

Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

● NUMBER 3

REVIEWER'S LIBRARY

The So-Called "Protocols of the Elders of Zion"

A Definitive Exposure of One of the Most
Malicious Lies in History

ISAAC GOLDBERG

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS

GIRARD

:::

KANSAS

25

The Reviewer's Library

The So-Called "Protocols of the Elders of Zion"

A Definitive Exposure of One of the Most Malicious Lies in History

By ISAAC GOLDBERG

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. The Psychology of Racial Prejudice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Without Trial" 2. Religious Prejudices 	3
II. The Historical Setting for the Protocols of the Elders of Zion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Political Anti-Semitism 2. Maurice Joly and Hermann Goedsche 	8
III. "Sergius Nilus" and the Protocols <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "The Great in the Little . . ." 2. Messrs. Butmi and Lutostansky 3. Farewell to Russia 	13
IV. The Protocols Go West <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Gottfried Zur Beek" 2. Henry Ford—And After 	20
V. The Real Enemy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Moscow or Washington" 2. "Divide and Conquer" 3. "Red" Herrings 	26

Copyright, 1936,
Haldeman-Julius Company

Printed in the United States of America

Men will continue to commit atrocities as long as they believe in absurdities—VOLTAIRE.

I

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RACIAL PREJUDICE

1. "Without Trial"

We do not, unless we are typesetters or lexicographers, live by the dictionary. It is rather the dictionary, by following closely the changing habits of thought and speech, that lives by us. The dictionary, in fact, is a veritable cemetery of language, until it is brought to life in the everlasting round of talk and print. Speech and writing are a continuous resurrection.

Nevertheless, language does not change so rapidly that the dictionary is in danger of becoming useless. For all the life that most people put into their talking and into their writing, it is rather they who are the cemeteries of language, and the dictionary that throbs with vitality. Sometimes it is good to consult the noble book of words.

Take the word "prejudice." It is, in its way, a word packed tight with the terror of history. It derives from the Latin: *prae*, before; and *judicium*, judgment. In other words, it stands for a pre-judgment; in other words still, for a judgment without a trial.

The dictionary, of course, reveals but the surface of the terror. Follow the meaning of the word into the mind and the emotions of the human being, and the word stands unmasked as a monster of our primitive instincts. That is why, for all the intelligence that I shall try to bring to the consideration of the subject, I feel at times an almost sapping sense of futility. The intelligence of humanity is so young; the instincts are so old. The intelligence is but a crust; the instincts are to the intelligence as are the core and filler of the earth to its thin surface.

It is difficult to fight the instincts with the intelligence. That it is not impossible, however, is proved by the fact that you and I have made the fight and emerged victorious. What we have done, surely others can do.

Every man, no matter how enlightened, is as packed with prejudices as a pomegranate is with seeds. He has prejudgments about food, about exercise, about his relations with man and woman, about his appreciation of music or painting, about his looks, his abilities, his achievements. Fortunately, many of these prejudices are no more harmful than other notions of his that are based upon wish rather than upon actuality. Self-understanding—that dubious gift of the Greek, Socrates, who counseled man to know himself—is appreciably an understanding of the prejudices that help to make up our personality. Mathematicians, in their complicated calculations, make allowances for error. We are wise, in calculating ourselves, so to speak, to make similar allowance.

The prejudgment becomes dangerous, however, when it involves a misapprehension of the social structure and the elements that compose it. Certainly I do not mean that we should regard our personal prejudices with the indulgence of a Narcissus. We have all met persons who fondle their acknowledged faults; at best such persons are jokes, and at worst, nuisances. It is when the prejudice, as I say, involves society—when it acquires strength from the multiplication of unconsidered opinion and uninvestigated self-interest, that it becomes a general menace.

Prejudice, like all violence and unfairness, when it reaches the social phase is rooted partly, perhaps chiefly, in a form of fear. We fear the unfamiliar, the unlike, the strange, the new, the different. They represent a challenge to our security. In primitive times, or when we react as primitives, there is neither opportunity nor desire to investigate, to consider. Through consideration, through investigation, the unfamiliar becomes familiar; the unlike is seen to exhibit many points of likeness; the strange loses its challenge; the new glides imperceptibly into the old, which itself was once new.

The emotional attitude of prejudice, however, goes back to a stage in social and individual life when there was little time to pause for reflection. Prejudice, indeed, even if it so far forgets itself as to enter into court, tries to rule reason out of the court room. Its last defense is to assault reason—to cast doubts upon it—to make it appear as the agent of the devil. Prejudice, in the emotional-mental life of the uncultured individual, or of the uncultured society, corresponds to the theory of the divine right of kings. It does not deal in reason; nor does it condescend to give reasons. It is, on its own authority, above question.

When the ancient Jews invented, or confirmed, the theory of the Chosen People, that was prejudice.

When the Catholic Church invented the doctrine of papal infallibility, that was prejudice.

It is characteristic of prejudice to invoke abstract sanction; the most abstract sanction that we know is God.

It is characteristic of politicians, amidst the windiness of their harangues, to invoke God and Patriotism. These are sufficiently vague not to mean anything tangible, yet so powerfully emotional in their appeal as to arouse a deep response. The response, to be sure, has nothing to do with the problems that politics and economics are called upon to solve; it is not to the practical interests of politicians—and what other interests have they?—that people should think to the point. The people must be bogged in a miasma of irrelevant emotion. The more often a politician invokes God, or Patriotism, the more suspect should he be.

It is significant that the more intelligent Jewish rabbi is coming to repudiate, or to reinterpret, in terms of social service, the ancient notion of the Chosen People.

It is significant that the more intelligent Catholics have produced a rebellion against the too-mundane aspects of Jesuitry and the Holy Church.

It is significant that the higher politics has veered definitely from chicanery and emotional appeal to a sound consideration of economics.

It is significant, too, that the old, prejudicial forces attempt to fight the new with bugaboo-words such as Socialism and Communism

and Infidel. Around these words has been built up a cluster of emotional attitudes that re-enforce ancient prejudices of religion and nation and race.

Unenlightened self-interest produced, through the ages, those emotional clusters that crystallized into the basic prejudices of society today.

It is enlightened self-interest that will dissolve, at last, these clusters of untrained, mis-directed, self-wounding emotions.

2. Religious Prejudices

In respect of the special question that we deal with in this monograph, the lie of the so-called "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," religious prejudice plays the cruel leading role. It is merely a specialized, and a specially cultivated, form of the self-same pre-judgments that make up all types of prejudice. It is a group-form.

It is only the exceptional man or woman who resists the pull of unreasoning emotionality. When one's emotions have been played upon craftily since earliest childhood—when fundamental reactions have been shaped from the cradle—it requires a battle to reassert one's individual mind. Signs of independence are made to appear as treachery to the group. To think for oneself, as contrasted with feeling for one's clan, is branded as betrayal.

Thus political parties and religious institutions, regardless of the platforms that they offer to the electorate, regardless of the noble ethical codes that they preach to their congregants, are very largely the codification of emotional prejudices.

To translate Tertullian's "Credo quia impossibile"—I believe because it is impossible—into its real meaning would be to recast the sentence entirely. What he really meant was something like this: "I want to believe. I do not wish to be bothered by any intellectual process of proof. I do not even care about what the result of such a process would be. Even if it proved that I was wrong, I would reject the proof. Even if what I believe is shown to be impossible, I will believe it all the more firmly because of its impossibility. My emotions demand this belief. My intellect is the enemy of my emotions. Therefore I reject my intelligence. I believe what I want to believe because I want to believe it."

This, of course, is not intelligence; it is emotional, childish proclamation. Yet, at bottom, it is this sort of thing that we, who would help free the world of prejudice, must contend with often in ourselves as well as in others.

Let us not under-estimate the magnitude of the task.

"Men will continue to commit atrocities," wrote Voltaire, "as long as they continue to believe absurdities."

If, today, it is possible, in the midst of the 20th Century, to rouse half of mankind to the slaughter of the other half—to invoke mass hatred—to make men, in the very names of their religion and their various patriotisms, turn into beasts, it is largely because they have been indoctrinated with absurdities.

Man, at the first sign of danger, or of what he is induced to regard as danger, begins a slow reversion to his primitive fears and to the savage ferocity that is bred by fear. Wily politicians, or politicians so ignorant that they are self-deceived, invariably drag forth the concepts of religion and patriotism when they go forth to

political battle. One's opponent is always suspected of Atheism, of high treason. The strategy is simple: a man blinded by such an appeal to his primitive emotions—emotions tied up with what he learned at his mother's knee, and during the blissful childhood at school—is in no fit condition to discuss or to ponder the problem of city, state or nation. Politicians do not desire men to think. They desire them only to feel—and to feel in a single direction; the direction of a vote for the politician's party. Consider the history of politics in the United States—the oscillations from Democracy to Republicanism and vice versa. All of the political leaders have been honorable, religious, patriotic men. Yet the country is still in a muddle that is worse than any we have known.

