Keynesian implementation of Market Socialism had not been invented. It was not that system that Marx called "Capitalism", but rather Thatcherism or Economic Rationalism. The Keynesian system Australia had from 1940 to 1972 (under Chifley, Menzies and McEwen) was a Market Socialist system with some similarities to Japan before Reagan forced it to partially Thatcherise, and other East Asian societies, characterised by a full-employment policy rather than a low-inflation policy, low real interest rates, steeply progressive taxation, substantial government ownership of utilities etc., and substantial government guidance of the private sector, via tariffs, boards and subsidies. None of this was to the liking of usurers, but they had to wait until the advent of the so-called "Left" Whitlam Government before they could begin to dismantle it - in the noble name of Internationalism. Since 1972 Australia has had an era in which Right economic policy has been combined with "Left" social policy. The usurers do not mind "Left" social policy too much, especially if it divides and distracts the public as the "sex war" has done; what they do not want is "Left" economic policy, i.e. a return to Keynesianism. Yet that is the only hope for our disheartened country.

World War I and Bolshevik Terror

The Protocols has some relevance to World War I, the war in which, through the rivalry of the Great Powers, Palestine was promised to Lord Rothschild. It says, "We must be in a position to respond to every act of opposition by war with the neighbours of that country which dares to oppose us: but if these neighbours should also venture to stand collectively together against us, then we must offer resistance by a universal war" (Protocol 7). The responsibility of the direct protagonists remains; the role the Protocols claims is that of facilitator. It claims to contribute to such wars via (1) funding (as was seen in the case of Japan, above) (2) exacerbating rivalries and (3) influencing members of secret societies. The Sarajevo bombing and assassination in 1914 were the work of such a society, Black Hand. Ben-Menashe and Ostrovsky (above) testify to such operations in recent years. Many passages in the Protocols advocate the use of "the terror which tends to produce blind submission" (Protocol 1), similar to the Terror of the Bolshevik state, which Left intellectuals had expected would instead be humane and enlightened. The horror of that terror, and the connection of terrorism with messianic millennial movements including secular ones, is well described in David Rapoport and Yonah Alexander, *The Morality of Terrorism: Religious and Secular Justifications*.

The Subversion of Marxism

Late last century Marx' movement was subverted by Eastern Jews fired by a messianic war against Christians. They spoke Yiddish and refused jobs which required work on Saturday, so lived quite separately from the Russians; relations were worsened by the czar's pogroms but also by the Jews' moneylending and their attempts at revolution. Their unassimilated chauvinism was the very thing Marx had condemned in *On the Jewish Question*, but that paper was now suppressed, and the people of the Protocols went on to create a totalitarian regime; Jewish chauvinists, the very people Marx had

railed against, took over his movement. Lenin was a Jew, but kept it secret. His biographer Dmitri Volkogonov, a Colonel-General in the USSR, later Director of the Institute of Military History, in 1991 Defence Adviser to Yeltsin, writes, "But Stalin, the Russified Georgian, could not allow it to be known that Lenin had Jewish roots, and his strict prohibition remained firmly in place" (Lenin: Life and Legacy, p. 9). Lenin also hid the fact that his revolution was funded by a West European Jew called Parvus; and Trotsky's funding by German-American Jewish bankers. When Lenin took power, he sacked the assembly elected about October 1917 in which the Bolsheviks gained only 25%, and wasted no time setting up the Cheka (NKVD, KGB), with a Jew in charge, to conduct a "pogrom" to kill off the non-Jewish ruling class of the old order: this was the nature of the Terror which Lenin introduced and Stalin perfected. It was Lenin, not Hitler, who invented the term "concentration camp" (p. 234). As Volkogonov searched the Lenin archives, "gradually the creator and prophet was edged out by the Russian Jacobin. I realised that none of us knew Lenin; he had always stood before us in the death-mask of the earthly god he had never been" (p. xxx); "The idea of the concentration camp system - the State Camp Administration, or GULAG - and the appalling purges of the 1930s are commonly associated with the name of Stalin, but the true father of the Bolshevik concentration camps, the executions, the mass terror and the 'organs' which stood above the state, was Lenin. Against the background of Lenin's terror, it becomes easier to understand the methods of Stalin's inquisition, which was capable of executing someone solely on the grounds of suspicion" (p. 235). Marx emerges better: "not that Marx, to give him his due, was much taken with the idea of dictatorship. Lenin, however, regarded it as Marxism's chief contribution on the question of the state" (p. xxxi).

Whereas Nesta Webster, in her book *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, accuses Jews of secretly fomenting the French Revolution, Marx accuses Jews of ending it: "And now even the Jews, whose eminent representatives, at least since the emancipation of their sect, have spearheaded the counter-revolution everywhere - what awaits them? The government has not even waited for victory to hurl them back into the ghettos", in Saul K. Padover (ed.) *The Karl Marx Library*, Vol. 5, p. 214. He says that Baronet Lionel Rothschild conspired with Napoleon in terminating the revolution, labelling him "a Jewish usurer who was notoriously one of the accomplices of the Bonapartist coup d'etat," in *The Jewish Bankers of Europe* in Saul K. Padover (ed.) *The Karl Marx Library*, Vol. 5, p. 215. When Jewish participation did swell it was largely in Eastern Europe, where they played a major role in establishing organisational structure, as Leonard Schapiro points out in a lecture to the Society for Jewish Study: "Thousands of Jews thronged to the bolsheviks, seeing in them the most determined champions of the revolution, and the most reliable internationalists. By the time the bolsheviks seized power, Jewish participation at the highest level of the party was far from insignificant. Five of the twenty-one full members of the Central Committee were Jews - among them Trotsky and Sverdlov, the real master of the small, but vital, secretarial apparatus of the party ... Jews abounded at the lower levels of the party machinery - especially, in the Cheka, and its successors the GPU, the OGPU and the NKVD" (*The Role of the Jews in the Russian Revolutionary Movement*, Slavonic and East European Review, vol. 40

1961, pp. 148-167). That was not counting Lenin, who kept his Jewish identity secret.

According to Marxist writer Enzo Traverso, "In the course of the [Russian] civil war, the Jewish population rallied massively to the Red Army (often the only existing defense against the pogroms), and its intelligentsia was recruited en bloc to the Soviet State apparatus. No longer an oppressed minority suffering discrimination, the Russian Jews were recognised as a nation with a modern culture. During the twenty years that followed the October Revolution, Yiddish culture - under all its forms, scientific, literary, and artistic - was encouraged and experienced a great development, although, parallel to this, the pluralism that had characterised Jewish life in the preceding period disappeared" (The Marxists and the Jewish Question, p.7). "The revolution transformed the Jewish intelligentsia, this layer of pariahs, humiliated and persecuted by the former regime, into an elite called upon to play a role of the highest importance in the construction of socialism. The Jews entered the state apparatus, universities, and liberal professions on a massive scale. In 1927, ten years after the revolution, they made up 1.8 percent of the total population of the USSR but represented 10.3 percent of the civil servants in the Moscow public administration, 22.6 percent in the Ukraine and 30 percent in Byelorussia. The sociologist Victor Zaslavsky has defined the situation of the Jews in revolutionary Russia as 'the first historical example of the coherent application of the principle of 'positive discrimination' founded on ethnic affiliation.' The conquest of the intelligentsia was a decisive element in inspiring the Jewish population in its entirety toward an attitude of support for the Soviet regime" (p.153).

Jewish author Ran Marom writes, "Since the end of 1917, the Bolsheviks had faced the problem of running a system with no professional bureaucrats and specialists. Without support from the Tsarist bureaucracy, they had to turn to the Jewish intelligentsia which saw in the Bolshevik Revolution an opportunity to achieve full civil rights. Many Jewish figures suddenly appeared in the Bolshevik administration, in the highest echelons of the bureaucracy, and especially in education, justice, banks, commerce, foreign affairs, and the secret police", (in The Bolsheviks and the Balfour Declaration, in Robert S. Wistrich (ed.), The Left Against Zion). Stalin's purges were in part a cover for the removal of the Jewish intelligentsia. Mao seems to have followed this cue: Paul Johnson says that on gaining power in China he expelled the Jews (p. 562). Soviet support for the Arabs in the Middle East wars led Jews to increasingly turn against the USSR, which was forced by their international pressure to allow Jews to emigrate, a successful defiance which emboldened other rebels. The USSR failed because lying became endemic. The nomenklatura were shielded from reality by their privileges and ideology; their repeated lies produced sullenness, distrust and passive resistance; just what faces us now.

Sins of Right and Left

Lenin, however, was clever enough to hide his paternity of the terror; the clean face was necessary to dupe the "Left" intellectuals in the West, those writing columns in newspapers and manning top posts in universities, and still refusing to acknowledge publicly that Hitler's terror might in some way have been a reaction to Lenin's earlier

terror. It was the Jewish leadership of the revolutionary movement in Europe which prompted Hitler's genocide, an act that humanity should forever abhor: one genocide does not deserve another. What should be equally remembered is Mao's Great Leap Forward of 1959-61, a failed "Left" experiment in utopia that caused a famine in which 30 million people died. The greatest manmade famine in human history occurred in our own lifetime, was created by a man many on the Left (including myself) regarded as a hero, and, compared to Auschwitz, is virtually unknown. Hollywood has showed no interest in it; there are no university chairs devoted to it; but does it not have lessons as stark as Auschwitz? Those who would "throw the first stone" at me for raising questions about the Protocols, should first be examined on their reaction to the Great Leap Forward. Have they written about it extensively in their newspaper columns? Are Chinese lives cheaper than Jewish ones?

