

**THE
BALFOUR
DECLARATION**



**WARRANT
FOR
GENOCIDE**

\$2.50

ERRATA

Page	Line	
10	2	changes—should be—change
10	32	intime—should be—in time
13	2	Slovaka—should be Slovakia
31	12	conservation—should be—conversation
36	25	diststrous—should be—disastrous
42	37	coludn't—should be—couldn't
42	32	ordent—should be—ardent
65	20	1971—should be—1941
86	2	he—should be—the
86	8	extraction—should be—extrication

**THE
BALFOUR
DECLARATION
WARRANT FOR GENOCIDE**

by

**Conrad K. Grieb
Collating Documentarian**

**Examiner Books
P. O. Box 2482
Grand Central Post Office
New York, N. Y. 10017**

BOOKMAILING SERVICE

**BOX 16 P.O.
INGLEWOOD, W.A. 6052**

A DISESTABLISHMENTARIAN PUBLICATION

A Disestablishmentarian Publication

Library of Congress Catalog No. 72-80203

Manufactured in the United States of America

CONTENTS

	Foreward	i
I	Balfour Declaration—Warrant For Genocide	1
II	President Wilson and The Balfour Declaration	29
III	The Balfour Declaration	35
IV	James Malcolm, Origins of the Balfour Declaration	39
V	The Khazars	45
VI	Nineteenth Century Money	49
VII	The Bankers Act	53
VIII	New World Order Pledged to Jews	65
IX	Col. Lindbergh's Des Moines Speech	79
X	President Roosevelt's Plans For War	87
XI	George Washington's Farewell Address	91
XII	Winston Churchill on War	93
XIII	Adolf Hitler on Peace	95
XIV	Jews Call Rarick Costly Racist	97
XV	The Protocols	101
	Acknowledgements	109
	Index	117
	Bibliography	121
	Disestablishmentarian Publications	122

To those many millions of people
who suffered because of the
Balfour Declaration
and to those
who through the years
preserved the documentation that
made possible this collated documentary

Douglas MacCollum Stewart
Richard "Bull" Smith Emmet
Seward Bishop Collins
Arthur Goadby
Francis Neilson
Benjamin Freedman
George Montgomery
Catherine Palfrey Baldwin
Lyrl Clark Van Hyning

FOREWORD

"Free societies are judged by how they treat their racial minorities and by the extent of the liberty they allow the individual citizen." (New York Times editorial on the Rehnquist Nomination, December 8, 1971)

THE BALFOUR DECLARATION, WARRANT FOR GENOCIDE, documents how a financially powerful racially-akin religious-group minority has taken advantage of the liberty allowed individual citizens to use its influence to the detriment of a racially consanguineous people with whom they are alien and for whom was created the Government set down by men great by all standards in the annals of time at the Constitutional Convention of 1787.

A top-echelon cabal of this racially-akin religious-group minority, that maintains its separateness and at the same time is dispersed among the populations of the liberal Western democratic nations, brought forth, in cooperation with a similar cabal in a foreign country, the Balfour Declaration to fulfill a 2,000 year old dream of a people whose religion they adopted and adapted to their own needs and with whom they are racially alien—a Declaration whose consummation with the aid of the governments of their host countries, has disturbed the peace, tranquility and natural development of the Western nation-states where this influential minority enjoys the freedom of institutions conceived for the native populations—a Declaration that has brought the host nations war, death and destruction with accompanying genocide for millions of people.

It is time there is made available to the natives of all countries the facts collated in THE BALFOUR DECLARATION, WARRANT FOR GENOCIDE, but now denied them by their liberal democratic governments, by their controlled educational institutions, by publishers and by the circulation media, television and radio.

With knowledge based on facts, the origin of the anarchic conditions in the Western world can be appraised and appropriate remedies sought.

Conrad Grieb

THE BALFOUR DECLARATION

It is a pity that it cannot be lost from sight, and a greater pity that it has not yet been removed from our public records. Unlawful in issue, arbitrary in purpose, and deceitful in wording the Balfour Declaration is the most discreditable document to which a British Government has set its hand within memory.

M. J.M.N. Jeffries in

Palestine: The Reality (Pages 200-01)

Published by Longmans, Green and Co. 1939

There was only one edition and never an American one.

THE BALFOUR DECLARATION WARRANT FOR GENOCIDE

This documentary collation is addressed to the people of the world in remembrance of those who have been victims of the most horrifyingly ghastly act of genocide in history, far rivalling that recorded in the Book of Esther.

Doubtless, many readers are horrified at this statement as was the author when its actuality was documented.

The man responsible is Theodor Herzl, founder of Zionism.

A play honoring Herzl, sponsored by the National Jewish Welfare Board, had its New York premiere on October 24, 1971 at the 92nd Street Young Mens Hebrew Association.

The new play, "The Man Behind The Legend," is by Yaacov Orland, artistic consultant of the Haifa Theatre in Israel. It is based on the diaries and autobiography of Herzl, once called "the dreamer of a Jewish homeland."

Let us begin on Saturday, August 29, 1903, the day after the closing of the Sixth Zionist Congress at Basle, as reported by Litman Rosenthal in the American Jewish News, September 19, 1919.

It is known as the "ladder revelation."