It is not a state of affairs that should arouse the suspicions of thinking men and women?

Should not these men and women be equally suspicious when the Republican party takes to calling the Democratic party Communistic, godless, Jew-ridden, even as Abraham Lincoln was called nigger-lover and traitor and Socialist? I write, not as a Democrat; I am not a Democrat. I am pointing out, however, a very pertinent example of the red-herring strategy, and let me assure my readers that America has far more to fear from these red-herrings than from the Reds—red herrings drawn across the trail by Nazis, by Fascists, by politicians of both the leading camps—by men, essentially, who are interested in power, not principles; in profits, not the people.

I am not, except as a student, interested in religion. I believe, however, that men and women should be permitted to worship as they please, and that no church should enjoy governmental favoritism. I believe also that the principle of toleration should be extended to non-believers, else it is but a caricature of toleration. More than one President of these United States has been agnostic or indifferent to religious questions. The fact that a man is a church-goer, on the other hand, does not prevent him from being a menace to the good of his country. After all, most politicians are staunch worshipers in one church or another. Yet the history of the country is a long roster of political scandals.

Religion is a private matter. The man who drags it into politics—I mean the private beliefs of a person, as distinguished from the attempts of some churches, as churches, and against the spirit of Americanism, to capture political power—is attempting to cloud the issue with irrelevant, emotional issues.

It is unfortunate that each religion, regardless of what it professes, actually has the result of increasing ill will among peoples and nations. It serves to instill, in the child, such a strong emotional attitude that it is an exceptional adult, indeed, who can shake himself free of the subtle hatreds thus implanted.

I repeat, it is these subtleties of emotion that we are called upon to combat when we enlist in the cause of liberalism.

To invoke, against prejudice, the proofs of history—to invoke, in short, the intellectual attitude, is useful. For there are some prejudiced souls who, in the privacy of their thoughts, may be compelled through an inner sense of decency, to admit to themselves what they may fear to admit to their prejudiced group. This is one of the hopes for the future: an appeal to the decency that must exist somewhere in most unpoisoned minds—the common decency of the human being who recognizes, across the borders of different beliefs, different

doctrines, and different attitudes, certain fundamental traits that are common to all humanity, no matter where it dwells.

For the few who really are interested in the facts, I give carefully authenticated, documented facts. These facts are incontrovertible. They may be checked and re-checked by the most prejudiced investigator. If his prejudice remains, he is compelled to admit that he still believes in the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, because, in the face of all the evidence, he chooses to believe.

I am hoping, half against hope, that this monograph will have a strong appeal to the human decency of the prejudiced reader. I am not such a cynic as not to believe that, even among many prejudiced persons, there is this spark of decency that may be blown into a fire that shall consume the exposed prejudice.

II

THE HISTORICAL SETTING FOR THE PROTOCOLS OF THE ELDERS OF ZION

1. Political Anti-Semitism

Though the end of the 18th Century had seemed to promise a new understanding of the Jew, Waterloo brought defeat for Napoleon and for the budding Jewish hopes. The Holy Alliance—Russia, Austria and Prussia—bent upon re-enslaving the Christian, was not likely to waste any tenderness upon an ancient enemy. **Once again a scapegoat was needed; once again that scapegoat was the Jew.** To parallel the new nationalism, there arose a new anti-Semitism. Jew-hatred, ingrained in the populace, took on an economic aspect. The religious basis did not disappear; it merged into the new fashion. Though much has been made of the **Rassenkampf**—the battle of the races—and of the political anti-Semitism that arose with it, it was all the easier to rally the reactionary forces because religious hatred had been so deeply implanted.

The new nationalism naturally looked about for a new ethnology, just as Hitler, in our own day, looked around for a new national mythology. With all the Jew-purging that Europe has indulged in, it is really surprising that the continent has not reveled in perfection. History can show the picture of many nations in which, for centuries, the Jews were virtually wiped off the map. Yet troubles persisted. Can it be that those national troubles are not attributable to the Jew, after all, and that they may be rooted in the greed of a dominant economic class, aided by the spiritual domination of a reigning Church?

The new "scientific" anti-Semitism received, from a succession of literary documents, impressive support, especially as the popular mind had been prepared for such an attitude. Ernest Renan, when only 24 years old, had published in 1847 a General History of the Semitic Languages, and had exalted the cultural prowess of the Aryan over the Semite. This was too good not to be seized upon by the ethnologists who were more interested in demonstrating the inferiority of the Jew than in adding to our scientific knowledge about races.

Joseph Arthur de Gobineau, between 1853 and 1855, published his **Essay Upon the Inequality of the Human Races**. He cautioned the white race to preserve its purity against contamination by other strains.

It is distinctly in order to remark that no ethnologist today accepts the concept of a "pure" race. The very word "race," indeed, takes on an unscientific coloration. Our newest investigators, following an old lead, show easily that Count Arthur de Gobineau and his followers had absolutely no scientific warrant for their notions.

Drs. Huxley and Haddon, indeed, in their recent book, *We Europeans*, find it difficult to attach any precise meaning to the word "race" altogether, and rule out of court all the ancient prejudices built up around the word.*

It needed but a passionate Jew-hater to appropriate the dubious race-theories of these scholars to the purposes of anti-Semitism. One of the first, in respect to the harm that he did, was Gougenot des Mousseaux, who in 1869 published *The Jew, Judaism and the Judification of the Christian Peoples*. Des Mousseaux distinguished between Judaism and Mosaism (somewhat as many distinguish between Christianity and Paulinity) and rejected the first. The Jew was condemned as an arch-revolutionary. In Germany, Wilhelm Marr, in 1873, wrote a pamphlet called *The Victory of Judaism over Germanism*. The slayer of God had now definitely become the slayer of peoples. Anti-Semitism takes on the color of the surrounding reaction.

All might have gone well, had it not been for the German crash of 1873. Another scapegoat was needed; or, rather, the same scapegoat was needed again. Though Bismarck had attained his power through the National Liberal Party, which was led by the Jew, Lasker, he soon deserted the liberal standard. Who was responsible for the crash? The Jews, of course. In Sam Behrman's new play, *The End of Summer*, a character asks, "And what did they blame for conditions, before the war?" So one might ask, "And before the Jews came to any country, who was blamed for the troubles?" Or, before the Jews came, was the world perfect? And did it become magically perfect when they were expelled from Spain, Portugal, France, England, and where not else?

The anti-Semitism of later Germany—the Christian Social Workingman's Union founded by Adolf Stoker, who was one day to be dismissed from his post as court preacher, in disgrace; Sepp's argument against the human status of Jesus, and against the Scriptures; the rabid anti-Jewishness of Wagner, who may have been born of a Jewish father, and who, in Cosima, married a woman with Jewish blood in her veins—led slowly and surely to Hitlerism.

In Russia, the pogroms of 1881 bled the Jews white. In France, the Dreyfus case brought the ancient libels up to date, this time (1894) with the coloration of treason. One had thought that, with the crushing revelations of this cause celebre, nationalistic anti-Semitism would have been exposed in the eyes of all. Vain hope. Over-night, mushroom-like, it springs up again whenever corruption needs to cover its trail. It is too valuable a means to be surrendered.

Let us return for a moment to France, and to a document that, for all its seeming innocence, plays a major part in the story of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion. And let us, after considering this document, migrate once more to Germany, there to examine another document—a seemingly innocent novel, this time—that was to partner the French satire in spawning the infamous Lie of the Protocols. Both of these documents, by the way, were produced amid the anti-Semitic atmosphere that we have just been considering.

Before we proceed any further, it may be well—returning to the dictionary mood of our opening—to define the word "Protocols."

*See "WE EUROPEANS, A Survey of 'Racial' Problems." By Julian S. Huxley and A. C. Haddon. With a Contribution by A. Carr-Saunders. New York. Harper & Brothers.

"Protocol" derives from the Greek, *protokollon*; *protos* means first, and *kolla* means glue. The word refers to the first leaf that was glued to the rolls of papyrus and the notorial documents. On this leaf was inscribed the date. (Webster's New International Dictionary.) From this is derived the meaning of "an original copy, draft, minute, or record of a document or transaction." In diplomacy, the word "protocol" refers to "a preliminary memorandum, as of discussions and resolutions arrived at in negotiation, often signed by the negotiators, as a basis for a final convention or treaty."

The so-called Jewish Protocols, then, would be the documents in which are outlined the plans for the Jewish control of the world.