The Jewish Identity

The Jews are called "semites", even though in genes and culture many are European. In his book *The Thirteenth Tribe*, Arthur Koestler showed that the East European Jews were mostly descendants of the medieval Khazar state which converted to Judaism. The word "semitic" signifies a cultural (language) group stretching from Iraq to Egypt to Morocco, also called "Afroasiatic". Into that region, about 4000 years ago, Indo-European (Aryan) invaders came with cavalry and chariots, the tanks of those days. The effect was so devastating, even on Egypt, that all societies had to adopt this chariot technology to survive: Pharaoh thenceforth was depicted riding a chariot, and there was even a branch of Jewish mysticism devoted to the image of Yahweh upon his throne-chariot, i.e. Merhavah (Merkabah); it is preserved in the Kabala (Zohar), the book of Ezekiel, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Richard Friedman, in *Who Wrote the Bible*, shows that Yahweh's Tent (tabernacle) was placed in the First Temple, under the outstretched wings of two cherubs. A cherub was a winged human-headed lion - a sphinx. Margaret Barker, in *The Older Testament*, shows that the outstretched wings of two cherubs were also seen as supporting Yahweh's Chariot. In calling themselves "semites", the Jews are recalling their past. Their most devastating memory is the subjugation by Rome, while they have fond memories of the Persian Empire of Cyrus (also Indo-European); this was the empire which destroyed the independence of Ancient Egypt forever (tragically, in my view). Egypt was the great semitic civilisation, yet the Bible has not a good word for it: perhaps a case of Jewish anti-semitism? Around 2000 BC, Aryan invaders had destroyed the civilisation of Ancient India (again, tragically), which had been bigger in extent than that of Egypt or Mesopotamia. The Jewish tradition fancifully tells them that they vanquished the Pharaohs, and that they can defeat Rome as well. The modern Rome being the U.S. (for Jehovah's Witnesses it is the modern Babylon), this is a problem, since more Jews prefer to live there than in Israel.

Books such as David Vital, *The Future of the Jews: a People at the Crossroads?*, Seymour Lipset and Earl Raab, *Jews in the New American Scene*, and Jonathan Sacks, *One People?*, analyse the Jewish identity, torn between the country they are in and a sense of themselves as a tribe, between secular and religious, between Orthodox and Reform. The tribal unifying factor is their ancient history, as presented in Bible, Talmud,

and Kabbala (which horrifies fundamentalist Christians but fascinates New Ager). Few Christians know that the Jewish religion, like the Catholic Church, prizes Tradition as well as Scripture, the oral Torah alongside the written Torah. They see their Tradition as evolving, to cope with new circumstances. While rabbis have often been leaders, to some extent the Tradition is the hands of all Jews, i.e. the Jewish people. A person can convert to this faith, but the priesthood is hereditary: the tribe of Levi (Levy); the word Cohn (Cohen, Cowen) means "priest". Not believing in personal immortality, for Jews the only immortality is that of the Jewish people itself. The Jewish Utopia is not an ethereal "Heaven", but a future Israel on Earth, a theocracy over "the peoples" (as the Jewish Christian churches the Jehovah's Witnesses and Christadelphia Ecclesia preach). Such a view allows even Jewish atheists to participate in the messianic project. In contrast Jesus declared, Buddha-like, "my kingdom is not of this world"; man lives "not by bread alone" but by enacting, in one's life, a spiritual drama. Thus it has been in all traditional societies. Modernism, as an attempt to live "by bread alone", is destroying the West.

The German-Jewish Dilemma

Steven Aschheim, *Brothers and Strangers*, shows that the unfavourable image of the unassimilated Ostjuden was created by the emancipated western Jews themselves. Jacob Wassermann, *My Life as German and Jew*, published in 1933, depicts the difficulty in being both German and Jewish. He writes, "The tragedy of the Jew's life is the union in his soul of a sense of superiority and the feeling that he carries a stigma of inferiority. He must live and find his bearings in the constant conflict and friction between these two emotional currents ... I have come to realize that a race cannot be permanently the Chosen People, and that it cannot permanently designate itself as such, without conflicting with the proper order of things as seen by other nations" (p.75). He mentions that whereas in Germany Jews were unobtrusive, in Vienna "the whole of public life was dominated by Jews. The banks, the Press, the theatre, literature, social organizations, all were in the hands of Jews" (p. 144). It was Vienna that shaped Adolf Hitler's perceptions of the Jews. **Wasserman recalls meeting in Hamburg, some years before 1914, a young Russian Jew whose "father had died in prison; his brothers were in Siberia; his sister had been killed in a pogrom. He himself was destitute, homeless, a fugitive. ... The scandal of the ages was unmasked, and justice bowed her head. Yet why was that austere masculine face transformed into a Gorgon's head before my eyes? Was it because of the terrible presumption of the individual who set himself up as the judge of all humanity? ... His keen logic and the scientific basis of his will to destroy laid bare the gulf between us" (pp. 162-3). "It is contrary to the divine ideal for the individual to claim the deciding voice in relation between crime and atonement. With this belief I stand and fall. He may rave, he may destroy everything about him, with a flaming torch in his hand he may become as a demon accursed; yet with all his passion, and even by reason of it, he still submits to the divine ideal; or so it seems to me, for he remains within the sphere of humanity. But when he comes forward with a self-assumed judicial title, and by virtue of his sovereignly enlightened spirit seeks to arrest and adjust the scales that with their secular burden rise and fall incessantly between heaven and hell, then he is only the enemy of the human race, the man whom God cast out" (p.**

Zealots, not the People

The Protocols, if genuine, is a program of the "learned elders" of Zion: a group of zealots, not of the whole Jewish people. A Jewish newspaper of Sydney, The Hebrew Standard, ran a debate over Zionism between moderate Sir Isaac Isaacs, the most eminent Jew in Australia, the first Australian-born Governor General, and his Zealot critics. One of the latter wrote, "Zionism is a magnificent structure that was shaped and formed, with infinite love and immeasurable suffering by the master-minds of the Jewish people throughout countless generations" (letter by Rabbi L. A. Falk, Hebrew Standard, 15/1/1942, emphasis added here and below). Sir Isaac replied, 'It is common knowledge in Jewish history that the aggressive or "Masada" type of Zealots were also called Sicarii from the sica that is the dagger that each carried under his cloak, and with which he dispatched any one who advocated moderation or any course contrary to their fanatic tenets, and who was therefore regarded by them as a traitor. The modern "dagger" is of course the pen dipped in bitter ink' (letter, Hebrew Standard, 22/1/1942). He himself advocates spiritual Zionism, 'that looks to the future of Judaism as one of a fuller life for our people and the Faith we hold, a life of peace with all the world and universal goodwill. It is utterly opposed to the "Masada" stamp of Zionism, one of desperation, defeat and death.' In the 28/10/43 issue he even quoted Mein Kampf, and argued that antisemitism is caused by Jewish nationalists themselves: "ANTI-SEMITISM AND JEWISH NATIONALISM HAVE A CERTAIN AMOUNT IN COMMON. Both regard the Jews as a separate people from the Gentiles, and as STRANGERS and ALIENS in whatever country they may have settled over however long a period of time." A brave man.

Originally Not Judaic

The historicist component of Jewish thought is in origin not semitic but Indo-European. Zoroastrianism was the means by which this Indo-European idea entered Jewish consciousness from the time of the First Persian Empire (539BC) to the Parthian Empire. The ancient Persian god Zurvan, i.e. Time, i.e. Kronos, is deified in Marxism as "History". These influences on Jewish culture are described in Mary Boyce, A History of Zoroastrianism; this religion being the religion of the ruling elite of the Persian Empire, it also greatly influenced the Greek philosophers, Greece being but a blip on the edge at the Persian empire - an empire which stretched from India to Upper Egypt. During this time Judaism was reconstructed by Ezra and the present Bible was written from oral traditions, beginning about 80 years after Cyrus freed the Jews in 539BC; any earlier written texts had been lost when the First Temple was destroyed by the Assyrians; the story of Adam and Eve was a late addition by Ezra. The Zoroastrian influence is discussed in Zoroastrians and the West, Unit 27 of the Open University series Man's Religious Quest. Influence from the Parthian Empire in the period 54-38 BC was particularly strong (p. 31). It is in this period that Barbara Thiering says Hillel and Menahem came to Israel from Babylonian Judaism: "Menahem was a man of talent who founded the Magians, whose name reflected their Babylonian culture ... It was probably

Menahem, with his Essene interest in calendar and prophecy, who conceived the idea of a thousand year empire of the Jews." (Jesus the Man, pp. 27-28, emphasis added). The Kingdom of the Jews would be "the greatest empire yet known", the throne in Jerusalem, and Rome under its sway as "a subordinate territory" (pages 28-29). To this end the Essenes and Zealots devoted themselves, culminating in Masada; the Zionist movement kept the vision alive for two thousand years, but some Jews fear that it will lead to another Masada - on a much bigger scale. The same Jerusalem-Rome polarity reappears in the title of Moses Hess' book Rome and Jerusalem, which instigated the re-surfacing of the Zionist movement; Hess was the "red rabbi" who had earlier converted both Karl Marx and Frederick Engels to Communism, before disowning it himself.