A month after meeting with Herzl at his hotel in Basle, Mr. Rosenthal was in Paris visiting Zionist friends. He was informed that Dr. Nordau was scheduled to speak about the Sixth Zionist Congress. Mr. Rosenthal interrupted his journey to Lyons to hear Dr. Nordau.

At the assembly Mr. Rosenthal found the people under the spell of Dr. Nordau whom he reported as saying:

"After Kishneff, the great, progressive power England, in sympathy for our people offered the Jewish Nation, through the Zionist Congress, an autonomous colony in Uganda. Uganda is not Palestine, but nothing is so valuable as amicable relations with such a power as England. Thus, accept the offer to create a precedent in our favor. Sooner or later the oriental question, where England's interests are will have to be solved,

and the oriental question means, naturally, also the question of Palestine.

"Herzl knows that we stand before a tremendous upheaval of the whole world. Soon, perhaps, some kind of a world-congress will have to be called and England, the great, free and powerful England will then continue the work it has begun with its generous offer to the Sixth Congress. And if you ask me now what has Israel to do with Uganda, let me tell you the following words as if I were showing you the rungs of a ladder leading upward and upward: Herzl, the Zionist Congress, the English Uganda proposition, the future world war, the peace conference, where, with the help of England, a free and Jewish Palestine will be created."

Like a mighty thunder these last words came to us and we all were trembling and awestruck as if we had seen a vision of old.

Eleven years later a shot was fired, the sound of which will echo around the world until the end of time. It started the world debacle that Dr. Nordau had spoken of in 1903.

In 1936 Winston Churchill made the following statement about the entry of the United States into World War I:

"America should have minded her own business and stayed out of the World War. If you hadn't entered the war the Allies would have made peace with Germany in the Spring of 1917. Had we made peace then there would have been no collapse in Russia followed by Communism, no breakdown in Italy followed by Fascism, and Germany would not have signed the Versailles Treaty which has enthroned Nazism in Germany. If America had stayed out of the war, all of these 'isms' wouldn't today be sweeping the continent of Europe and breaking down parliamentary government, and if England had made peace early in 1917, it would have saved over one million British, French, American and other lives."

How then did these United States get into the war that Sir Winston said we should have stayed out of?

Mr. James A. Malcolm, a British-Armenian Jew tells us in his brochure, ORIGINS OF THE BALFOUR DECLARATION, Dr. Weizmann's Contribution. We quote:

"During one of my visits to the War Cabinet Office in Whitehall Gardens in the last autumn of 1916, I found Sir Mark Sykes less bouyant than usual. As I had known his family of old and our relations were unrestrained, I enquired what was troubling him. He spoke of military deadlock in France, the growing menace of submarine warfare, the unsatisfactory situation which was developing in Russia and the general bleak outlook. He also told me that the much publicized Arab revolt in the desert, which was intended to deal a mortal blow to the Turks, from within, was a dismal and costly failure. The Cabinet was looking anxiously for United States intervention. I asked him what progress was being made in that direction. He shook his head glumly. "Precious little", he replied. He had thought of enlisting the substantial Jewish influence in the United States, but had been unable to do so. Reports from America revealed a very pro-German tendency among the wealthy American Jewish bankers and bond issuing houses, nearly all of German origin, and among Jewish journalists who took their cue from them. He was sorely disappointed and puzzled that two missions which had been sent from France and Italy had completely failed to have any effect. It appeared that the Tsarist persecution of the Jews, with the terrible record of pogroms at every Russian retreat, had made a deep impression. As the Germans had, on the contrary, shown in many army ordinances, especially in occupied Poland, a great understanding and sympathy for the Jews, the pro-German tendency of these Jews of German origin could not be deflected.

"I enquired what special argument or consideration had the Allies put forward to win over American Jewry. Sir Mark replied that they had made use of the same argument as used elsewhere, viz. that we shall eventually win and it was better to be on the winning side. I informed him that there was a way to make American Jewry thoroughly pro-Ally, and make them conscious that only an Allied victory could be of permanent benefit to Jewry all over the world. I said to him, 'You are going the wrong way about it. The well-to-do English Jews you meet and the Jewish clergy

are not the real leaders of the Jewish people. You have overlooked what the call of nationality means. Do you know of the Zionist Movement?' Sir Mark admitted ignorance of this movement and I told him something about it and concluded by saying, 'You can win the sympathy of the Jews everywhere, in one way only, and that way is by offering to try and secure Palestine for them.' " (pages 2-3)

Samuel Landman, Secretary to the Joint Zionist Council of the United Kingdom (1912) and Joint Editor of *The Zionist* (1913-1915) in his brochure *GREAT BRITAIN, THE JEWS AND PALESTINE*, published in 1936, provides the details of the undertaking to enlist the support of the Zionist Jews in America to bring the United States into the war on the side of the Allies:

"During the critical days of 1916 and of the impending defection of Russia, Jewry, as a whole was against the Czarist regime and had hopes that Germany, if victorious, would in certain circumstances give them Palestine. Several attempts to bring America into the war on the side of the Allies by influencing Jewish opinion had failed. Mr. James A. Malcolm who was already aware of the German pre-war efforts to secure a foothold in Palestine through the Zionist Jews and of the abortive Anglo-French demarches at Washington and New York; and knew that Woodrow Wilson, for good and sufficient reasons*, always attached the greatest importance to the advice of a very prominent Zionist (Mr. Justice Brandies of the U. S. Supreme Court); and was in close touch with Mr. Greenberg, Editor of the *Jewish Chronicle* (London); and knew that several important Zionist leaders had already gravitated to London from the Continent on the qui vive awaiting events; and appreciated and realized the depth and strength of Jewish National aspirations, spontaneously took the initiative, to convince first of all Sir Mark Sykes, Under Secretary of the War Cabinet, and afterwards Monsieur Picot, of the French Embassy in London and Monsieur Gour of the 'Quai d'Orsay' (Eastern Section), that the best and perhaps the only way (which proved so to be) to induce the American President to come into the War was to secure the co-

* See Page 31

operation of Zionist Jews by promising them Palestine, and thus enlist and mobilize the hitherto unsuspectedly powerful forces of the Zionist Jews in America and elsewhere in favor of the Allies on a quid pro quo contract basis. Thus, as will be seen, the Zionists having carried out their part, and greatly helped to bring America in, the Balfour Declaration of 1917 was but the public confirmation of the necessarily secret gentlemen's agreement of 1916 made with the previous knowledge, acquiescence and/or approval of the Arabs and of the British, American, French and other Allied Governments, and not merely a voluntary altruistic and romantic gesture on the part of Great Britain as certain people either through pardonable ignorance or unpardonable ill-will, would represent or rather misrepresent. . .

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

Mr. Malcolm evidently was privy to the deal Samuel Untermyer had made with President Wilson to have Mr. Brandeis appointed to the Supreme Court as Mr. Malcolm informed Sir Mark that he knew a man in America who was probably the most intimate friend of President Wilson. Through that man, if through anybody, the President's mind could be turned toward active participation in the war on the side of the Allies. (Jeffries, Palestine, The Reality, p. 135)

To hasten America's participation in the war the sinking of the small Channel steamer Sussex with the loss of American lives was falsely reported. This incident enabled President Wilson, desperate for a pretext to declare war

against Germany to fulfill his obligation to the Jews who had saved him from the public scandal of having his private life with Mrs. Peck (later Mrs. Hulburt) revealed, to ask Congress for a declaration of war. The Sussex had disappeared into a snug harbor and later turned up unharmed with no loss of lives. Who arranged this affair has never been revealed.

Apparently this agreement was timed to swing influential support to Wilson in the election of 1916. In **WOODROW WILSON, DISCIPLE OF REVOLUTION**, Jennings C. Wise states:

"Another new source of support in 1916 was the sudden and tremendous enthusiasm displayed by Zionist Jewry for Woodrow Wilson. About this there is perhaps a little mystery. Referring to a pamphlet published in 1936 by Samuel Landman, Solicitor and Secretary of the Zionist organization during the War, which purports to make quite clear the switch in Jewish support from the German to the Allied cause: the initial bias was not simply anti-Russian but pro-German. The reason was that the Zionists had expected to 'close a deal' with Germany for the later possession of Palestine, which they subsequently effected with the Allies.

"Jewish influence had much to do with Wilson's initial anti-Entente bias. Later, it influenced him in the opposite direction. The Jewish backing he enjoyed in 1916 constitutes strong circumstantial evidence that Wilson had subscribed at least tentatively, to the British deal with the Zionists. . ." (page 458)

The Balfour Declaration agreement the Zionist Jews made with Britain to bring the United States into World War I proved to be decisive.

Dr. E.J. Dillon reported the Peace Conference for the London Daily Mail. In his book **THE INSIDE STORY OF THE PEACE CONFERENCE**, he stated:

"Of all the collectivities represented at the Conference the Jews were the most influential. The largest and most brilliant contingent was from the United States. . . Delegates believed the real influences behind the Anglo-Saxon people were Semitic . . . The formula into which this policy was thrown by the members of the conference, whose countries it affected, and who regard it as fatal to the peace of Eastern Europe

was this: "Henceforth the world will be governed by the Anglo-Saxon peoples, who, in turn are swayed by their Jewish elements'" (page 12)

In the London Illustrated Herald, February 8, 1920, there appeared an article, A Struggle For The Soul of the Jewish People, by the Rt. Hon. Winston S. Churchill. He laments the enormous and determining influence Jews were having in the Bolshevik faction that was communizing Russia.

"From the days of Sparticus-Weishaupt (pseudonym of Adam Weishaupt who founded the secret Order of Illuminati on May 1, 1776) to those of Karl Marx, to those of Trotsky (Russia), Bela Kuhn (Hungary), Rosa Luxembourg (Germany), and Emma Goldman (United States), this world-wide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilization and for the reconstruction of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence, and impossible equality, has been steadily growing.

"It played a definitely recognizable role in the tragedy of the French Revolution. It has been the mainspring of every subversive movement during the nineteenth century; and now at last this band of extraordinary personalities from the underworld of the great cities of Europe and America have gripped the Russian people by the hair of their heads, and have become practically the undisputed masters of that enormous empire."