2. Maurice Joly and Hermann Goedsche

It is significant to notice, at the start, that the history of the Protocols is characterized by anonymous authorship, by authorship under assumed names, by the type of writing that is very dubious as to dates, authenticity of detail, authority for important statements, and all the other apparatus required of respectable, responsible historiography. Moreover, the authors of the various books and pamphlets are not, in any single case, men of unimpeachable standing. They are journalistic adventurers; they are plagiarizers who steal from each other; they are forgers; they are generally disreputable characters who have been condemned, often by the very Gentile society in which they moved.

Maurice Joly, in 1864, published (in French) a *Dialogue in Hell, between Machiavelli and Montesquieu*. It was printed, at first anonymously, and has been described as "a grim satire on the usurper and autocrat, Napoleon III." As late as August 27, 1921, that Jew-baiter, Lord Alfred Douglas, in his periodical, *Plain English*, was calling Joly a Jew, whose real name, supposedly, was Moses Joel. How did Douglas know? He had come upon the news in some hitherto unknown memoirs. (The history of the Protocols is full of these secret books and people. **Definite dates, definite documents and definite persons are not part of the Jew-baiting technique.**)

This Jewish attribution was seized upon in Germany, quite naturally. It is therefore too bad that, in November, 1924, in the Parisian monthly, *Paix et Droit* (Peace and Justice), fragments of Joly's autobiography, written in 1878, show him to have been descended from a Catholic family. The original manuscript is in the library of the Parisian Bar Association.

The *Dialogue in Hell*, it must be remembered, has nothing to do with the Jews. Why it is mentioned at this point, and dwelt upon, will become very clear at the right moment in this very condensed account of a malicious forgery. For, much of the material in the Protocols, in which certain schemes for world domination are attributed to the Jews, are in this source-document attributed to Machiavelli.

Let me quote, from a very valuable pamphlet by the German investigator, Benjamin W. Segel, enough matter to give an idea of the *Dialogue in Hell*.*

*THE PROTOCOLS OF THE ELDERS OF ZION. The Greatest Lie in History. By Benjamin W. Segel. Authorized Translation from German, by Sascha Czazkes-Charles, Ph.D.J.D. New York. Bloch Publishing Co., 1934. I would recommend this as the best pamphlet upon the subject,

"The satire is in the form of a dialogue between the ingenious French philosopher and the statesman Montesquieu, who in the 18th Century strove against absolutism and tyranny . . . and Niccolo Machiavelli, the Italian statesman of the 16th Century who, in his famous book, **The Prince (Il Principe)**, became the preceptor of tyrants and autocratic rulers. Machiavelli teaches that the foremost task of a sovereign consists in preserving his power. . . . Might is above right. . . . Malice, treachery, corruption, lies, forgery, perjury—no crime is too wicked and objectionable if the power of the prince is at stake; justice, law, liberty, honesty are . . . void abstractions to which no reality corresponds."

Machiavelli, as he defends his ideas, virtually passes in review all the misdeeds of Napoleon III. The satire was so transparent that Joly was fined 2,000 francs and imprisoned for a year and a half.

So much—at this point—for Monsieur Joly. We now cross to Germany, to meet a "Sir John Retcliffe," whose real name was Hermann Goedsche. Goedsche wrote also under the name "Armin."

Between 1866 and 1870 Goedsche, under his English pseudonym, was issuing a series of trashy novels—a series entitled **Biarritz-Rome**. The **Biarritz** volume was published in 1868; it contains a chapter in which is depicted a Jewish cemetery in Prague. Here, amid the most melodramatic circumstances that were ever imagined by a mediocre brain, we witness what purports to be a secret meeting of representatives from the Twelve Tribes of Israel; in parliamentary form they proceed to the business of making their reports to the head conspirator.*

There is a good deal of hocus-pocus as the various tribes, through their spokesmen, answer the roll-call. Once every 100 years this meeting takes place, at the "grave of the great teacher of Caballah whose doctrines give the chosen ones power on earth and supremacy over all the descendants of Ishmael. Eighteen hundred years the struggle has been conducted by the nation of Israel for supremacy which was promised to Abraham and which was taken away from us by the Cross."

When will the future belong to the Jews? It appears that they will first conquer Gold. To achieve this, they must facilitate loans. They must acquire ownership of land. They must work for unlimited freedom of trade. They must humiliate the Christian Church. They must agitate for the transference of Church property to the State. They must work for world peace. They must support revolution. They must corner all speculative business. They must monopolize governmental positions. They must seek special privilege before the law. They must load themselves with honors. They must support intermarriage. They must rule the press.

It is a vast, and, it must be confessed, a contradictory, program. The Jew is left without a leg to stand upon. No matter what he may do, no matter how lofty his motives, he is condemned beforehand;

*For a very full version of what comprises this chapter of "Biarritz," see **THE HISTORY OF A LIE**, by Herman Bernstein, New York, J. S. Ogilvie Publishing Company, 1921. This book, together with the monograph by Benjamin W. Segel, provides in very succinct fashion a complete, documented refutation of the Protocol myth.

and his motives are shown to be sly and self-seeking, despite their outward appearance.

It should be remembered, however, that this is a single chapter from a tawdry novel by a disreputable German fictioneer.

In 1872, only a few years after its original appearance, this chapter was translated into Russian, and published in St. Petersburg.

Meantime, political anti-Semitism in Germany, as we have already seen, was rising. Goedsche, always alive to the main chance, saw an opportunity to "cash in" on the event. He was hardly a man with scruples. In 1849, he had been dismissed from the postal service as having been implicated in the Waldeck forgery case. It was a small matter, then, to select this particular chapter of avowed fiction, and palm it off on a new public as the supposed speech of a Rabbi. "The very man," as Bernstein writes, "who had invented the speeches set down in his work of fiction 20 years before, now vouched for the authenticity of the obviously fabricated speech which he attributed to a Rabbi who had his birth in the contorted mind of the forger."

Already, between the satire of Joly and the re-worked chapter of Goedsche, we have the genesis of the Protocols. The deadly parallel has been established by comparative quotations. I believe it was Segel who first showed that Goedsche, like the good forger and plagiarist that he was, stole much material from Joly's anti-Napoleonic diatribe. Now it was the turn for second, or third, thief to become best owner. For, as the German had plundered the Frenchman, now the Russians began to plunder the German. Later, to be sure, other Germans would plunder the Russians, and at every new resurrection of the libel, new matter would be added, so as to bring the accusations up to date. It became a game—for everybody but the foully aspersed Jewish people.

The 1872 translation was re-published in Russian, particularly in 1903, at the time of the Kishinev pogrom. Four years later it turned up again in a book by G. Butmi, called **The Enemy of the Human Race**, and dedicated, with unsuspected appropriateness, to the Black Hundreds. It is worth noting, at this point, that the Protocols have not yet been identified with a definite Jewish plot to acquire domination over the world. The Protocols here are Masonic, not Jewish, documents.

Not until the appearance of a certain—rather, a most uncertain!—Sergius Nilus do the Protocols take on a distinctly Jewish cast.

This elusive gentleman deserves consideration all by himself. That is, if we can discover who—as distinguished from the books that he signed, and the allegations that he accumulated—the fellow was. Joly and Goedsche, after all, are traceable entities. Nilus is one of the will o' the wisps of history. The name might easily be regarded as the Latin word for "nothing"; certainly, as far as establishing an undoubted identity is concerned, Nilus evaporates into "nobody." **His work, however, and the damage that it did, are only too real.** And if historians should discover that there really was such a person, it would not alter the case by a jot.

III

“SERGIUS NILUS” AND THE PROTOCOLS

1. “The Great in the Little . . .”

In 1901 a book was published in Moscow entitled, in full, **The Great in the Little, or the Advent of the Anti-Christ and the Rule of the Devil on Earth Are Near**. It was signed by Sergei Nilus. It was a rather common type of writing—one of those apocalyptic visions of universal destruction in which a mad mind seems to run riot through scenes of passionate sadism and cruel religious ecstasy. Nilus' anti-Christ will be Jewish: “Before the second advent of the Lord and the last day of judgment, the other will come in his name—that is, the Anti-Christ—who, springing from Jewish blood, will become tsar and emperor of the whole world, a Messiah from the house of David, from the same Israel upon whom rests the guilt of the blood of the true Messiah, and whose destinies even today are managed by the Pharisees and scribes.”

Seleg has pointed out that this theory is original with Nilus, differing from the similar theories of previous authorities. Nilus got it straight from the Holy Spirit. “From our mother church, through her holy spirit, came my regeneration to a new life; from her spirit came to me the divine revelation concerning terrestrial and celestial things. Secret after secret was unveiled to my human weakness, secrets in which God's great power became manifest and merely by virtue of this power I understood that the world and everything that is in it can be conceived and explained as to its real existence only in the light of divine truth; that there is not and cannot be absolute truth on earth; that before the establishment of the kingdom of truth (through the second advent of Christ) under a new sky and on a new earth, the Antichrist must come—hailed by the Jews as Messiah and by the world as sovereign of the globe.”