Tribalism and Universalism

The Jewish ethic is a fusion of Tribalism and Universalism. The former is evidenced by the focus on Auschwitz to the exclusion of the terror of Leninism, the Great Leap Forward, and the war against the Palestinians. Zealot activists want to bring the millennium to the world (a thousand-year period of peace; it need not begin in any particular year, the point is its duration); the Protocols' program shows this feature: the goals are good, but it uses immoral means to achieve them. But though the aim would be to create an equal world, it is an equality administered by them; they are the light-bringers to humanity; their high-priest ("pope") is the mediator between God and humanity; and they themselves are a priestly people ruling as a theocracy. This scenario is much as "Jewish" Christian sects envisage, such as the Jehovah's Witnesses and the Christadelphia Ecclesia, each conspicuous by a lack of ecumenical ties with any other "Christian" church, and for its subversive attacks on all other churches; each looks forward to Armageddon, with glee at the prospect of the wicked being destroyed by Jehovah. Each imagines that its adherents will form the theocracy of the New Earth, inspired by the image of those who reign "with Christ a thousand years" (Revelation 20:4); a thousand years being a millennium. The Jehovah's Witnesses is a hierarchical sect controlled by twelve men in Brooklyn. The Christadelphia Ecclesia book *The Jews, Rome and Armageddon*, by Roger Stokes, depicts the Jews as the true Christians, and the pope as the Antichrist. In its version of Armageddon, the final battle will be between those who align themselves with the Jews, who will win, and the rest, who will lose; it is very much anti the Protocols, it rightly castigates Hitler but is pro- Lenin, despite his terror and his persecution of the churches, and strongly pro-Balfour Declaration and pro-Zionist. The Christadelphia Ecclesia used to place signs on railway stations in Sydney saying "One World Government in the Name of Our Lord Jesus Christ". When The Australian newspaper ran a supplement on Israel on 4 May 1995, the Christadelphia Ecclesia placed an advertisement in it, stating that the usual Christian interpretation of the Christian scriptures was unscriptural! A strange doctrine for a group calling itself "Christian"; could this instead be ideological warfare directed against Christianity - an attack from the inside? Could these two churches be affiliated with the Zionist movement, at the top level either now or in the past, as a means of sowing dissension within Christianity? The theocracy they advocate sounds like medieval Christendom. This is something like what the authors of the Protocols are aiming at:

they would use greed, subversion, war etc. during the time of struggle, but after gaining world control they would abandon the ideology of Progress and return to Community.

Frederick Engels, in his articles *On the History of Early Christianity* and *The Book of Revelation*, noted the similarity between the early Christian movement and the early Socialist movement. He pointed out that the author of Revelation regarded himself as a Jew (see Revelation 2:9 and 3:9), and that this is not a book of Love but a book of Hate, promising retribution - Hell - against the Romans who had put down the Jewish uprising. This element of Hate has also been present in the "Left" movement since the French Revolution; it is behind Lenin's terror. There is a parallel between what the Zealot fundamentalist movement has been doing to the West in recent centuries, and what the Christians did to the Roman Empire before Constantine's "conversion". Christianity began as a breakaway Jewish sect fusing Plato's God with Yahweh, spreading rapidly amongst people who had earlier converted to Judaism but found its pollution laws silly. It deconstructed the religious worldview of the empire, its metaphysics and value system, shielding itself all the while in the guise of victim. After Constantine, the Church gained power and turned the tables, switching from Victim to Enforcer.

Ideological Warfare

Ideological warfare is based on the premise articulated by Hegel, that what holds a society together is shared ideas, such that each culture lives in its own mental world. That there is a main idea in each culture, which is articulated in its family life, its economy, its manners, its art etc. What Marx added to Hegel is the insight that the main idea, that which props up the whole social order, is inevitably a concoction of viewpoints which contains contradictions and errors. Normally, these are not brought to public attention, so people ignore them. If, however, they are brought to public attention, and public focus on them is sustained over a long period of time, then the social order is vulnerable to collapse, because its unifying idea is gone. This applied equally to those societies Marx despised, and to those constructed in his name. A remedy is possible where the contradictions and errors are minor and can be contained by a reconstruction of the main idea, resolving the exposed contradictions and error in a "development of doctrine". Where the contradictions are too great, as in the later Roman Empire, late Christendom, the late USSR, and perhaps our own Western culture at present, there is no remedy. E.F. Schumacher articulated the dangers in *Small Is Beautiful* (p 89-90).

In both the later Roman Empire, and the modern European world, the method of attack has been (a) ideological subversion and (b) martyrdom, i.e. victimhood. Ideological subversion means deconstructing the world view and value system upon which the social order is based, so that people no longer know what to think (are confused), and social bonds are broken (are isolated). Every worldview can be thus criticised, but these masters in ideological warfare are holding a powerful torch, focused on their target, so that the beam does not shine on the holders themselves, shielding the inconsistencies etc. in their own world view from deconstruction. Khrushchev's courageous speeches about Stalin led to the first major deconstruction of Leninism in the West. The ideological warrior knows that his lies must have an element of truth, for credibility. But

there are many injustices around, to be picked on: numerous minorities receiving a bad deal, who often enough have genuine grievances, and can be brought into the revolution. The revolutionaries have contributed to remedying grievances such as the plight of colonised peoples. But those peoples liberated from European colonialism have often been cast into an even worse colonialism, that of the World Bank and IMF, not the charities they seem but profit-making agencies bleeding the Third World to death. The lesson is that, when faced with an injustice and considering overthrowing it, one is tempted to assume that its replacement will be better than the initial situation. It may be; it may not be.

The strategy of the ideological warriors is to pinpoint the weaknesses in the "enemy's" ideology and practice, and exaggerate them, so that the enemy appears, not just a "bad guy", but totally bad, lacking any good qualities whatsoever. As a result, followers are encouraged to feel that they have no common interests with the "bad guys", no common humanity. The way is then open for hate, killing, and revolution. But what kind of "good" regime can be built on such a foundation? The illusion of "good" must then be maintained by abolishing the memory of what things were like before the revolution, in case it seem better than what followed, vilifying it, changing the terminology even, using terms which themselves contain judgments, like "female genital mutilation" in place of the more neutral "female circumcision". The findings of Cognitive Anthropology, which studies ideology in relation to language, may have been used for ideological warfare. Many Anthropologists take their cue from Rousseau and Plato, not Darwin, being not observers of human nature, but engineers of society.

Newspeak - Language As Despotism

Westerners overseeing modernisation in developing countries install an indigenous elite which is required to stamp out traditional ideas and practices inconsistent with an international division of labour and Western "internationalist" values. Development is assumed to be a linear process converging on a world culture. The elimination of tradition is done by manipulation of the language, so that words are no longer available to express the old culture, the idea being that actions are limited by thoughts, thoughts by words: rearrange the words and meanings available to people, and you rearrange their mental furniture, thereby eliminating unwanted features of the old culture. Newspeak, in a word; [Kinhide Mushakoji's name for it is Occlusion](#), in his paper Post-Modern Cultural Development in East Asia, in *The Futures of Asian Cultures*, Unesco, Bangkok 1993. Occlusion is "a process influencing the cognitive structure of a society and affecting its discourse through the selective elimination or marginalization of concepts and propositions, which makes it difficult for the society to focus attention, or even to perceive a certain aspect of the reality which was previously included in its field of attention." (p. 78, note 12). This is a brilliant description of Newspeak such as in Australia today, with the marginalisation of the Menzies era as an "industrial museum", despite the greater social equity then. At least we had a manufacturing industry then. Now we turn coal and iron into steel bars and call them "elaborately transformed manufactures", while our trade in finished manufactured goods runs a large deficit.

Victimhood means portraying one's movement as a victim of the social order, rather than the attacker undermining it, as persecuted rather than subversive. Stalin noted how clever Lenin was at this: in the early days of the revolution, when it was not secure, Lenin called for supporters to "defend the revolution", whereas he himself was launching the attack on the old order. Playing the victim motivates one's followers to struggle and sacrifice, since they are able to see themselves as Good and the "Oppressor" as Bad, in a Good-vs-Evil struggle which is the characteristic feature of fundamentalist thinking, including secular fundamentalism: this is "holy war", as much a feature of Bolshevism and Radical Feminism as of any religious movement.