Had the United States stayed out of World War I this tragic event could never have happened as Churchill stated (see page 2). Churchill continues by offering Zionism as an alternative allegiance for the soul of the Jewish people with its emotional appeal for the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine under the protection of the British Crown an event which would be especially in harmony with the truest interests of the British Empire.

Zionist Max Nordau said the same in his Paris speech in September 1903—A Jewish State in Palestine would be in the interests of the British Empire.

On December 17, 1964, Churchill was honored for his Herzlian concept of Jewish statehood which in a 1908 letter he expressed to an English Zionst group, "sympathy with the historical aspirations of the Jews."

This phrase was incorporated in the preamble to the Balfour Declaration of Nov. 2, 1917, in which the British Govern-

ment pledged the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine.

As Samuel Landman explained in Great Britain, The Jews and Palestine, the British Government pledge was not gratuitous but a quid pro quo contract to bring the United States into the war.

While World War I fighting was still going on M. Ouden-dyk (Netherlands Minister at St. Petersburg) on September 16, 1918 wrote " . . immediate suppression of Bolshevism is the greatest issue before the world not excluding the war which is still raging. If not nipped in the bud immediately it will spread over the whole world as it is organized and worked by Jews who have no nationality and whose one object is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things."

How is it that M. Ouden-yk's warning which appeared in a British White Paper that was quickly withdrawn, was not heeded?

"Friendliness of Allied Governments toward the Bolshevik bandits became an immense political Panama at the Peace Conference" wrote Dr. Dillon (ibid 161). In a foot note he cited the influence of International Finance at the Peace Conference.

In his book Through Thirty Years, Wickham Steed confirms Dr. Dillon. Writing of the Bullitt Mission to Russia, Steed states in Volume II:

"Potent international interests were at work in favor of the immediate recognition of the Bolsheviks. The well known American-Jewish banker, Mr. Jacob Schiff was known to be anxious to secure recognition for the Bolsheviks among whom Jewish influence was predominant. (page 301)

" . . . unknown to him (Wilson) the prime movers seeking recognition of the Bolsheviks were Jacob Schiff, Warburg and other international financiers who wished above all to bolster up the Jewish Bolsheviks in order to secure a field for German and Jewish exploitation of Russian." (page 302)

Jacob Schiff, in 1917 head of Kuhn, Loeb & Company, sent a congratulatory telegram to the Friends of Russian Freedom meeting at Carnegie Hall on the night of March 23, 1917, to celebrate the triumph of the first Russian revolu-

tion that made possible the success of Bolshevism eight months later. The telegram read in part:

"Will you say for me to those present at tonight's meeting how deeply I regret my inability to celebrate with the Friends of Russian Freedom the actual reward of what we had hoped and striven for these long years."

JACOB H. SCHIFF

The New York Times published the telegram on March 24th with Mr. Schiff's signature in capital letters.

Society columnist Cholly Knickerbocker wrote in the New York Journal-American, February 3, 1949:

"Today it is estimated even by Jacob's grandson, John Schiff, a prominent member of New York Society, that the old man sank about \$20,000,000 for the final triumph of Bolshevism in Russia."

Is it surprising that M. Oudendyk's warning went unheeded with the influential Jewish delegates at the Peace Conference and their influence in international finance?

As the result of intransigence at the Peace Conference, where the fate of Europe was being determined, millions of native Russians were liquidated by the Jewish dominated Bolsheviks. "As for anyone who does not know that Bolshevism in Russia is Jewish I can only say he must be taken in by the suppressions of our deplorable press," wrote Hilaire Belloc in G.K.'s Weekly, February 4, 1937.

Columnist M.Z. Frank, gives us this information in his column, The Jews in Russia, in the Jewish Post & Opinion, February 26, 1971:

"Jewish cosmopolitanism was, if not the propelling force of the Bolshevik Revolution, certainly its brain-power . . . In Russia the process of absorbing the Jews into the cultural and social life of the country began comparatively late (that is later than in Western Europe —M.Z.F.). Millions of Jews in Imperial Russia . . . harbored within themselves a fierce energy of protests, which failing to find an outlet turned into the dynamite which blew up the Empire. The star of Zionism had only begun to rise at the opening of our century. For the mass of impoverished Jews that star was overshadowed by the sun of the terribly primitive and simplistic theory of Marxism.

"Many Jewish intellectuals saw in Marxism the weapon which could radically changes the social, economic and political structure of human society. They sincerely believed that, having destroyed by violence the old way of life and carried out a series of social reforms, they would alter not only society but human psychology as well, to be followed immediately by an era of human brotherhood . . . They won, but after the victory of the Revolution no one any longer needed the revolutionary energy of the Jews who served it." Quoted from an article by "Nikolayev" in the December, 1970 issue of "Ami", a Russian language publication issued by Russian-speaking university students in Israel.

The horrors of the Bolshevik Revolution inspired no international clamor for a crusade against Bolshevism. However, when the anti-communist National-Socialist government was voted into power in Germany, as a consequence of the Treaty of Versailles, Samuel Untermyer, prominent Jewish attorney of New York City, broadcast on August 7, 1933 on Radio Station WABC, a declaration of holy war against Germany on behalf of World Jewry and asked all the nations of the earth to join with them.

Reviewing the accomplishments of the Peace Conference in his book *The Peace Negotiations*, Robert Lansing, Secretary of State in Wilson's Cabinet, made a scathing indictment of the terms of peace and predicted the aftermath to be another war. He was not wrong.