Nilus was sure of this because of a document that had mysteriously come into his possession.

This brings us to the second edition of his book, which was issued in 1905. It is in this edition, mark you, and not in the original, that the Nilus version of the Protocols suddenly makes its appearance. What has been happening in the four years that intervened? How comes it that the original, 1901, edition of **The Great in the Little** has not a word about Protocols, and that the 1905 version carries such a preface as this:

“In the year 1901, I succeeded in having a certain manuscript placed at my disposal by a close friend of mine. In this manuscript, the development of the world Jewish Freemasonic conspiracy was described with unusual accuracy and truth. I submit this manuscript under the general title **Protocols of the**

Elders of Zion to all those who are eager to hear, to see, and to understand."

Who was Nilus? We know not. Who was his "close friend?" We are not told. Where is the original of the manuscript? Nobody can discover its whereabouts. We are asked to accept a mad, sadistic libel upon an entire people—a document that we have been able to trace back to a French satire and a German novel—upon the mere, undocumented, unestablished say-so of a religious fanatic whose very identity is uncertain. Had not the consequences of this infamous lie proved so disastrous, it would be hugely comical.

We are, however, unfortunately but at the beginning of the libel and its grave consequences.

First, as to the sudden appearance of the Protocols in the second edition of the Nilus apocalypse. . . . In 1903 the Kishinev pogrom had signaled a new reign of terror against the Jews. Two years later, the revolution that was to succeed only in 1917 had again reared its head. It was only too evident, to Nilus, that anti-Christ was abroad in the land, and that the conditions for the second advent had begun to fulfill themselves.

Bernstein, comparing the abridged English translation of Nilus' book with the original, reveals important omissions in the translation. (Much the same is true, and for much the same reason, concerning the original of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, and the English version.) He shows that Nilus' book was a work of propaganda for the endangered Russian aristocracy. It was violently opposed to Tolstoy and his humanitarianism, to the emancipation of woman—in fact, to all progressive ideas. The Protocols—of which these denunciations did not form a part—were naturally associated with the anti-Semitism of the Russian reactionaries. Nilus opposed Tolstoy and the emancipation of woman out of the same motives that led him to oppose the Jews. He and the class for which he stood were interested chiefly in retaining their domination over the Russian masses. Their strategy called now, as it had always called, for the incitement of those masses against the Jews. In this way, the masses, blinded to the character of their real enemies, would vent their energy of protest against the eternal scapegoat.

The Protocols appeared in 1905 because they would make excellent propaganda against the hated Jews.

Even now, however, there was not any agreement amongst the libelers as to just what the Protocols consisted of, and as to what their true significance might be. It is somewhat suspicious, to say the least, that the contents and meaning of the Protocols change with the times, and always assume the character required by the special interests of the accusers.

Students of psychology, even of the elementary branches, need not be surprised to discover that those who have been most vehement in spreading the lie of the Protocols have been, in their own lives and aims, most guilty of the very charges brought against the Jewish race as a whole. Upon the Jews have been projected the evil designs of the human race. They become, in this distorted account, the villains of the universe. Their very virtues are but masks intended to beguile the Gentile, and conceal the more reprehensibly their sinister aims.

This is the very apotheosis of racial prejudice. It is a nightmare of history. It flies fantastically in the face of obvious fact. It is

a crude appeal from undisciplined emotion to undisciplined emotion. It is a plain insult to one's intellectual integrity. But how wonderfully well it was to work for the hosts of reaction!

2. Messrs. Butmi and Lutostansky

I have already pointed out, and it should be pointed out every time the infamous Protocols are mentioned, that the compilers of this fraud deal in false names, or no names at all, so far as authorship and authority are concerned.

Even when the Nilus book was edited for American readers, the editor preferred not to give his own name. He gave, none the less, a great deal of information about Nilus himself. According to that "information," Nilus had been born in 1862, of Russian parents holding liberal (!) opinions. He was pretty well known in Moscow. Indeed, he had been graduated from the University there, had taken up the law, and had then become a landowner in the Government of Oryol. Later, he entered a monastery, was visited in a vision by Saint Sergei, and underwent conversion. His end is unknown.

In Germany, as Bernstein pointed out in his expose, Nilus was described as a secret agent of the Russian police. He was supposed to have received, in 1901, a "copy of the text of the Protocols from the secret archives of the Main Zionist organization in France; they were not published until 1905."

In England—and, again, the author of *The Cause of the World Unrest* preferred to remain anonymous—the Protocols were represented as having been stolen or extracted "from a whole volume of protocols. All this"—says the anonymous editor—"was got by my correspondent out of the secret depositories of the Head Chancellery of Zion. This Chancellery is at present on French territory."

What is the address of the Chancellery? The anonymous editor does not say.

The cream of the jest, however, is this: Bernstein, and, no doubt, the other men who have investigated this malicious falsehood, looked up Nilus in all the standard Russian reference books and encyclopedias. Not a word about this putative Nilus is to be found.

One has a right to demand the identity of Nilus. One has a right to ask, of the various anonymous editors and authors, where they got their conflicting reports of this Nilus. Rightly does Seleg remark that "If a Berlin market-woman should, on such evidence, accuse her neighbor of having stolen her chicken, the policeman would deride her. But such evidence is good enough to indict an entire people, when prejudice sits on the judge's bench."

The next gentlemen to join the Jew-baiting procession are less elusive than Sergei Nilus. At least we know that G. Butmi and Ippolit Lutostansky existed. That is something. We know, too, that Butmi was a propagandist for the Black Hundred. And we know that Lutostansky was an old hand at baiting the Jews. Let us, however, be calm and judicial. The fact that a man is a professional hater of the Jews, and of the liberal tendencies in modern life, does not mean, necessarily, that everything he says or writes is *ipso-facto* a lie. We must subject the specific utterance to the test of truth. We cannot pretend to be prejudiced in favor of such creatures. Yet their statements, however much they are to be suspected on general principles, must be examined in the cold, clear light of fact.

First, then, Mr. G. Butmi.

In 1907 he published the book in which the Rabbi's speech, cribbed from Goedsche's fantastic fiction, appeared as fact. Goedsche himself, as we have seen, had attempted to transform his own fantasy into an allegedly factual report. The book that contains the Rabbi's speech, as acclimatized in Russia by Butmi, contains also a version of the Protocols. The Protocols (forgive me these repetitions, but it is important to keep in mind the chain of events, and the various uses to which each new "discoverer" of the Protocols put his material) came from Joly and Goedsche. Nilus had introduced them to Russia two years before Butmi's book appeared. And now Butmi, taking these leaves out of Joly's, Goedsche's and Nilus' notebooks, advanced, as proof of the forged, plagiarized Protocols, the Rabbi's speech, which was also stolen!

Is there a court in Christendom that would accept this as evidence—unless it were as evidence of lying, brutality, literary theft and misapplication?

Butmi's Protocols undergo a sea change. They are chiefly Masonic, not Jewish, in character. Of course they were "secured with difficulty in fragmentary form. . . . But the above-mentioned failure to mention the time and place where the protocols were composed might call forth in the reader, who is entirely unfamiliar with the abominations of Masonic doctrines, doubts as to the authenticity of these documents."

The wicked flee when no man pursueth. Proverbs, 28,1.

Butmi went out of his way to caution the reader. These representatives of Zion, he said, were not to be confused with the representatives of the Zionist movement. Too bad that Mr. Nilus, whoever and wherever he was, did not read this part of Butmi's volume, for, in later editions of his own book, this is precisely what he proceeded to do. All things come to him who waits. In the course of time Mr. Nilus would discover, no doubt through the intervention of another divine messenger, that the Protocols applied to Dr. Theodore Herzl and the Zionist movement.

The Protocols are like a slide-rule; they move forward and backward, this time like the man on the flying trapeze, with the greatest of ease. The translator who appears in Butmi, and in this respect he links hands with Nilus and Lutostansky, announces that the true origin of the Protocols harks back to 929 B.C., and that the vast plan for dominating the universe was invented by none other than King Solomon and the sages of Judea.

During his investigations, Bernstein went through the writings of Ippolit Lutostansky. Now, curiously enough, there was a tiny spark of decency in this fellow. In 1882, reacting from the pogroms that had been visited upon the unfortunate race, Lutostansky wrote a book in which he took back all the vile accusations he had made against the Jewish people. To be sure, this attack of decency proved to be only intermittent. A few years later he had returned to his ancient anti-Semitism, more violently than ever. The Russian soul of the pre-revolutionary variety was a strange and contradictory essence. When the Beiliss case ended with a great moral victory for the Jews, Lutostansky appeared again. He was ready to retract his newer accusations—provided some wealthy Jews would reward him handsomely for the book in which he proposed to publish them. The Jews rejected the mountebank and his vile money-grubbing. This,

by the way, was the type of man who vilified the Jewish race as a breed of gold-worshippers! It is to laugh, and to weep.