The Millennial Myth

The history of fundamentalist worldviews does not, however, begin with the Jews. They acquired it from the Zoroastrian religion, while they were living in Babylon, which they preferred to Jerusalem, even though Cyrus had allowed them to return. Cyrus is hailed in the Bible as a messiah who freed the Jews from exile. From the Zoroastrian religion the Jews borrowed Angelology, the God-vs-Satan struggle, the linear notion of history as a movement towards an apocalyptic armageddon inaugurating a millennium, draconian "pollution" laws based on the idea that outsiders are polluting, a hereditary priestly caste, the notion of the number seven as being a holy number - in Zoroastrian religion there are seven Archangels, and they actually appear in the later books of the Jewish bible. Even the notion of a "bible" itself, as a revealed book, probably comes from Zoroastrianism, since that religion already had its Avesta (bible), Zend (commentary, like the Talmud), and Gathas (Psalms, i.e. hymns). Jewish communities in Africa, e.g. Ethiopia, go back to pre-Persian times and know nothing of the Talmud. Theirs is more likely to reflect the original Jewish culture. They also retained a Goddess, Ishtar, whereas the Babylonian Judaism followed Zoroastrianism in its more male-oriented notion of sacredness. From narrowminded Zoroastrian religion the Babylonian Jews also developed the habit of judging all other cultures harshly, as being the work of Satan; we now name the evil force "Patriarchy".

Hitler too thought in this manner, and made "Jewry" the evil force, as if by eliminating it from the world, he could eliminate evil. Zionists tend to think of "Nazism" in this metaphysical way, too. Nazism was a millennial movement (see James Rhodes, *The Hitler Movement*), and Zionism is too. Such movements see History as composed of three stages: an initial Paradise (Garden of Eden/ Ancient Athens/ Ancient Sparta/ the Aryan nomadic tribes/ Primitive Communism). After being cast out of Paradise there is a time of struggle between Good and Evil (God and Satan / ruling class and slave class / men and women etc.). Finally, after the climax of the struggle in the Great War (revolution/ Armageddon etc) there is a return to Paradise. It was the transition to this third phase that gave Nazi Germany its title "the THIRD Reich". These movements and myths re-work the same myth that has come down to us from Zoroastrian times. The key study on this Western myth is contained in the works of Eric Voegelin (1952 on); it was from Voegelin's insights that Norman Cohn produced *The Pursuit of the Millennium*. That book, however, only provides a cursory examination of the great secular millennial movements of our own time: Marxism, Nazism and Radical Feminism. Cohn's other

major book, *Warrant For Genocide*, a study of the Protocols, is polemic rather than scholarly, the author being Jewish and keen to ignore any counter-evidence in the Protocols, such as its apparent linkage to later major historical events in the Twentieth Century. Cohn fails to even consider whether the Protocols might be seen as millennial literature - which it obviously is. The notion of an initial Paradise and a final Millennium (thousand-year empire) is Zoroastrian - the word "paradise" is Persian. It is time that we got rid of this myth, before it kills us all, now that humanity has such powerful weapons. The solution is not to try to abolish the weapons - that can only be done by force, which itself requires weapons - but to finally expose this myth, lurking as it is within Christianity, Zionism, Islam, and Marxism. It is like a fatal virus which has gone unrecognised.

The Fundamentalist Ideology

This virus - fundamentalist thinking - often lies dormant within those civilisations, being brought to the fore during times of threat. Such Good-Bad thinking has probably existed in some way in most human societies, during times of war when, to mobilise the population, it is found expedient to demonise the opponent and exonerate one's own side. However, most societies have not generalised the Good-Bad polarity, taken it to the extreme of Absolute Good vs Absolute Evil in a permanent battle in a bifurcated universe. This can be seen from an examination of the society's "gods" or "spirit beings", which lay down the parameters of human life as seen within the society. In Ancient Egypt there was something of a Good-Bad struggle between Horus and Seth, but Horus had some faults and Seth had some good points. What distinguishes the fundamentalist ideologies is the incorporation of an Absolute Good vs Absolute Evil struggle into the metaphysics, i.e. the very structure of the world view (a culture's metaphysics is the structure of its worldview, its most basic view of reality).

Non-Fundamentalist Ideology: East Asia

Fundamentalist thinking is not part of the traditional Confucian/Daoist/Shinto outlook, which is based on complementary polarity (yin-yang) rather than antagonistic polarity (good-bad), and that is largely why, in my opinion, those traditional East Asian cultures offer humanity the best hope of getting away from the Millennial / fundamentalist world view we have inherited from Persia and the Middle East, worldviews which spread Enlightenment (Salvation) by the sword. If, as charted in the Protocols, Zionist leaders still aim for a thousand-year empire, then they would regard the rise of Confucian East Asia as a threat, best dealt with by playing China and Japan off against one another; Chalmers Johnson recently pointed out (lecture, ANU, 15/11/94) that Huntington, by casting them as two different civilisations, hoped that they might fight one another. Johnson thought them smart enough not to fall for this trick. The Japanese and the Jews both admire and fear one another, as shown in their recent spate of books about one another: books by Masami Uno saying that the U.S. has been bankrupted because influential Jews caused the multinationals to move their factories from America to low-wage countries; Daniel Burstein's *Yen: The Threat of Japan's Financial Empire*; Isaiah Ben-Dasan's *The Japanese and the Jews*, Ben-Ami Shillony's *The Jews and the*

Japanese,; and The Jews in the Japanese Mind. This conflict is based on Japanese study of the Protocols, which was acquired from the "White" Russian armies during the civil war. At least part of the Japanese leadership seems to have regarded it as a genuine document, and furthermore judged that in it were exposed the secret ruling class and innermost weaknesses of Western society, which Jewish thinkers, being its victims - cast as God-killers, sacred executioners, agents of Satan - had studied for centuries, and which the fundamentalist Jewish factions were using to try to undermine that civilisation in order to further their own, in particular through having discovered ways to get Westerners to want things that were not in their own best interest; if correct these methods work because they exploit the other's structure of thinking, which the persons involved can never detect. In those Japanese eyes, this meant that the knowledge of these strategies might assist them too, in particular in financial management and the avoidance of foreign debt and control; but that the Jews had to be feared as much as respected. Jewish authors Marvin Tokayer and Mary Swartz, in their book *The Fugu Plan: The Untold Story of the Japanese and the Jews During World War II*, reveal that during the Pacific War, Japanese leaders put a deal to Jewish leaders, offering large-scale Jewish migration to Manchukuo, from Europe and America; in return these Jews would use their skills - skills the Japanese felt they themselves lacked - to construct and administer the Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere. The problem for Jews was that they regarded the United States as a homeland, and could not work against it in this way.

The Catholic and Judaic Heritage

Fundamentalism in the Western religions is associated with the historicist theme in their mythology, which they acquired from the Zoroastrians. Inside both Judaism and Catholicism, underneath the Zoroastrian overburden, lies a rich legacy of the ancient world. The Catholic monstrance, for example, with its wavy sun-rays emanating from the golden centre, in which the consecrated host is located, is a memento of the religion of Mithra (Persia) / Ra (Egypt): Jesus as Sun God. The Virgin Mary preserves much of Isis, Sister-Wife of Osiris. As a Catholic, I used to chant litanies to Mary addressing her as Queen of Heaven, a title she inherited from the love-goddess Ishtar. It would be a shame to lose these precious relics of the past. Equally, the Kabbalah preserves features of ancient Middle-Eastern mysticism, the Tree of Life for example, which we should cherish and rework into our understanding of the world. Catholicism and Judaism preserve many features of the earliest civilisations of the Egypt-Mesopotamia-Indus triangle - a priceless heritage. I can understand Jews wanting to return to a region so rich for them in memories. My hope is that they do not destroy it, and the rest of the world in the process. Fundamentalists are confident that the Good will survive Armageddon; I am not.

Peace Between Jews and Christians

The key to understanding the barrier between Jews and Christians is provided by Hyam Maccoby, author of *The Sacred Executioner*: this is a book about human sacrifice. Maccoby's insights relate to those of Rene Girard about the linkage between violence

and the sacred. Certain epic acts in the past - "heroic" acts - have "sacramental" value for us as we relive them. The Catholic mass is the sacrifice of the mass, in which Jesus is a human sacrifice. Jesus' body is recreated on the altar (a place of sacrifice, a sacred barbecue) by the priest and communally eaten by the community. This act goes back thousands of years: Jesus himself was a figure in the mould of Osiris, and James Frazer showed in *The Golden Bough* that other annual gods symbolising the vegetative cycle of spring and harvest, died, were ritually eaten by their devotees, and were reborn next spring.