During the days of the Weimer Republic the English journalist and author, Sisley Huddleston stated that Briand and Stresemann might have made peace, intime, and saved Europe—and America—from increasingly violent perturbations (In *My Time*, p. 278). Stresemann at the end of his career attributed his failure to secure for the Weimar Republic amelioration of the harsh terms of the Versailles Treaty to the intransigence of the World War I Entente.

Huddleston comments on the results of the Entente policy in these words:

"There have been three stages of Germany's revolt: first despair, which provoked passive resistance and bankruptcy; second, finesse, of which Stresemann was the principle exponent by which Germany gradually

moved from one position to another; third, force." (War Unless, p. 79)

Samuel Untermyer's declaration of holy war against Germany on behalf of world Jewry was the cue for the circulation press of the liberal Western democracies to become increasingly antagonistic toward the National Socialist Government of Germany. A glimpse of the pervading journalistic slant of opinion is exhibited in the 256 page FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT, TRIBUTE OF THE SYNAGOGUE, published in 1946. Here Roosevelt is eulogized for his support of Zionism (as was Churchill—Ed.) and for his feeling of outrage and horror, beginning in 1934 and continuing through the years, at the persecutions and brutalities carried on by the German Government.

No notice was taken of denials such as a report by the Patriotic Society of National German Jews nor of the atrocity fabrication factory operated in Amsterdam by a Jew Singer as reported by Hilaire Belloc in G. K.'s Weekly in 1938.

In London, Sir Walter Elliot, M.P., announced at Albert Hall in October 1942 that he considered the atrocities of the Nazis were, more than any other single factor, the cause of Great Britain going to war (London Jewish Chronicle, 6th Nov. 1942).

The atrocities of the Bolsheviks' liquidation of many millions of native Russians before the Nazis had political influence was never considered a cause for war.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

In Western eyes Czechslovakia was a happy democratic state. Few people understood that once Czech prestige and power were shaken it would be impossible to hold the polyglot state together. Of a population of almost 15 million in 1938, only about 51 per cent were Czech. There were 3.2 million Germans, 2.3 million Slovaks, .7 million Hungarians, .5 million Ruthenians, and a third of a million confessional Jews (the Zionist and non-orthodox Jewish populations was considerably greater than the figure given for confessional Jews).

The minorities in Czechslovakia, people who previously had never been under Czech rule, were so badly treated by the Czech rulers that the German and Slovak minorities had time and again appealed to the League of Nations, without results, to be freed from Czech rule. Doubtless, the plight of the minorities was never publicized in the circulation press of the liberal western democracies as, for strategic reasons, they preferred to maintain the Czechoslovak territorial dagger deep in the back of Germany rather than endanger the stability of Czechoslovakia by publicizing the plight of minorities. In June 1935, immediately after the ratification of the Czech-Soviet pact, the Paris Soir wrote of Czechoslovakia as fulfilling the function of Mother-Ship to the Soviet Air Force.

Although the Munich Agreement became a synonym for surrender to the dictators, A.J.P. Taylor, not known to favor the National Socialists, in his book, ORIGINS OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR, favored the Agreement as bringing peace to Europe, not unjustly.

To review the background of Czechoslovakia which came into existence through intrigue at the Peace Conference is beyond the scope of this study. In the Communist International, the central organ of the Comintern, there appeared on July 7, 1937 an article by Kopensky about the dependency of the Czech state on the Bolshevik October Revolution:

"The great October Revolution had a strong and positive influence upon the fate of the Czech people . . . the existence of the Czechs as a state . . . is primarily the result of the influence of the October Revolution."

After Munich the demand for Slovak autonomy came to the surface after being a grumbling undercurrent throughout twenty years of Czechoslovak history. Freed from the domi-

nance of Prague the Slovaks grew turbulent. By the end of February 1939 Czecho-Slovakia (hyphenated since October 1938) was crumbling. Benes had resigned and left the country. Hacha, his successor, was an elderly lawyer with no political experience. In the hour of disintegration he turned to Hitler and asked to be received. He was received in Berlin with the honors due a head of state. He was asked to sign away the independence of his country to become a protectorate of Germany. Any reluctance was silenced by a threat to bomb Prague. It was an improvisation. Hitler confessed later that the German airfields were shrouded in fog and no planes could have left the ground. Hacha signed and served as a faithful German subordinate until the end of the war.

On March 15th Bohemia became a German Protectorate. German troops occupied Prague and Hitler as head of state and army spent the night in the city. There was nothing unusual in this but the liberal democratic press aroused public opinion about violation of the Munich Agreement and Hitler couldn't be trusted. Hitler had nothing to do with the disintegration of Czecho-Slovakia. The Slovaks took care of that.

These developments happened without design on the part of Hitler. But they were to be used by the British as a pretext to stop Hitler.

On the 17th of March 1939 Chamberlain spoke in Birmingham. Aroused over normal developments of a no longer viable state, he asked "Is this the last attack upon a small state, or is it to be followed by others? Is this, in fact a step in the direction of an attempt to dominate the world by force?"