In 1907, Lutostansky published a book—he was always backed by the Grand Duke and the Dowager Empress—entitled **The Talmud and the Jews**. Herein he promised that a later volume would contain the Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion. In view of what we know of the man, this may have been a sort of threat held over the heads of the wealthy Jews. Without waiting for the later volume, Lutostansky went on to outline, in his introduction, the now too-familiar plan of the Jews to achieve rulership over the world. Bernstein points out that this outline corresponds, almost word for word, to the epilogue in Nilus' revised book that was issued 10 years later. Who robbed whom? Bernstein even suggests that Lutostansky and Nilus may have been the same person.

We are not yet through, however, with Ippolit Lutostansky, the man whose literary favors were for sale to the highest bidder.

It should be remembered, especially when we come to the German perversions of the Protocols, that **The Talmud and the Jews** was as definitely anti-English as it was anti-Jewish. The explanation of this is exceedingly simple, for England, at the time, was anathema to official Russia.

"The English," wrote Lutostansky, with a high degree of ethnographic originality, "are typical pure-blooded Israelites. . . . Indeed, the lion of Judah has become the British lion and adorns the coat of arms of the King of England. The harp of King David to this day represents the coat of arms of Ireland (!)."

This is the most unkindest cut of all. It reminds me, somehow, of the old notion, first spread abroad in the 17th Century, that the Indians were members of the Lost Tribes of Israel. And certainly the proofs were far more convincing than those adduced by Lutostansky for the Hebraic origin of England and Ireland.

Indeed, Lutostansky goes on to remark, of North America, that it "is inhabited by the tribe of Menasseh of whom it was said in an ancient prophecy that he will become a 'separate great nation.' The very word **Saxon**"—and I am sure that all etymologists and philologists will appreciate this notable Russian discovery—"is derived from **Isaacson**, that is, the son of Israel. . . ."

"The particular reverence in which the English hold the Bible smacks of the Old Testament of the Jews. Even the preference for long clothes indicates something Asiatic. . . ."

"Arousing of late the unanimous indignation of the whole civilized world"—how affecting are these appeals of the barbarians to the virtues of that very civilization which they flout and seek to destroy!—"the English at the same time call forth amazement at their traits, instincts and aspirations which positively make them a monster in the family of cultured and civilized European nations. As the proverb says, there is no family without a black sheep. Every monstrosity, however, is to be explained—Jews come from Jews."

One could easily imagine that one were reading the latest Nazi book on race and creed as interpreted by the Wise Men of the Rhine.

Is it not too bad that when English journals—**The Morning Post**, **Blackwood's Magazine**, **The New Witness**, **The Spectator**, and a lesser fry—later became excited over the Protocols, and printed a mess of inexcusable insinuations, they did not know the full text of the various protocol documents?

Is it not too bad that this filth, which was taken so seriously by the Fords of the United States, and the more or less latently anti-Semitic newspaper owners in Great Britain, was too foul even for the Russian Jew-baiters to believe? Bernstein shows that during the high excitement of the Beiliss case, when the Jews once again were on trial, when the Russian government was straining every nerve to justify massacres of the Jews, when the very charge that had been made against Beiliss showed the persistence of anti-Semitism in its vilest state, no use was made of the Protocols, though they had been published eight years before.

A propaganda that failed to attract wide attention even among the Russians, amid whom the Black Hundreds carried on their murderous campaign, was destined to be accepted by the civilized nations of Europe and by certain factions of the United States.

As the lie prospered, it gathered, like the proverbial snowball rolling down hill, new accretions.

With each new thrust of mankind toward progress, the reactionaries return to their arsenals, furbish up the rusty weapons, and fare forth to battle once more in defense of their sacred privileges. The lie of the Protocols appears promptly in new dress, with revisions brought up to date. The lie, like all other lies persisted in against the patent evidence of fact, takes on other lies to substantiate the original falsehood.

We are thus prepared, in every crisis of world affairs, for a new version of the Protocols.

The year 1917 was more than a crisis for old Russia. It was a cataclysm. No sooner had the Armistice been signed than the protocol-propagandists for the old regime got busy with the dissemination of a new Nilus book.

The date of the original plot is pushed back, as we have already seen, to 929 B.C. The latest of the Elders of Zion becomes Theodore Herzl. The war, the peace, the establishment of the Bolshevik regime—all these (and anything else you please to insert) become fulfillments of the Protocols. So once again the Joly-Goedsche material is lifted down from the dusty archives, the old hatreds are raked into flame, and the paladins of civilization march forth once more on their crusade of libel, vilification, and race-assassination.

Even as I type these lines, I must confess, I find it hard to believe that creatures such as these exist. For the sake of the human race itself, I try to feel that perhaps these books, these people, these recurrent historic episodes, are figments of my imagination. Alas, they are only too real. As real as pogroms, as real as the Black Hundreds of Germany who have taken over the work of the Black Hundreds that made Russia run with innocent blood.

It is one of the mad ironies of history. No sooner does an autocrat wish to rule the world than he discovers that it is the Jews who have this paranoiac desire. No sooner does he wish to inaugurate a campaign of gold-greed, slaughter and economic castration, than he discovers that it is the Jews who, long ago, concocted a plot to achieve this very end. That which the Jews are supposed to aim at—that of which they are accused on the basis of plain lies and forgeries—is actually put into effect by the accusers themselves!

Who tried to suppress a veritable continent, and to rule with the greatest of despotism? Was it the Jews or the Czar?

Who is sapping the very life-blood of Germany today? Is it the Jews, or Hitler and his rabid crew?

Perhaps, in the chancelleries of Europe, there have been protocols, after all. But, if so, they did not bear a Jewish seal.

3. Farewell to Russia

Let us cast a last glance at old Russia, before following the libel of the Protocols into Germany, and, alas, into England and the United States.

Butmi had written that the French Revolution was "engineered in England with the aid of the Jews and the Judaized Masons. Only the Jews profited by the French Revolution, even as they profited by the English Revolution, attaining in the general turmoil equal rights with the native population of France." The English were presented as a people shamelessly self-satisfied, arrogant, treacherous—all these qualities revealing the "repulsive Judeo-Carthaginian imprint." Butmi, in 1907, appears to have stolen his essential arguments from Nilus. Bernstein, who compared the statements of both men in the original Russian, and who gives, in his book, facsimiles of the original pages, shows easily that the later version was altered to suit the temper of the new times.

"And now" [Bernstein wrote in 1921] "cowardly anonymous writers are embellishing the 'protocols', adding new lies to the old ones, making accusations against the Jews that even Nilus-Lutostansky-Butmi dared not make in darkest Russia."

The Protocols did not have to wait long for their debut in Germany. Within two years after the 1917 revision of the Nilus documents, and, significantly enough, following upon the heels of the German revolution, they came out under the sponsorship of "Herr Gottfried Zur Beek." This was not, *natürlich*, his real name. They formed part [pages 68-143] of **The Secrets of the Elders of Zion**, and were presumably translated from the Russian edition of 1911.

The real name of the author was Captain Mueller von Hausen.

IV

THE PROTOCOLS GO WEST

1. "Gottfried Zur Beek"

If the lie of the Protocols had but remained within the limits of a single country, it would have been relatively simple to trace the origin of the falsehood, and to expose it under a withering array of unquestionable documents. History has not been so kind to the Jews. The lie travels like the legendary Wandering Jew himself, and seems quite as deathless. Every time it appears in a new country, it assumes a new disguise. Once again the defenders of justice have to go over the entire documentation of the libel—have to unravel the new lies that have been woven into the fabric to tighten the old ones—have to discover the identity of the authors—have to show how they have been stealing from one another—in a word, have to begin anew the sorry business of re-exposing a malicious falsehood.

Benjamin W. Segel, in the excellent pamphlet already quoted, literally makes hash of the book by "Gottfried Zur Beek." To a Jew this is no longer exciting. Repetition—endless repetition—dulls the edge of such intellectual victories as this. It even dulls the edge of martyrdom. Segel continues the expose almost automatically; it has become a habit. And always there is a new public that has been contaminated by the vile propaganda.

Such men as "Gottfried Zur Beek" are patently malicious. They are the deliberate deceivers, not the deceived. Else, why is there not, in *The Secrets of the Elders of Zion*, so much as the name of Nilus, or the mention of the Russian book? The reader, comments Segel, "does not even come to know that it" [that is, the Nilus book] "exists and that the Protocols, which are the essence of Zur Beek's work, only form an appendix to the Russian production.