For Jews, the chief sacrifice was Abraham's sacrifice of his son Isaac, which is today commemorated in Israel at the Rock of Ages: this is the chief sacred site of Judaism (and a mosque is built upon it - trouble ahead). Maccoby points out that in the Bible story, Abraham is about to sacrifice Isaac to Abraham, when an angel appears giving him a lamb as a substitute. But, Maccoby says, it looks as if Isaac was saved by an editor rather than an angel. That is, a later scribe, re-copying the manuscript, thought it appropriate to change the story. The reader should consult Maccoby's book directly, but his case is convincing: Ancient Israel was founded upon a human sacrifice, that of Isaac. That is why, when considering offers to locate the new state of Israel in Kenya or Siberia, the leaders of the movement said "No" - their sacred site is in the old Israel, and it cannot be relocated. So now we have two human sacrifices: that of Isaac, inaugurating the Jewish Covenant with Yahweh; and that of Jesus, inaugurating, from the Christian point of view, the New Covenant, i.e. ending the Old one. And according to the New Testament, the sacrifice of Jesus was done by the Jews, symbolised by Judas, the mob choosing to free Barabbas rather than Jesus, and the High Priest. So there is a fundamental contradiction between Judaism and Christianity, in terms of their foundation sacrifices. No amount of apologising by the Pope can overcome this contradiction, because every crucifix points to it; every cross is offensive. The only way would be to abandon the New Testament and the notion of a New Covenant breaking the Old. It would be the end of Christianity.

Peace Between Jews and Nazis

But there is a third sacrifice. The Nazi genocide of the Jews, symbolised by Auschwitz, is also a human sacrifice, that human sacrifice which has been made the foundation of the modern state of Israel. That is why the Israelis can never get over it or forget it: it has sacramental value for them. They must forever mark the Nazis and the Germans as sacred executioners, just as Christians themselves mark the Jews in this way. To think that an unresolved problem 2000 years old could bring us to the point of destruction of the planet today! One pathway towards resolution is the disclosure that Moshe Dayan actually admired Hitler, and sought to learn from him. Ostrovsky says that the Jewish Defence League are regarded by moderate Jews as "Judeo-Nazis". Furthermore, the Palestinians have suffered the same dispossession at the hands of Jews, as they themselves suffered at the hands of the Romans. When Lenin's sins are considered, and especially the Jewish contribution to the Bolshevik cause, then surely the conclusion is that we are all guilty, none of us superior to the others. Is this not an

occasion for mutual public confession? And forgiveness, and a new start?

A Conspiracy Inside a Conspiracy?

The New World Order emerged from the two revolutions based on the ideas of Rousseau. Firstly in the American Revolution: the Great Seal of the United States, authorised in 1776, contains the words (in Latin) "Towards a New Order of the Ages". Secondly in the French Revolution; Marx wrote, "The French Revolution gave rise to ideas which led beyond the ideas of the entire old world order. The revolutionary movement which began in 1789 in the Cercle Social, which in the middle of its course had as its chief representatives Leclerc and Roux, and which finally with Babeuf's conspiracy was temporarily defeated, gave rise to the communist idea which Babeuf's friend Buonarroti re-introduced in France after the Revolution of 1830. This idea, consistently developed, is the idea of the new world order." (The Holy Family, Chapter 6, Part 3 - this part being written by Marx alone - in Collected Works of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Volume 4, p.119).

In societies based on Rousseau's ideology of bottom-up legitimacy - sovereignty arising from the will of the people rather than descending from God - real power is underground: the ruling class rarely shows its face, except for a few icons. The book which best discloses how the Anglo-American political system works is Carroll Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment*. It shows how consent is manufactured through informal power: how oligarchies informally control "formal democracies" by shaping public opinion in a subtle way, by having one's people in journalism, educational institutions and as party-bosses, to limit and massage the information reaching the public; in particular, they try to control the writing of History. The insiders anticipate issues, discuss them and determine the preferred courses of action. Then, when the matter is before the public, various well-known members of The Group, acting individually and apparently without collusion, express opinions publicly, in line with the pre-agreed position. Public opinion tends to follow, since there appears to be such consensus among the leaders of society. Think tanks and their journals are a key part of this process. The book charts this conspiracy, the Rhodes/Milner Group, from about 1870 to World War II. Cecil Rhodes aimed to create 'a kind of religious brotherhood, like the Jesuits, "a church for the extension of the British Empire".' (p. 34); the secret society of the Left, the Illuminati, also modelled itself on the Jesuits. Under the leadership of The Group, facing growing moves for independence among the dominions and colonies, Britain developed an ideology which reconciled "freedom" with "empire", such that the British Empire appeared to be the primary instrument for the bringing of freedom to the world. This freedom involved minimal state involvement in the economy, free trade and free movement of capital (i.e. debt), which Britain alone adopted in the nineteenth century, and Anglo-Saxon "individualism", which justifies actions against the majority interest. While Europe and Asia were "oriental despotisms" ruled by bureaucracies which regarded the public as "spectators", in Britain the public ruled, i.e. rule was by "public opinion". In disclosing how opinion is manufactured, Quigley exposes the ideology of "freedom" as a fraud: the Group was 'an early example of what James Burnham has called the "Managerial Revolution" - that is, the growth of a group

of managers, behind the scenes and beyond the control of public opinion, who seek efficiently to obtain what they regard as good for the people' (p. 85). The Group was amenable to One World Civilisation - one world government - provided that it was British and controlled by the Group. They did not want the dreaded "oriental despotisms" to have any part in it, and were alarmed when they realised that the League of Nations was trying to be a supra-national body overriding member sovereignty. Quigley shows that the empire is run by a conspiracy, but fails to consider if there are other conspiracies operating through the one he knows about. From 1888 to 1891, Lord Rothschild was the sole trustee of Rhodes' will (p. 34). One of Rhodes' associates, W.T. Stead, wrote, "he ... told me some things he has told no other man - save Lord Rothschild" (p. 37). In World War I Britain lost its empire, but Rothschild gained Palestine. Rhodes wrote in his will of 1877 that his plan for federation between the U.S. and the British Empire was aimed at "the foundation of so great a power as to hereafter render wars impossible" (p. 33). Years later, Schiff's first name for the League of Nations was the "League to Enforce Peace" (Cyrus Adler, Jacob H. Schiff: His Life and Letters, vol ii, p. 193).

After the Treaty of Versailles, which The Group helped draft, the U.S. became the "Receiver" of the British Empire, and the Council On Foreign Relations was formed as the U.S. counterpart to the Milner Group, the new headquarters of the Anglo-Saxon "federated empire" planned by Rhodes. The concept of the Institute Of International Affairs and the CFR came from British historian Lionel Curtis, who set out his ideas in The Commonwealth Of Nations. The creation of the CFR and its control of U.S. foreign policy is described by Marxist scholars Lawrence Shroup and William Minter in Imperial Brain Trust. The Christian Right has also documented the activities of the CFR: Pat Robertson, The New World Order, and Ralph Epperson, The Unseen Hand. If only the Marxists or the Christians had done this one might suspect bias, but the fact that the CFR has been targeted by both sides means that criticism cannot be easily deflected. The CFR created the Trilateral Commission, the Trilateral Commission created the Group of Seven, and the G7, combined with the Security Council, is the defacto world government; but the people of the world do not know that. In the U.S. today, all of the national television networks (currently three) transmit their news broadcasts around that country from New York, a suitable means of shaping opinion from a suitable headquarters.

The Fall of the United States

The rise of the "oriental despotisms" abhorred by the Group, Germany, Japan etc., as the "individualist" Anglo-Saxon countries flounder, shows that Burnham failed to distinguish between the nationalist and internationalist types of managerialism. The latter, whether of the laissez-faire or the central-planned variety, amounts to internal colonialism, plunder by an alien ruling class; this is prevented in the former by the very bureaucracy the Group disdained. The Anglo-Saxon world abandoned individualism when it turned to Keynes, and took it up again as it abandoned him. Huntington's co-worker Zbigniew Brzezinski, a leading theoretician of the Cold War, Jimmy Carter's National Security Adviser and first Director of the Trilateral Commission, has admitted

the U.S.' decline in his book *Out Of Control*. Similar assessments are made by J. K. Galbraith in *Culture of Contentment*, and Kevin Phillips in *Arrogant Capital*, the latter likening the U.S. today to the Roman Empire just before its collapse. How has the United States fallen from power and wealth so quickly? The Protocols might shed some light on this: it claims to have implanted the "laissez-faire" (Thatcherite) theory of economics into academia. It also says, "we will destroy the family life of the goyim". If there is any substance in this, it would have happened via the New Left movement, which had substantial Jewish leadership: in the Paris 1968 riots, Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Rubin, Betty Friedan etc., but was far from being exclusively Jewish. Germaine Greer wrote, in *The Female Eunuch*, "Hopefully, this book is subversive ... the oppression of women is necessary to the maintenance of the economy ... If the present economic structure can change only by collapsing, then it had better collapse as soon as possible. ... The most telling criticisms will come from my sisters of the Left, the Maoists, the Trots, the I.S., the S.D.S., because of my fantasy that it might be possible to leap the steps of revolution and arrive somehow at liberty and communism without strategy or revolutionary discipline. But if women are the true proletariat, the truly oppressed majority, the revolution can only be drawn nearer by their withdrawal of support for the capitalist system. The weapon I suggest is that most honoured of the proletariat, withdrawal of labour" (Paladin, p.21, emphasis added). Greer was calling on women to destroy Marriage; the I.S. are the International Socialists, a Trotskyist group.