No one had been concerned about the plight of the Slovaks and other minorities under Czech misrule. When the Slovaks sought autonomy and freedom from Prague with the aid of Hitler who had liberated them from Czech dominance, that was interpreted as "a step in the direction of an attempt to dominate the world by force."

Chamberlain continued, saying he would not sacrifice for peace "the liberties that we have enjoyed for hundreds of years and any attempt to dominate the world by force was one which the Democracies must resist."

Nothing new had happened. Hitler merely confirmed the natural disintegration of an artificial nonviable state.

The event, however, marked a turning point in British policy to resist further territorial rectifications.

There were rumors of further German moves put out by journalists hoping to stir up trouble. All proved false.

POLAND

Writing in the London Economist, November 1931, R.W. Walmsley stated:

"One does not need to be endowed with an abnormally vivid imagination in order to foresee that for us to guarantee Germany's Eastern frontier would be an act of sheer criminal lunacy."

Sir Walter Layton, Editor of the Economist, commented on the Walmsley letter:

"We are apt to judge when we look into the East Europe settlement that its terms are inequitable and they ought not to be perpetuated if they could be."

William Harbutt Dawson, English authority on Germany, in **GERMANY UNDER THE TREATY** (1933) wrote of Danzig and the Corridor:

"... No factor in the life of Europe today offers so grave and certain a menace to peace than the Corridor, which cuts Germany into two parts, and severs Danzig, one of the most German of cities, from the Fatherland. Can Europe afford to ignore this menace and allow matters to drift? So to do would be tantamount to inviting and hastening catastrophe, for instead of improving, the conditions in the Corridor, after and because of over twelve years of Polish occupation, are steadily growing worse.

"Because it is now abundantly clear that all the needs of Polish trade, present and future, can be satisfied without the Corridor, and because good relations between Germany and Poland, which are so essential to the settlement and peace of Europe, will be impossible so long as that political monstrosity continues, the greater part of the territory should go back to the country to which it owes its civilization." (Pages 169-70)

Churchill had favored reconciliation between Germany and her neighbors, the removal of just grievances and opening discussions on the Danzig Corridor (House of Commons, Nov. 23, 1932 and April 13, 1933)

Hitler sought an amicable solution for the eastern border involving Danzig, as German a city as Boston is American, and the Corridor dividing Germany. The terms he suggested to Poland on October 24, 1938 were extremely reasonable but Foreign Minister Joseph Beck (his father was a converted Jew

from Galicia, Jewish Daily Post, 28th July, 1935) refused to accept the moderate terms offered and on March 26, 1939 broke off negotiations with Germany.

Chamberlain's March 17th Birmingham speech led Beck to believe that England would strengthen his position in negotiating with Germany. Furthermore, Ambassador Potocki's dispatches from the United States had alerted him to important influences in the American government favoring war in Europe to stop Hitler.

On January 12, 1939, scarcely four months after the Munich Agreement Count Jerzy Potocki, Polish Ambassador to the United States, sent a dispatch To His Excellency, the Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs in Warsaw about conditions in the United States:

1. How an artificial war panic was being created.
2. Roosevelt's expression of hatred for Fascism was for the purpose to divert American opinion from domestic problems. By creating a war panic and rumors of European crisis Roosevelt sought endorsement of an armament program in excess of normal requirements as conditions in the American labor market are growing worse with 12 million unemployed.

3. A particular group of people, Baruch, Gov. Lehman, Felix Frankfurter, Morgenthau and others all in highly placed American official positions, desirous of being representatives of "true Americanism", are linked with International Jewry by ties incapable of being torn asunder . . . Jewry was able not only to establish a dangerous centre in the New World for the dissemination of hatred and enmity but also succeeded in dividing the world into two war like camps.

4. Roosevelt has been given the power to enable him to enliven American foreign policy and at the same time to create huge reserves in armaments for a future war which the Jews are deliberately heading for.

On January 16, 1939 Potocki sent another dispatch to Warsaw reviewing his conversation with William Christian Bullitt (half Jew) who is to convey these views to European statesmen. The content of these views, officially those of the United States, is as follows:

1. Condemnation of totalitarian states by President Roosevelt.

2. The war preparations of the United States which are being executed at an increasing speed at the colossal expense of \$1,250,000,000.

3. Emphatic opinion of the President that France and Britain must make no further compromise with the totalitarian countries and must not allow themselves to be led into discussions regarding territorial changes.

4. A moral assurance that the United States are abandoning their policy of isolation and in case of war are ready to grant active support to Britain and France, America being prepared to place her whole financial and material resources at their disposal.

These developments in the West stiffened Beck's attitude and he rejected further negotiations over Danzig and called up Polish reservists. There were rumors of German troop movements to the border. They were without foundation and could have been started by the Poles. A News Chronicle reporter expelled from Germany had been briefed by German generals, claiming to be opponents of Hitler, on troop movements. On March 29th the reporter alerted the British Foreign Office. After the occupation of Prague and the supposed threat to Rumania, the British were ready to believe anything. They supposed Poland to be in danger. No alarm had come from the British ambassador at Berlin. Notwithstanding the Foreign Office accepted the report of the expelled journalist. Immediate action seemed necessary if Polish nerves were to be strengthened and the "peace front" saved.