"Instead, Herr Zur Beek fills his work with an immense quantity of exemplifications, analogies, explanations, and documents to substantiate the Protocols and prove the existence of a Jewish plan to subjugate the world." Of course the Speech of a Rabbi in 1901—that hoary fabrication which was born of the imagination of Goedsche—figures prominently, and is now supposed to have been delivered in 1912, at a Zionist Congress held in Lemberg.

It is part of the general irony that Kaiser Wilhelm II, who once aspired to rule the world in real earnest, used to recommend Zur Beek's book to all his visitors. In fact, monarchical Germany got behind the volume with a right good will. Was it not dedicated to the "Princes of Europe," whose thrones and religions were threatened by these Jews?

The *Secrets of the Elders of Zion* flamed, through translation, across the "civilized" world. The book was issued in Polish, French,

English, the Scandinavian tongues, Italian, Japanese, Arabic. And you may be sure that every translation was supplied with new introductory material.

If the truth grows in the mouths of honest men, what happens to a lie? Precisely what happened to "The Secrets of the Elders of Zion."

The English press, especially the *Times* and *The Morning Post*, fell for the lie, line, hook and sinker. The *Times* asked, editorially, "What is the meaning of the Protocols? Are they authentic? Which malevolent society made these schemes and is now triumphing over their realization? Are they forged? From where does the weird gift of prophecy spring that partly has come true and is partly to be realized? Have we fought these years in order to dissolve and destroy the nefarious organization of the German world empire, only to discover behind it a much more dangerous conspiracy, because of its secrecy? Have we escaped a German peace by straining all our national resources, only to submit to Jewish peace?"

These words, printed on May 8, 1920, were, even at that exciting moment, inexcusable. They show that the writer was filled with a latent anti-Semitism needing only a slight stimulus to flare up into fantastic verbiage. The rapidity with which the Protocols started forth upon a new career of publicity bears witness to the same condition all over the world. The world—the entire "civilized" world—had been conditioned by training, by rationalization, by the endless repetition of other anti-Jewish myths, to the ready acceptance of any accusation, however gross and unfounded.

It was, moreover, an historic moment in which the barbarism of the "civilized" world once again needed a scapegoat to bear the burden of universal degradation. How could we—we cultured, civilized, Christian nations, have been really to blame for the late war and its awful consequences? That was not we! We were bewitched. We were the victims of an enchantment, of a plot, of "a weird gift of prophecy." And thus, by a sardonic inversion of roles, the victim becomes the victor! The betrayed becomes the betrayer. Not the rulers of the various nations had been responsible for the war. No; it was the Jew. Not the exploiters of the various nations had been the profiteers of the war. No; it was the Jew.

The man who lacks the courage to assume responsibility for his moral deviations invents the saying, "Cherchez la femme." Hunt the woman in the case.

The civilization that lacks the courage to acknowledge responsibility for its economic maladjustment invents the method, *Cherchez le juif*: hunt the Jew.

It is an easy way out. It turns aside the dangerous social dissatisfaction, and lets it vent its fury upon the age-old scapegoat. It was a technique that worked for a long time in Russia. Significantly enough, no sooner did the Russian people awaken to the true nature of the oppression under which they had been crushed, than they decreed, officially, the end of anti-Semitism. Such a day, surely, to the honor of the oppressed German people, will dawn. They, too, will discover the true nature of the oppression under which they have been living. In the new scale of values that will be ushered in with that new day, the Jew will appear in his role as a sacrificial victim. Justice, ultimately, will be done to him. And he asks that simple justice, not for his own sake alone, but for the sake of the human race.

The editorial query of the *Times* was accompanied by an even less excusable series of articles—23 in all—that appeared in *The Morning Post* and was afterward collected and published as the book entitled *The Cause of the World Unrest*. The writer on the *Post*, naturally, knew little about, or chose to ignore, the Russian linking of the British, Irish and Jews, in the hereditary stigma (?) of Judaism. Gleefully he must have watched the practical results of his labors.

One of the saddest results was the establishment, by Henry Ford, the automobile magnate, of his *Dearborn Independent*. Ford himself had the decency, in 1927, to acknowledge that he had been victimized—that he had become convinced of the untruthfulness spread abroad by his weekly, and by the book that was born of its calumnious commentaries. By that time, however, more harm had been done than could ever be recalled by a retraction.

To be sure, no sooner had the vaporings of *The Morning Post* begun to appear than Lucien Wolf made them the target of his ready refutation.* What, however, could this little book do to counteract the inundation of defamatory volumes that were poured into every "civilized" nation of the world? The governments of these nations were frequently behind the sale of the books.

2. Henry Ford—And After

It is the judgment of Segel that the support of Ford, with his fairly illimitable means, did more to spread the lies of the Protocols anew than even all this inundation. How regrettable, then, that before entering upon such a campaign—before taking upon his head the blood—and I speak literally, not figuratively—of an innocent race, the great automobile magnate did not consider it advisable to study the matter with infinite care.

This man, who had thought that he could, in person, save the world from war, may have been Quixotic in his peace-ship enterprise. At least, however, he had been humane. At least he had been moved by a most laudable motive. Though one might question the efficacy of his method, one could not withhold admiration for his purpose.

That this same man, then, fresh from a mission of peace on earth and good will to man, could plunge his fortune and his reputation into the systematic vilification of a whole people attests the sad inconsistency of the human race. His retraction was a noble gesture. Whether you are rich or poor, it takes "guts" to acknowledge that you have been seriously in the wrong. In the case of Ford it was all the more difficult because of the action involved. What Ford could not recall, however, was the universal effect of his deed. It flows on, right into our own day, a testimony to the immortality of evil.

"It was generally assumed," comments Segel, "that the Protocols were defeated forever. But a half year later"—that is, following the summer of 1927, when Ford made his retraction—"an English version of the Protocols was published anew in Shanghai by a Christian missionary, who asserted his aim to be enlightenment of the world about the true origin of Communism and Bolshevism, then rife

*THE MYTH OF THE JEWISH MENACE IN WORLD AFFAIRS, or *The Truth About the Forged Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. Lucien Wolf. Macmillan.

in China. He maintained boldly that the Jews had not displayed the shadow of a proof in rebuttal and had only contented themselves with assertions and protestations. The Shanghai edition reached a high circulation and called forth stormy debates, in which principally the White Russians, who live in great numbers and are of great influence in China, zealously championed its authenticity. Some time before that, the Protocols had been published in the Bulgarian language by a national association at Sofia and circulated in great quantities among the population. They were the cause of several near-massacres. A few months afterwards, the Protocols were published in serial form by two Greek dailies. . . . Theodore Fritsch, of Leipzig, despite the multiplied, though juridically unenforceable demands and admonitions of Ford, continued to circulate **The International Jew** in several languages."

The evil that men do lives after them. . . .

In the light of these events it is utterly beyond dispute that the Protocols have become a valuable weapon in the hands of all reactionary groups. Wherever, in this day, they are brought up as an argument against the Jews, they are brought up, inevitably, as an argument against any advanced point of view. During the early days of the lie there may have been an excuse, among the general populace, for believing in them. The originators of the libel were manifestly dishonest, malicious, treacherous to the finer instincts of humanity. Their dupes, however, were lamentably sincere in lending credulity to the moral filth. Today, however, there is no longer any excuse. The Protocols have been exposed time and time again. They have been shown to be forgeries, fantasies, falsehoods. Every document in the case is available to all who can read, whereas the allegations of the opposition lack the most elementary sort of proof.

Henry Ford, unfortunately, did not even end the vogue of the Protocols in his own country, for all the manliness of his retraction. The Protocols, now in underground manner, again through the columns of vituperative magazines, live on to keep alive prejudice and hatred. Not only in the backwoods of the United States, to forget momentarily the vast area of Canada, does the lie of the Protocols flourish. It finds fertile soil in the cities, whether as part of an eternal whispering campaign, or in books issued from presses in the metropolitan center or its environs, or in the heated utterance of political conflict.

The Jews, despite statistics freely available, are accused of forming a majority of the Communist party, whether in the U.S.S.R. or in the United States. Lenin is palmed off, to ignorant readers, as a Jew! It is conveniently forgotten that the race which gave to the world the figure of Karl Marx also gave the world the symbolic figure of Jesus Christ. Since the American definition of a Communist—especially in the heat of a political campaign—seems to be "anybody who doesn't believe and vote as I do"—President Roosevelt becomes a "Communist." (Roosevelt, who has saved, temporarily, the Capitalist system in the United States!) Having thus simply become a "Communist," he becomes, by a similar lapse of logic, a Jew or, at least, a Jew-lover.