No-one could accuse any individual in these matters; as individuals they may have acted in good faith, for social justice etc., but the effect has been destructive: the loss of any predictability in marriage, any security for children whose family might fracture, enormous social welfare costs, advocacy of children's rights to the extent of abandoning respect for parents and teachers, abandonment of the core area of history, tables and grammar from curricula, etc. The 60s rebellion had both libertarian (Anarchist) and authoritarian (Marxist) streams; the former tended to "drop out", the latter "stayed in the system to change it from the inside". The former wanted to build their own houses in the bush, and give birth at home, without regulations (I belonged to this stream, and have done both); the latter promoted regulation for "consumer protection" and "the maintenance of standards". The former favoured free love, even inside marriage, while elements of the latter have promoted the sex war, of women against men, and the destruction of the family. The Marxists tried to do deals with any movement trying to change society (unions, churches, ethnic groups, women's movement, environmentalists, homosexuals). They offered ideology (Good-Bad), battle-hardened members, and organisational techniques; the cost was that they would take over the movement to some extent, by having a clearer idea of where they were going, by block-voting to sway decisions and gain leadership positions, forming united fronts which blurred the boundaries between these reformist movements and revolutionary Marxism. The Cold War was fought, not only between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., but also within those societies, and to some extent has not quite finished. The difference between the Marxists and the movements they used, is that many of the Marxists were aiming to destroy the social order, while the others merely wanted to improve it. To each movement, the Marxists brought the techniques of ideological warfare: religious brotherhood (sisterhood), focusing the torchlight on the enemy, keeping the beam off

oneself. The enemy is evil, the movement is innocent. Such fundamentalism, undiagnosed because it is secular rather than religious, made its home in the heart of our universities. The Jesuits moulded children; the Marxists remoulded young adults.

Jews and the New Left

In *Culture of Complaint: the Fraying of America*, Robert Hughes noted that in the era since the Vietnam War, the generation which protested (I was one) has given up class as its major issue of concern, for others in particular gender. This marks a distinction between the Old Left, which mainly targeted Capitalism, and which supported family life, and the New Left, whose target was Patriarchy, and which regarded the family as "the source of our oppression", fostering instead radical feminism and "gay rights". Whereas the Old Left had favoured educational standards, the New Left promoted Individualism to the extent of the destruction of the core curriculum. The New Left has been much more Trotskyist and Internationalist; the difference between Old Left and New Left is articulated well in the Trotskyist 1979 publication *Socialism or Nationalism Which Road for the Australian Labor Movement?* by Jon West, Dave Holmes and Gordon Adler.

Only 2% of the population in the U.S. is Jewish; less than 1% in Australia. Yet Jewish author Philip Mendes writes, in his book *The New Left, The Jews, and the Vietnam War 1965-1972* (pp. 21-22, emphasis added), "In the USA, it has been estimated that roughly one-third to one-half of New Leftists were Jews. Jews made up approximately two-thirds of the Freedom Riders that went South in 1961 ... In 1965 at the University of Chicago's Selective Service demonstration, 45 per cent of the protesters were Jews. At Columbia University in 1968 one-third of the demonstrators were of Jewish origin; three of the four students killed at Kent State in 1970 were Jewish ... Many of the important national officers in Students For A Democratic Society (SDS) were of Jewish origin. These included the founder ... Nearly half the delegates to the 1966 SDS convention were Jews ... In fact, the Jewish presence was so large that it concerned and, at times, even embarrassed the SDS leadership. An examination by Arthur Liebman of the New Left's theoreticians and intellectual articulators again revealed a significant Jewish presence. From 30 to 50 per cent of the founders and editorial boards of such New Left journals as *Studies on the Left*, *New University Thought*, and *Root and Branch* (later *Ramparts*), were of Jewish origin. Similarly, in Britain ... Jews were involved in particularly large numbers in the two main Trotskyist groups, the International Marxist Group and the International Socialists. In France, a number of prominent New Left leaders including Alain Krivine, Alain Gaismar and Daniel Cohn-Bendit were Jewish, and it is believed that about three-quarters of the members of the Trotskyite groups in the Paris area were identifiably Jewish."

Giles Kepel writes in his book *The Revenge of God: The Resurgence of Islam, Christianity and Judaism in the Modern World*, "When the twentieth anniversary of May 1968 was celebrated, many commentators pondered the 'Jewish nature' of that event - a topic which, some years earlier, would have been dubbed far right anti-semitic propaganda. But in essence such questions show that the discovery of Jewish identity by certain '68 militants was actually retrospective. It was common knowledge that many

of the leaders in those uprisings were Jewish. Indeed, there was a joke (one among many) which said that the only reason why Yiddish was not spoken at the politbureau of the largest Trotskyite organisation in France was that one of the committee members was a Sephardic Jew. And although some studies have linked the revolutionary commitment of the May '68 Jews with the fact that their families had been in the immigrant communist movement, the Resistance or the fight against Hitler, the 'Jewish nature' of this commitment was sublimated by the strictly atheistic revolutionary messianism with which left-wing militants were imbued at that time." Many were even anti-zionist, until the 1972 Munich Olympics split them and led many to return to their religion. They felt that the 1973 Middle East war was, unlike the Vietnam War, a just war, and rallied to the fold. The Gulf War was a similar test. They have called both for the abolition of nation-states, and the establishment of Israel as a nation-state. These goals are contradictory: if the former applies, why bother with the latter?

Robert Ellwood shows in his book *The Sixties Spiritual Awakening* that in the U.S., "To begin with, Jews participated in disproportionate numbers in the civil rights movement, in the counter culture, and in antiwar activity ... Not a few prominent voices in all these activities, from Allen Ginsberg to the Yippies Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin, were of Jewish background. This participation certainly had roots in longstanding Jewish commitment to social justice, based in turn on Jewish experience of pogroms and persecutions ...But the deepest roots of Jewish activism undoubtedly lay in the long Jewish traditions of being a people set apart, always a little different, and so able to appreciate and flourish in the role of the marginalized, **the cheerful iconoclast, or the outsider with a message**" (p.235, emphasis added here and below). "Judaism itself was a counterculture of very long standing" (p. 244). This book **documents the return to religion and orthodoxy**, and the reassertion of monotheism as "the fundamental premise of Western religion: a single transcendent center of value that is more than merely subjective and beside which everything without exception must be weighed and judged" (p.95). This type of monotheism originated in Zoroastrianism; and it needs to be pointed out, and has not been pointed out, that the same definition shows that such monotheism is incompatible with true multiculturalism, for the latter is premised on the rejection of any single culture's blueprint for life as having authority over that of other cultures, as if to claim itself as a standard by which others are rightly judged. Not relativism, but live and let live, vive la difference, remember the glass house you live in before throwing the first stone - these are the key ideas of multiculturalism. I doubt that many of the Jewish activists in the New Left were consciously "conspirators", so the only way of fitting them into a conspiracy would be via a "bottom up" method of organising, i.e. by their indoctrination as young people into a culture with a "victim" view of history in which the "others" (non-Jews) are bad guys ever waiting to exterminate them, while they must constantly organise to defend themselves, attack the oppressor, and point the way forward for mankind.

One of the ironies of this Jewish participation in the battle against "patriarchy", is that the Jewish Bible, in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah, is the main source of the West's view of homosexuality as not merely an anomaly but a sin (but the Gay movement uses the guise of minority rights to attack the family, the microcosm and building-block of

society, the nursery of our young: an attack on heterosexuality itself, courtship newspeaked into harassment). Yahweh, unlike the gods of other peoples, had no female consort, no goddess: this has markedly affected the Western idea of the feminine, since it portrays sanctity as male, or at least much more male than female. The Catholic Church did something to remedy this: faced with the popularity of the goddess Isis, it turned Mary into a defacto goddess with many of her qualities. The least the Jewish New Left might do, for the sake of consistency, is campaign for the rewriting of the Jewish Bible. Only in 1994 has such a call been made, by Bernard Boas in his book *It's Time To Rewrite the Bible*, but such is the power of Orthodoxy within Judaism, that he enlisted the support of Rabbi John Levi, for the foreword, and Christian bishop John Spong, for the preface. That book points out that the tenth commandment depicts a wife as a possession like livestock: "You shall not covet your neighbour's house; you shall not covet your neighbour's wife, nor his male or female slave, or his ox or his ass, nor anything that is your neighbour's" (Exodus 20:17, emphasis added). It points out that the Bible also says, "When anyone explicitly vows to the Lord the equivalent for a human being, the following scale shall apply: If it is a male from twenty to sixty years of age, the equivalent is fifty shekels of silver by the sanctuary weight. If it is a female, the equivalent is thirty shekels" (Leviticus 27: 1-4, emphasis added); and there are many other similar quotes demeaning women. The West's racism also largely derives from the Bible, from the story of God's condemnation of Ham and curse on his descendants (Genesis 5:32, 9:20-27). According to the *New Bible Dictionary*, Ham is regarded as the ancestor of the Egyptians (Mizraim), Libyans (Put), Ethiopians (Cush) etc (2nd ed., p.816). Genesis says, 'Noah, a man of the soil, was the first to plant a vineyard. He drank some of the wine and became drunk, and he lay uncovered in his tent. And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father ... When Noah awoke from his wine and knew what his youngest son had done to him, he said, "Cursed be Canaan: lowest of slaves shall he be to his brothers."' (Genesis 9: 20-25, emphasis added). This was a rationale for apartheid.