On March 30th Chamberlain drafted with his own hand an assurance to the Polish government:

"If . . . any action were taken which clearly threatened their independence, and which the Polish Government accordingly felt obliged to resist with their national forces, His Majesty's Government and the French Government would at once lend them all the support in their power."

The assurance was unconditional: The Poles alone were to judge whether the guarantee should be called upon. The British could no longer press for concessions over Danzig.

From this moment peace rested on the assumption that Hitler would be more sensible and cautious than Chamberlain had been, that Hitler would continue to accept conditions at Danzig which most Englishmen had long regarded as intolerable.

The British had no practical means with which to fulfill their assurance; it was a declaration of words only. The British had not consulted the French and could only be a British promise that the French would not go back on their alliance with Poland. When Beck came to London in April the British hoped to remedy the flaws in their assurance: no condition that the Poles would be reasonable over Danzig, no promise of support for Rumania or cooperation with Soviet Russia. With his usual "great power" arrogance, Beck was prepared to turn the one-sided British guarantee into a pact of mutual assistance. Beck refused cooperation on all counts. Chamberlain and Halifax accepted his virtuoso performance without protest.

On August 25th Hitler made a generous and comprehensive offer of a final understanding with England. On August 27th, 1939, an emissary, Dahlerus, took the proposals to 10 Downing Street for presentation to Prime Minister Chamberlain and Foreign Minister Halifax. The proposals were in essence:

1. Germany would sign a pact of alliance with England.
2. England would act as mediator with Poland for the return of Danzig and the Corridor to Germany with Poland being allowed the use of the port of Danzig.
3. Germany would guarantee the sovereignty of Poland.
4. Agreement on Germany's former colonies.
5. Adequate guarantees for the treatment of the German minority in Poland.
6. Germany would aid in the defense of British Empire when called upon.

It appears that Hitler did not realize the extent by which English policy was influenced by the spirit of Nineteenth Century Money created by England and in the twentieth century a determining influence in the United States, and vouched for by the banking institutions of both countries.

The very day, August 25th, that Hitler made his offer, England confirmed her new blank check guarantee of Poland. It was designated:

AGREEMENT
between the Government of the United Kingdom and the
Polish Government
regarding
MUTUAL ASSISTANCE
(with **PROTOCOL**)
London, August 25, 1939

The Agreement comprised eight articles and a Protocol. It required the Government of the United Kingdom to come to the aid of Poland if Poland became engaged in hostilities with a European power in consequence of aggression by the latter.

Article 1.—(a) of the Protocol reads as follows:
By the expression “a European Power” employed in the Agreement is to be understood Germany.

According to Article 1 of the Agreement if the European Power is Germany, immediate hostilities will ensue.

Article 1.—(b) of the Protocol states that if the European Power is other than Germany, “the Contracting Parties will consult together on the measures to be taken in common.”

Interestingly, the text of the AGREEMENT, between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Polish Government regarding MUTUAL ASSISTANCE (with PROTOCOL) dated LONDON, August 25, 1939, was not released by His Majesty's Stationery Office until April 1945.

England ignored Hitler's offer of an agreement that would have kept the peace of Europe and righted what was recognized by informed people everywhere to be an injustice and cause for war written into the Peace Treaty of Versailles, and deliberately made an agreement with Poland that guaranteed war. Poland, encouraged to come to no agreement with Germany on the German city of Danzig and the German territory of the Corridor, began immediate mobilization against Germany. Attacks were made on Germans not only in the Corridor and in the Free City of Danzig, not under Polish administration, where there were massacres of German civilians, but Poles crossed the border to provocatively attack Germans on German territory.

England had the backing of President Roosevelt, as stated by Ambassador Potocki. Doubtless when James A. Farley, a member of Roosevelt's cabinet made Poland his first stop on his European tour in the late summer of 1939, he carried

a message from Roosevelt to Foreign Minister Beck not to negotiate territorial rectifications.

After the Munich Agreement had liberated German, Slovak, Hungarian and Ruthenian minorities from oppressive Czech political dominance (the Englishman, George Pitt-Rivers, in his book THE CZECH CONSPIRACY, testified to that) Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain and Reichkanzler Adolf Hitler on September 30, 1938, signed an agreement that England and Germany would never go to war with one another again:

"We have had a further meeting today and have agreed in recognizing that the question of Anglo-German relations is of the first importance for the two countries and for Europe.

"We regard the agreement signed last night and the Anglo-German Naval Agreement as symbolic of the desire of our two peoples never to go to war with one another again.

"We are resolved that the method of consultation shall be the method adopted to deal with any other questions that may concern our two countries, and we are determined to continue our efforts to remove possible sources of difference and thus to contribute to assure the peace of Europe."

September 30, 1938

Adolf Hitler, Neville Chamberlain

Two months later, on Hitler's instructions, German Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop, made the following agreement with France:

Herr Joachim von Ribbentrop, Reich Minister for Foreign affairs and

M. George Bonnet, French Minister of Foreign Affairs, acting in the name and by order of their Governments, are, at their meeting in Paris, on December 6, 1938; agreed as follows:

1. The German Government and the French Government fully share the conviction that peaceful and good neighborly relations between Germany and France constitute one of the most essential elements for the consolidation of the situation in Europe and the maintenance of general peace. The two Governments will in consequence use all their efforts to en-

sure the development of the relations between their countries in this direction.