The cry then arises—as everywhere else, when malefactors have their own misdeeds to conceal—that the Jews are too powerful in business and in government. The deluded public, emotionally strained by the pressure of hard times, unconsciously looking for someone

or something upon which they can vent their general dissatisfaction with the way in which things are going, seize with more or less conscious glee upon this tangible symbol of their troubles. For this, as I have shown at the very beginning of this monograph, they have been prepared by centuries of religious mis-education. Whereupon the way is clear, once again, for the eternal repetition of the pogrom, whether the old Russian type of frank massacre, or the new German type of delayed destruction.

Does it do any good to confront these purposely general accusations with definite figures and facts? Let us hope so.

The Jews, according to the latest figures, form about 1/28 of the population in the United States. **One twenty-eighth.** Because they are largely concentrated in cities, they seem, to some observers, to be more. These, however, are the figures: 4,500,000 Jews in a nation of 125,000,000.

The February, 1936, issue of **Fortune**—a magazine published by the owners of the widely-circulated weekly, **Time**—carries a long collaborative article upon the Jews in the United States. It should be interesting to recall, in this connection, that the organization has been suspected, by many, of being Fascistic and anti-Semitic. I know a number of Jews who, during recent excitements, canceled their subscriptions to **Time** because of allegedly anti-Semitic statements and attitudes. I mention this, not because I have any reason to believe in the allegations; in fact, I know a Jewish editor on **Time**. I mention it, rather, to remove from the magazine **Fortune** any suspicion of being pro-Semitic. And I may add, while I am about it, that I do not believe the matter of anti-Semitism in the United States to be as simple, or as free of evil possibilities, as the article in question would imply.

That, however, is ink from another bottle. I am concerned with the statistics compiled by the writers of the report. Having—most unlike the type of person who writes Protocol-accusations—named the source, I do not intend to transcribe the numerous figures to be found in the article. Copies of **Fortune** are readily accessible in main libraries; the article, moreover, has been widely reprinted, summarized, and commented upon.

It proves, once again beyond the slightest doubt, that the Jew, despite this prominent person or the other, is not anything like the power in national affairs invented by the Protocol-terrorizers. I am not concerned with the implied morality of these objections to Jewish leadership. I am not concerned with their implied treason to the spirit of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, which do not name any special race or creed as the favored creed or race of this free government. I am concerned with statistical facts, which give the lie to the Judeophobia that spills its filth in the columns of the anti-Semitic press.

The same issue of **Fortune** that carries the investigation into the financial and industrial power of the Jews in the United States, gives also, in a special appendix, a list of the anti-Semitic publications of this country and of Canada. The large circulations that are rolled up by the sheets bears witness, yet again, to the fertile soil that awaits the planting of the venomous seed. It proves, for the thousandth time, that in dealing with racial prejudices—prejudices against any race, whatever its color—we are dealing with deeply-rooted emotions, not with intellectual convictions.

This brings us back to the theme with which we opened this sorry account of human malice and human stupidity.

For there are many, as anyone with a fairly wide acquaintance may testify, who may be rid of an intellectual conviction through the regular process of intellectual enlightenment, yet remain very little affected in their emotional attitudes. This helps to explain why so many brainy people fail to rid themselves of prejudices. Prejudices sink their roots not only into our less disciplined emotions; they sink their roots into our youth, our childhood, when we were being indoctrinated with the attitudes that our elders desired us to cultivate. To outroot a prejudice is, in a very deep sense, to re-live our childhood, to recast it, to undo the harm done by parental indoctrination, to reshape the attitude adopted when we were intellectually immature and responded more with the minds of others than with our own feelings and thoughts.

Thus every prejudice uprooted represents a reconquest of one's self.

Together with this personal reconquest goes the influence of an environment in which, how slowly and how painfully, the perpetuation of such lies as that of the Protocols becomes less and less profitable.

For racial prejudice has a class-character as well as a religious character. The spreaders of the lies that keep the common people of all nations apart are not interested so much in racial purity or in religious purity (whatever either of these concepts may really stand for) as they are in acquiring and retaining political and economic power.

It is they, not the Jews, who aim to control the world for their own greedy purposes. Theirs are the true Protocols. If you wish to know what they desire, what they plan, and how they aim to achieve it, re-read the Protocols and forget the references to the Jews. Insert, instead, any names you please that refer to the sinister representatives of our economic overlords.

Consider, in a word, the unwritten, but the indelible, Protocols of the Elders of Capitalism!

THE REAL ENEMY

1. "Moscow or Washington"

That was a characteristic peroration in which Al Smith indulged before the American Liberty League, on that eventful evening in which he accused President Roosevelt of having helped himself to the platform of the Socialist Party. I am not interested primarily in the squabble between the Democrats and the Republicans. I say, with Mercutio, "A plague on both your houses." What interests me far more, at this moment, is the fireworks shot off by Smith at the end—his star-spangled finale, with its rabble-rousing climax, Washington or Moscow!

The American Liberty League may have chosen its name because it desires to control the liberties of the American people. Perhaps, inwardly, it has as little use for Washington as for Moscow, and would prefer to have America ruled from and through Wall Street. Beware of Greeks bearing gifts, and beware of Liberty-Leaguers bearing liberty. **Beware of any politician who, in order to best his opponent, drags across the trail a herring that is Moscow-red.**

Smith is the last man who should have allowed himself to use this antiquated strategy. For, not a small part in the defeat of Smith for the presidency of the United States, in 1928, was played by a similar slogan: Washington or Rome!

Smith, and many other Catholics and non-Catholics, knew how unjust was that insinuation. The general public, nurtured upon the hatreds that religious indoctrination breeds, did not know, and did not care to know. Many of them were consumed by just such a prejudice as lies at the roots of the lie about the Protocols.

I am not defending the Catholic Church, any more than I defend the Jewish Church or any other religious institution. I am defending the right of a man to believe or disbelieve, as his conscience and judgment tell him. I am defending the right of a man to combat that which he deems false in favor of that which he believes to be true. I am defending his right to run for public office on his personal merits as a citizen capable of fulfilling the duties of that office.

When the Smiths (insert any other name that fits) rant about Moscow versus Washington, they are perpetrating precisely the malicious strategy that was used, in 1928, against Smith. Surely Al Smith must know that these tactics were employed by many Liberty Leaguers who now welcome him—perhaps with ironic reservations—to their predatory ranks.

When the Smiths (insert any other name that fits, from any party) rant about God, they are guilty of attempting to becloud the political and economic issue with which they pretend to deal. This country, as a nation, recognizes no special God; its fundamental documents do not require belief in any specified religion. The politician

who fills his sentences with pious cant is to be suspected just as much as the politician who fills them with references to Moscow.

Wherever the Communist bugaboo is invoked, the Jewish bugaboo is sure to follow, especially if times are hard and there is a large population of Jews. Pre-revolutionary Russia, as we have seen, associated the Jewish "peril" with the rise of liberalism; Hitlerized Germany, in defiance of all the figures and facts, tries to make an equation between Jews and Communistic ideas, and then, forgetting the equation very conveniently, accuses the self-same Jews of being international bankers with bourgeois plots up their sleeves! **Hitlerite logic is a wonderful phenomenon; it creates a marvelous creature who is at the same time a rabid Communist and a rabid Capitalist.**

The Smiths invoke the Democracy of Thomas Jefferson. Let them, rather, study the life of that great man, and try, even in humble manner, to measure up to his all-embracing greatness. Let the Republicans, too, cease from staining the memory of Lincoln by invoking it for comparison with the life and misdeeds of their scheming contemporaries.

I say it again: the Protocols that the people of this and other countries truly have to fear are the unwritten, but plainly read, Protocols of the Elders of Capitalism.

Let them cease from allowing themselves to be kept apart by slogans of religion, of national pride, of racial assertiveness. The forces of Capitalism, in the service of their great God, Profit, do not recognize boundaries between nations, between creeds, between races. They are, for the purposes of gain (which spell inevitably the purposes of war), internationalists.

Let the people, for the purposes of peace and prosperity, become internationalists as well.

This does not mean that they surrender their national existence, or give up—if they must retain them—their creeds, or deny their origins.

It means that they achieve, at long last, an understanding of their true interests.

Beneath the lie of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion are to be found the parent lies bred into Religion and into that organized exploitation, of which the latest phase is Capitalism.

The essential slogan is not "Washington or Moscow."

Neither is it "Religion or Atheism," despite the great importance of a realistic interpretation of religion.

2. "Divide and Conquer"

No. The essential slogan is "Exploitation or Non-Exploitation."

The exploiting classes, though subjected, as are we all, to the foibles of human nature, unite or clash upon questions of power and economic supremacy. Though they may, for strategic purposes, invoke the language of religion, they seek the rewards of crass materialism. The exploiting classes cannot carry out their designs unaided; they require—if only the people could understand this ironical truism!—the aid of the very masses that they exploit.

In order to get that aid, without which they could not continue their exploitation for a day, they must keep the masses from uniting. A united people could, in a day, restore to themselves the rulership

and the usufructs of the earth, without shedding a drop of blood. The masses must be kept disunited.