Plato's Revenge

One of the slogans of the New Left was "bring the war back home", i.e. promote a civil war on as many fronts as possible. But considering the social dislocation that the New Left has wrought, its weakening of the fabric of the United States such that it now seems to be sinking visibly, handing its imperial baton to Japan, one might wonder whether it would have been more honest if the overwhelming Jewish leadership and participation had been made public at the time. Why was this not done? If there has been a conspiracy, then this was possible because of the Platonic utopian heritage in our universities, specifically the belief that a perfect society was an actual possibility, not just a pipe dream, and that they - the university-trained intelligensia - would be the ones to implement it. This gave them the confidence to reject existing and past actual societies and instead engage in a social experiment on a massive scale involving hundreds of millions of people. To work for the destruction of existing society, as a way of preparing for the new, improved model. Socrates was an important example, the archetypal "deconstructor" of the Old Order, the Christ of the intellectuals. Marx was fascinated by Professor D. Baur's paper on *The Two Christs*, about Socrates and Jesus,

and wrote about this matter in detail in his own doctoral dissertation. Babeuf, the only person praised by Marx in *The Communist Manifesto*, linked Jesus and Socrates in his defence prior to his execution following the fall of Robespierre (see John Scott, ed., *The Defense of Gracchus Babeuf Before the High Court of Vendome*). The fact that Socrates' associates Alcibiades et. al. had helped bring about the destruction of Ancient Athens, its conquest by the Spartan tyranny, did not seem incongruous to these "Enlightenment" intellectuals. Nor did the fact that Plato and Rousseau frequently referred to Sparta as the model for the utopia to be created by intellectuals ("philosophers"). Sparta expressed the martial values on which both the USSR and the Third Reich were built; it was not known for its art, literature or science. Why would Enlightenment intellectuals reared as modern-day Athenians, help the Spartan cause? How could they combine Plato's utopia with the fundamentalist millennium? So, even if the *Protocols* is an authentic book, it is not justifiable to blame its activists for the demise of the West; on the contrary the real fault has been within ourselves, those activists were merely taking advantage of our weaknesses. We thought that freedom was incompatible with structure, rights with duties, and have chosen the former, destroying the latter, symbolised by the Family. As in polarities such as male-female, one must have both poles to make a whole, in economics we require both chaos and order, free enterprise and bureaucratic planning; E.F. Schumacher pointed this out 20 years ago in *Small Is Beautiful*.

The Revisionist History of the Twentieth Century

Robert John, *Behind the Balfour Declaration*, shows that World War I was so evenly balanced between Britain and Germany, that American support tipped the balance. The Zionist movement was active in both Britain and Germany, on the basis that either side might win: it was as much pro-Germany as pro-Britain. However, Americans were isolationist, and their national identity revolved around the War of Independence from Britain. The crucial Americans who prevailed upon Wilson were Zionists, who Britain appealed to in 1917, offering Palestine in return for their support. The great majority of American Jews were anti-Zionist, but the Zionists had better connections. By that time, Britain had used up its prewar credits, and needed big loans - which German-Jewish American bankers on Wall Street were prepared to provide, conditional upon the Balfour Declaration, switching their allegiance from Germany at that point. A prominent German leader later stated that if Germany had realised that promising Palestine would sway America in the war, then Germany would have won. The other factor which prompted Britain to make the Balfour Declaration was the Bolshevik Revolution. Britain was aware that it was led by Jews, and that they intended taking Russia out of the war, freeing Germany from fighting on two fronts. Britain thought that the offer of Palestine might prompt the Bolsheviks to stay in the war. But the arrival of American troops made up for the Russian exit.

Hitler was an imperialist in the style of all the European empires. He was no more racist than the British had been, but while the Spanish and the British had done their bloody conquests in the "third world", away from prying cameras, Hitler did his in Europe itself, and his victims were Europeans (including the Jews). This is one reason for the special

horror attaching to his name. In attempting to build an empire in Europe, he was following in the path of Napoleon, and he came to a similar fate. It is hypocritical to consider one a hero and the other a demon: they had more in common than they had apart. Napoleon, too, killed millions of people. Hitler's attitude to the Jews was in large part a reaction to Jewish leadership of the revolutionary movement in Europe, especially Russia, and the Terror that Lenin had launched. Hitler's propaganda machine matched that of the Bolsheviks, and came after, following in the wake of the former; in Hegelian terms, it was the antithesis to Bolshevism as thesis. It is hypocritical to condemn one but not the other; but it is appropriate to condemn both. Some of the blame for Hitler's racism must be attributed to the Social Darwinists, and some to the Bible's story of Ham, a major basis of Western racism. We cannot escape "the century of ideological wars", as Herman Hesse put it in *The Glass Bead Game*, without a public confession from all sides and factions.

Anthony Sutton's books *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* and *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler* show that Wall Street built up both regimes. Victor Suvorov, *IceBreaker*, shows that Stalin was as responsible as Hitler for World War II; moreover, since the USSR Constitution of 1924 states its aim as "one World-Wide Socialist Soviet Republic". As Roosevelt carefully crafted a scenario at Pearl Harbor in which Japan played the "baddie", so Stalin conspired in the division of Poland as much as Hitler but more craftily, delaying Russian entry until after German entry, making Hitler seem the sole aggressor. Stalin then invaded Finland and "liberated" the Baltic states; 4 republics were added to the USSR. The USSR had even allowed the German army to train in the USSR, violating the Treaty of Versailles. If Stalin had not wanted war with Hitler, he would not have agreed to the partition of Poland, for that removed a buffer state and gave Germany and the USSR a common border, facilitating a direct German attack. Instead Stalin regarded war through the perspective of the Hegelian dialectic: it was a powerful way to play thesis off against antithesis to achieve a desired goal as synthesis. Sutton's book *National Suicide: Military Aid to the Soviet Union* shows that the U.S. continued to supply the USSR with technology it could use for war, despite the two countries being protagonists in the Cold War. World War II began in Poland; the Cold War began as a fallout between Stalin and the West over Poland; and the end of the Soviet Block began in Poland, with Solidarity.

The Risks of War

Fundamentalist Zionists would be well aware of the following text in the Book of Genesis: 'On that day Yahweh made a covenant with Abram, saying, "To your descendants I give this land, from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates"' (Genesis 15:18, emphasis added here and below). As for relations with Arabs, they are indicated by the story of Ishmael, born to Abram's Egyptian slave-woman Hagar; Abram's wife Sarah later gave birth to Isaac. The ominous text reads, 'But Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, whom she had born to Abraham, playing with her son Isaac. So she said to Abraham, "Cast out this slave woman with her son; for the son of this slave woman shall not inherit along with my son Isaac." The matter was very distressing to Abraham on account of his son. But God said to Abraham, "Do

not be distressed because of the boy and because of the slave woman; whatever Sarah says to you, do as she tells you, for it is through Isaac that offspring shall be named for you. As for the son of the slave woman, I will make a nation of him also, because he is your offspring." (Genesis 21:9-13, emphasis added).

Given Ben-Gurion's claim that "the Bible is our mandate" (see above), one can assume that Israel will try to gain more land from the Arabs to fulfil the promise of Genesis 15:18. But even if it expands in a non-military way, it will eat economically and politically into the heartland of Islam, which pressed will turn fundamentalist and retaliate against Israel and its Western allies. The Balfour Declaration may become the means of the destruction of civilisation; its birthplace may become its graveyard. Suppose that the Zionist plot is true, and Israel becomes the centre of a world empire; it would not last for long, because it would break up from its own internal struggles: Christianity emerged from Judaism in this way. Why risk the planet for such a dubious goal? It could not be achieved without another world war; could God reward those who use such foul means? Or have the leaders of the movement made of God a mere divinisation of themselves? The people best placed to act are moderate Jews: those who realise the risks. Rather than dismiss the Protocols out of hand, associating it with Auschwitz, moderate Jews should read it and seriously consider whether it might be authentic. If it is genuine, they would be the last to know. My message to them is: rediscover your pre-Zoroastrian past.

A Resolution?

A century ago, the pope gave up his "temporal" domain, his lands and armies, settling for Vatican City as the spiritual centre of Christianity. At the time this seemed a defeat, but it has allowed a greater focus on the spiritual side. That is what Judaism needs now. For the sake of world peace, Jewry should give up Israel as a Jewish state, i.e. a religious state with an established church, armed to the teeth, and settle for a small, spiritual "Vatican City" in Jerusalem, as its centre. An international settlement, involving all the interested religions, could lay the groundwork for harmony. This would not be a new exile - Jews and Arabs could remain in the land as brothers and sisters, as they once were (as Ron David says in *Arabs & Israel For Beginners*, Jews must have descended from Arabs). If that happens then I too will visit it. And let us end usury: it is illegal in Israel today (or at least was recently); it is forbidden in the Koran; and it was forbidden in Christendom.

Saving the Enlightenment

Chalmers Johnson said that that rise of Japan has been possible because "they have no antagonistic culture: they had no French Revolution" (lecture, ANU, 15/11/94). If we want to get rid of this legacy of Hate in our own society, we cannot do it by means of Hate - against Jews, Leftists, Capitalists or whatever group - since Hate breeds Hate. The only way is to expose it and promote the understanding of it. John Ralston Saul, in *Voltaire's Bastards*, and John Carroll, in *Humanism the Wreck of Western Culture*, write of the failure of the Age of Reason and the Enlightenment; the Postmodernist writers

are similarly anti-Reason, even nihilist. The mistake of the Enlightenment was to see Reason as more than a Method - as having some particular Content or standpoint. Leninism was, not the culmination of the Enlightenment, but a perversion of the Enlightenment, and its origins must be traced back to Rousseau's advocacy of Machiavelli, to Plato's advocacy of Sparta, and to Socrates as the archetypal sophist and deconstructor, an intelligent man who pulled others' ideas apart but give no guidance on how to live (see I. F. Stone, The Trial of Socrates). To save the Enlightenment - to forestall a new Dark Age - we must discard these three philosophers, but keep the Presocratics and Voltaire, and look to East Asia as he did. [Mushakoji \(op. cit.\) says that in East Asian culture there is a dialectical relationship between the Confucian and Daoist cultural poles](#): dialectical as Daoist "complementary polarity", not Hegelian "antagonistic polarity". Those cultures can help us to retain Reason but to keep it in perspective.

E. R. Dodds describes a comparable situation to ours in Ancient Athens, at the time of the Peloponnesian war between Athens and Sparta, which began about 432 BC and lasted 30 years. That it is comparable to the Cold War, though of a far smaller scale, is suggested firstly by its ideological nature, as a war between Sparta, the "people's democracy" of its day, and Athens the "democracy". Ideologically, Socrates and Plato took the Spartan side, as many Western intellectuals have taken the Bolshevik side. Following Plato, Rousseau idealised Sparta as a model for his Enlightenment state, and this was the model of leaders in the French Revolution such as Babeuf. Athens lost the war, whereas America won - so the story goes; but according to Chalmers Johnson the Cold War was lost by both sides, won by Japan (interview, Indian Pacific, ABC Radio, 30/12/91) - in this view both Athens and Sparta lost their war, to the advantage of Persia. The war finished off Ancient Athens, as Thucydides argued: it was the end of its creative period, and Greek philosophers ended up, several centuries afterwards, slaves of the Roman empire, tutoring the children of the rich. It was a time when Greece had an "Enlightenment", brought about by its rationalist intellectuals, who by destroying the traditional religion had undermined the social fabric. In *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Dodds describes it as follows (the Inherited Conglomerate is the rejected traditional culture): "the new rationalism carried with it real as well as imaginary dangers for the social order. In discarding the Inherited Conglomerate, many people discarded with it the religious restraints that had held human egoism on the leash ... with most ... the liberation of the individual meant an unlimited freedom of self-assertion; it meant rights without duties ... The new rationalism did not enable men to live like beasts - men have always been able to do that. But it enabled them to justify their brutality to themselves" (p. 191). "... the regressiveness of popular religion in the Age of Enlightenment. The first signs of this regression appeared during the Peloponnesian War, and were doubtless in part due to the war. Under the stresses it generated, people began to slip back from the too difficult achievements of the Periclean Age; cracks appeared in the fabric ... As the intellectuals withdrew further into a world of their own, the popular mind was left increasingly defenceless" (p.192-3).

Herman Hesse depicts our crisis today in his major work *The Glass Bead Game*:

'It was ... an era emphatically "bourgeois" and given to almost untrammelled individualism' (Holt Rinehart & Winston edition, emphasis added, p.18). '... men came to enjoy an incredible degree of intellectual freedom, more than they could stand. For while they had overthrown the tutelage of the Church completely, and that of the State partially, they had not succeeded in formulating an authentic law they could respect, a genuinely new authority and legitimacy' (p.19). 'They faced death, fear, pain and hunger almost without defences, could no longer accept the consolation of the churches, and could obtain no useful advice from Reason. ... They moved spasmodically on through life and had no belief in a tomorrow' (p. 22). 'They struggled through a deluge of isolated cultural facts and fragments of knowledge robbed of all meaning. ... they were already on the verge of that dreadful devaluation of the Word ... At the end of an era of apparent victory and success they found themselves suddenly confronting a void' (p. 23). 'Even as intellectual ambitions and achievements declined rapidly during that period, intellectuals in particular were stricken by horrible doubts and a sense of despair. They had just fully realized ... that the youth and the creative period of our culture was over, that old age and twilight had set in.' (p. 23-4). 'celebrated and loquacious professors... offered them the crumbs of what had once been higher education ... The deeply debased intellectual professions were bankrupt in the world's eyes' (p.33-4).

In *Small Is Beautiful*, E.F. Schumacher wrote, "The leading ideas of the nineteenth century, which claimed to do away with metaphysics, are themselves a bad, vicious, life-destroying type of metaphysics" (p.89). He quotes the statement "It was not barbarian attacks that destroyed the Greco-Roman world ... The cause was a metaphysical cause. The 'pagan' world was failing to keep alive its own fundamental convictions ... owing to faults in metaphysical analysis it had become confused as to what those convictions were", then he comments, "This passage can be applied, without change, to present-day civilisation" (p.90). Zbigniew Brzezinski postulates that the U.S. faces disintegration, facing "an increasingly pervasive sense of spiritual emptiness", woes comprising "the economic, the social, and even the metaphysical" (*Out Of Control*, p.107, emphasis added); "social and especially cultural dilemmas are also ultimately philosophical in nature." (p.108).

Astrophysicists Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe write in *Our Place in the Cosmos*, "The popular belief is that the Copernican Revolution and the inquisition of Galileo are things of the past. Human societies, it is claimed, have progressed beyond the stage when such outrages could happen again. In this book we show that the Copernican Revolution is far from over, and that society has not improved since the sixteenth century in any important respect. If anything the situation may have got worse, with the successes of the Industrial Revolution conferring upon human beings a degree of arrogance not seen before. The dogma has shifted from an Earth-centred Universe to the equally unlikely idea that life, which is the most complex and amazingly intricate phenomenon in the entire cosmos, must be centred on the earth. The new dogma has Judeo-Christian roots, but today its custodians are scientists rather than the high priests of the church" (p.1). Included in the dogmas is the Big Bang theory, demolished by Eric J. Lerner in *The Big Bang Never Happened*.

One reason for the rootlessness in our society, is that since the French Revolution, the Far Left has managed to place great power in the hands of youth, blocking the transmission of tradition by the elders. The Means of the Transmission of Culture was seized, to destroy the old social order and create a new one. At the 1994 U.N. population conference in Cairo, the draft document stated that "in all societies discrimination on the basis of sex often starts at the earliest stages of life". The Radical Feminist authors were here attacking the "sexual division of labour", the natural basis of all traditional societies, where the breastfeeding of infants, often to the age of about three years (before "modern" times) causes women to live a different life from men - different but satisfying, as Margaret Mead said. This was a rejection of all past societies, an attack on human nature itself. Has the Enlightenment come so low? Is the Protocols right about the weakness of the goy intellect?

{end of *Hiding Behind Auschwitz* (1995)}

The sequel to *Hiding Behind Auschwitz* (1995) is the *Protocols of Zion Toolkit* (2002) - the most complete study of the *Protocols of Zion* available, incorporating the major arguments both for and against: [toolkit.html](http://www.jewwatch.com/toolkit.html).

Correction (030211): the correct spelling of the name of the author of *Icebreaker* is Viktor Suvorov.

Correction (030915): I am informed that Jacob Venedey was a Freemason.

Addition (030926): A reader writes: "By the way Jacob Vendey is a jew and he was admired in the German East Republic as a hero! There exists a diary of Jacobs second wife which I do not have but it is still available as it is from 1997/98! There are also a lot of short biographies in german and he was a famous figure in the 1848 revolution which failed! He was joining company with f.e. Heinrich Heine the famous Jew Writer and Poet! And Heine was joining company with Rothschild! I found a quote from his letters in my library by accident!"

Note (040306) Herman Hesse's book *The Glass Bead Game* was also published as *Magister Ludi*.

Back to the Zionism/Communism index: [zioncom.html](http://www.jewwatch.com/zioncom.html).

Write to me, Peter Myers, at <mailto:myers@cyberone.com.au>.

**Archived for Educational Purposes only Under U.S.C. Title 17 Section 107
by Jew Watch Library at www.jewwatch.com**

COPYRIGHT NOTICE*

In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, any copyrighted work in the Jew Watch Library is archived here under fair use without profit or payment to those who have expressed a prior interest in

reviewing the included information for personal use, non-profit research and educational purposes only.
Ref. <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml>

If you have additions or suggestions

[Email Jew Watch](#)