How are they kept disunited? By the perversion of their noblest instincts. By Religion, by Nationalism, by Racial Pride.

Is it not strange that these three nouns suggest to us, at first, hostility rather than union with our supposed brothers? For this hostility there is a psychological explanation; yet the unreasoning suspicion between peoples unfamiliar to one another could easily have been educated out of them if it had not been to the interests of the exploiters to breed that hatred rather than to eradicate it.

The Jew, as history reveals, is a rather constant scapegoat. There is, however, likewise throughout history, another scapegoat: the common man and woman—the eternal victim of economic exploitation. The Jew, originally a religious scapegoat, has been turned to the uses of economic exploitation. He is one of the surest means of keeping the economic victims from recognizing the true faces of their enemies. And what of the Negro, in the United States especially, as another scapegoat, whose plight, compared with that of the Jew, is an abyss at the bottom of an abyss?

The ancient Romans had a famous saying: *Divide et impera*: Divide and Conquer. Keep your enemies divided, and conquer them the more easily. Modern exploitation carries out, upon a scale that would have astounded the Roman amateurs, this self-same strategy.

The fact that rich, exploiting Jews may be snubbed by the rich, exploiting non-Jews does not invalidate the general truth of what I have been writing. Money, eventually, seeks and finds its own level. Besides, there is a difference between the amenities of social, private life and the realities of the economic life. There is a difference, too, between the clashes that break out when one exploiting group, in the demonic drive for ever vaster and vaster combinations of control, wishes to wrest power from another, and the artificial animosity that is stirred up and maintained between the various groups of the exploited.

We are able, even with this schematic presentation, to look upon the Lie of the Protocols in its proper psychological and historico-economic setting. It should teach us, not only that the Protocols are a malicious lie, but that the origin and use of the Protocols has its direct reference to the origin and use of other lies—lies employed to stir up and maintain hatred between groups that should unite for their common good.

Just as the treatment of the Jews in Germany is, at bottom, not only a Jewish question; just as the treatment of the Negroes in the United States is not only a Negro question; even so, at bottom, is the matter of the Protocols not simply a Jewish question. The oppression of any exploited group, in any part of the world, on any pretext, is the immediate concern of every other exploited group in the world. The Jews, for historic and psychological reasons, may form a group apart; Hitler, under the pretense of "cleansing" Germany, may rob even the rich Jews, as kings and princes have done before him. We have heard something, have we not, about dog eat dog? This does not alter the essential diagram of exploiters versus the exploited. Hitler is not robbing the Jews in order to enrich the German working-class. Nor did he "save" Germany from Communism in order to better the conditions of the German proletariat.

3. "Red" Herrings

Let us return to Al Smith and his stale slogan, "Washington or Moscow." I have said, and I repeat, that insinuations of Communist propaganda are, sooner or later, accompanied by insinuations of sinister, protocolist Jewish influence. In the case of Smith, this ultimate effect was singularly to be deplored, because Smith, as an individual, has always been on good terms with the Jews. Many, indeed, have regretted the passing of Belle Moskowitz, who was such a potent influence in his political life. Close watchers have noticed, since her death, a lack of stability in the once "happy warrior." Considering what one of the effects of the speech before the Liberty League was bound to be, it is sad to contemplate that, in the preparation of his speech, Smith had the cooperation of one or two wealthy Jews.

The true line of division is thus seen to be, in politics and in economics, not between race and race, creed and creed, or even nation and nation, but between one economic class and another. Recent books and investigations into the armament situation, and into the manufacture and sales of munitions, have once more established only too plainly the selfishly international character of industry. It would be worth while, for Gentiles who have been deceived by talk of Jewish Protocols, to ask themselves before they are once more summoned to the battlefield, whether profits in munitions haven't more to do with warfare than have a set of purely fictitious Protocols. (It would even be worth the while of Mary Pickford, author of the momentous discovery that no war was ever started on Christmas Day, to learn whether there is any connection between war profits and the waging of war on every other day of the calendar.)

I am not aware that the Jews figure prominently in the manufacture and sale of ammunition. Money has no sex; it knows no creed; it acknowledges no nation. A Jew in the munitions industry, a Gentile in the munitions industry, selling death to all sides of the battle-line, is first of all an enemy of the human race, and should so be considered by his fellow Gentiles or his fellow Jews, as the case may be.

When, as Karl Liebknecht showed, Germans own stock in French munitions factories, and French own stock in German munitions factories, collecting profits from the wholesale reciprocal destruction—when, as in London recently, a leading munitions profiteer freely admits that his concern is business, not peace, and that it makes no difference who buys his bullets and cannon and bombs, or what human goal they eventually find—when such supposedly human beings as the Krupps and the Du Ponts look on with indifference while Jews and Gentiles and Blacks and Yellows join in a mad symphony of slaughter, with each detonation ringing up a profit on the impartial cash-register, it is time that those sacrificial Jews and Gentiles and Blacks and Whites and Yellows forget such nursery rhymes as the forged Protocols, and give some attention to the real factors in the domination of the world.

In Germany, it is beginning to appear, the Catholics and the Communists have got together through underground channels and have determined upon a united front to combat the Nazi terror. There is no pretense, on the part of the Catholics, that they have surrendered their opposition to Communism; nor is there any pretense, on the part

of the Communists, that they have given up their educational campaign against the reactionary nature of religious institutions. In the face of a common enemy, however, they decided to pool their strength. Perhaps, from this strange association, dictated by the necessities of existence, each side will learn a new tolerance. For each side needs to learn precisely such a tolerance.

My point is this: if Catholics and Communists can get together for the purpose of fighting the common enemy of Fascism, of dictatorial oppression, then it is possible for any groups, however seemingly divided, to join forces for a like action and a like enlightenment.

The crime of the Protocols is not alone a crime against the Jews. This cannot be too often emphasized. Not only the Jews are the victims of this deception. The Gentiles, too, have been deceived. They have been made to swallow lie upon lie, and have been led into deeds of violence that disgrace the human species. Their prejudices, instead of having been slowly eradicated—and a great part of true education is the eradication of prejudice—have been emotionally confirmed by falsehood. It thus becomes more difficult than ever to root them out.

The crime of the Protocols is a crime against civilization itself. It has roused the beast in man, and made of him, as so often before, a blinded Cain rushing forth to slay his brother.

What has been the result?

Has the lot of the oppressed Gentile, in any country, been at all improved as a consequence of the pogroms unleashed against the Jews? Are those countries in which there is no Jewish problem—take, as an example, Japan, or Italy—any better off than the rest of the world? Is the deliberate starvation and slaughter of a people a path by which nations may rise to culture and civilization?

Should this not lead one to suspect that the real cause of the world unrest has nothing to do with the Jews, or with any other people as a people?

Should it not lead one to suspect that the cause of the world unrest is rather to be sought in economic maladjustment?

As I type these concluding lines, a book arrives; for the moment it shall be nameless. It is printed in this country. It is signed by a man who calls himself a sincere American. He even denies that he is actuated by malice toward the Jews. It opens with an insult to Benjamin Franklin, attributing to that great-hearted scientist a statement that reeks with hatred for the Jewish race. The statement lacks all authority; historians, including Professor Charles A. Beard, of Columbia University, deny that there is the slightest validity to the attribution. Nobody can bring forth proof of its existence in any report or document. The man who used it knew that the statement was unauthenticated. He did not care—this true American who avowed that he was not moved by anti-Jewish malice.

He speaks of the Jewish attempt to create hatred for "Christian Germany."

One would have thought that Hitler had made very plain his own hatred for "Christian" Germany. Why else is he having so much trouble with the Protestants and the Catholics? Why else has the cross been replaced by the swastika? But facts are nothing to this true American who avows that he is not moved by anti-Jewish malice.

When Ford had the manliness to admit his error in the matter

of the Protocols, he was, according to this "true American," "cowed" into making his apology. (Anybody who turns decent, and tries to make good an unjustified insult is, in the eyes of this "unprejudiced," "unmalicious" witness, "cowed." So, for example, General Grant, having apologized for an insulting letter about Jewish profiteers (is the word "profiteers" really a Jewish noun?), "cowed" into the retraction.)

I mention this book merely to show that, for all the conviction brought to the mind by the mere statement of fact, prejudice will flourish in the soil of emotional viciousness. Ultimately, I suppose, harsh circumstance will educate those who refuse to profit by reason.

In the meantime, it becomes more and more evident that those who choose to go on believing in such libels as that of the Protocols believe in spite of unimpeachable refutation—believe because they wish to believe—believe because their minds cannot conquer the prejudices with which they have been indoctrinated.

It all comes back to the element of human decency, to the spirit of live and let live. It is tragic that the road to the mind is so strewn with the debris of twisted and perverted emotions.