2. The two governments recognize that between the two countries there is no territorial question outstanding, and they solemnly recognize as final the frontiers between their countries as they now exist.
3. The two Governments are resolved, while leaving unaffected their particular relations with other Powers, to remain in contact with regard to all questions concerning their two countries, and mutually to consult should the later evolution of those questions lead to international difficulties.

In token whereof the representatives of the two Governments have signed the present Declaration, which comes into immediate effect. Done in two original Documents in the French and German language respectively, in Paris, December 6, 1938.

Joachim von Ribbentrop
Reich Minister for
Foreign Affairs

George Bonnet
Minister for
Foreign Affairs

It would have been thought that the agreements to preserve the peace of Europe that Hitler initiated with Britain and France would have made possible collaborative reconstruction in which all countries of Europe could be participants.

This was not to be.

Shortly after Chamberlain returned home after signing the historic agreement of friendship with Germany the British Government embarked on an extensive armament program as vouched for by Hilaire Belloc in the article attributed to him in the Weekly Review of January 12, 1939, two months before Hitler sought to allow the Slovak autonomy within what came to be known after the Munich Agreement as Czecho-Slovakia (not Czechslovakia). It was Hitler's mediation between the Czechs and Slovaks when Czecho-Slovakia became a protectorate of the Reich that caused Chamberlain in his March 17th Birmingham speech to express the sentiment that this was "a step in the direction of an attempt to dominate the world by force" when actually it was an attempt to preserve peace between Czechs and Slovaks.

Who was it that made a scrap of paper of the agreement for peace between England and Germany signed on Sep-

tember 30, 1938 by Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain and Reichkanzler Adolf Hitler?

Remember the scrap of paper of 1914 when Belgium was part of the ring with which the Entente had encircled Germany? Francis Neilson, former M.P. contemporary of Winston Churchill, detailed that in his book DUTY TO CIVILIZATION.

On the fateful 1939 Spring, Karl von Wiegand wrote:

On April 25, 1939, four months before the German invasion of Poland Ambassador Bullitt called me to the American Embassy in Paris to tell me:

War in Europe has been decided upon.

Poland had the assurance of the support of Britain and France, and would yield to no demands from Germany.

America, Ambassador Bullitt predicted, would be in the war after Britain and France entered it (Chicago Herald-American, Oct. 8, 1944).

Confirming von Wiegand's conversation with Ambassador Bullitt, Arthur Sears Henning wrote on November 12, 1941:

From the outbreak of the war the President has been under fire for permitting, if not encouraging, William C. Bullitt, American Ambassador to France and other diplomats to encourage France and Poland to get into the war with promises of American support (Washington Times Herald).

On December 27, 1945, Forrestal made this entry in his diary:

Played golf today with Joe Kennedy. Chamberlain, he says, stated that America and the world Jews had forced England into war.

Charles A. Lindbergh in his The Wartime Journals of Charles A. Lindbergh asserted that the Roosevelt Administration, pro-British elements and American Jews had forced the United States into World War II—a war he contended America had lost (New York Times, Aug. 21, 1970)

British diplomacy, influenced by the resort-to-war-to stop—Hitler policy of the Roosevelt Administration, as herein documented, and assured of American military support, set the stage for World War II.

It is interesting to observe that the August 1968 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia (one word again since the liberal Western democracies allowed the Czech and Slovaks together to be placed under Soviet dominance) aroused journalistic indignation in the liberal Western democracies but no cause for war against the Soviets. Likewise, when the Soviets invaded Hungary in 1956, after Walt Rostow made known that the United States did not look with favor on unfriendly, anti-communist countries on the Soviet's borders. No cause for war here. The liberal Western democracies find no cause for war when the Soviets communize border states.

But in 1938 when Hitler sought to free the forty-nine per cent unhappy minorities from Czech political dominance the liberal Western democracies threatened war against Germany. The Munich Agreement brought peace to Central Europe by placing the minorities where they wanted to be.

Then England treated as a scrap of paper the peace agreement signed by Hitler and Chamberlain by sharply increasing armament expenditures as had the United States under Roosevelt's direction. Then, with the backing of Roosevelt (see Chamberlain statement page 16) England gave Poland a blank check guarantee instead of counselling Foreign Minister Beck to come to an agreement with Germany over ~~the~~ Danzig and the Corridor as all informed opinion had advocated for years (page 14). England with Roosevelt's urging set the trap for World War II. Beck and Hitler sprung it.

Before America was in the war General Robert Wood testified in February 1941 before a Senate Committee on Lend Lease that at a luncheon with Churchill at his London flat, Churchill had said to him:

"Germany is getting too strong—we must smash Germany."

England had much experience smashing before Churchill made his comment to General Wood. In earlier times, one after the other, England had annihilated Spain's sea born commerce, then Holland's; at the Peace of Paris, 1763, divested France of her North American colonies and during the Napoleonic period destroyed Denmark's navy and crippled her shipping.

DENMARK

During the Napoleonic period Denmark had entered a neutral confederation with Sweden, Russia and Prussia, formed to prevent England from searching vessels of neutral countries for contraband of war. To force Denmark's withdrawal from the confederacy and to become a vassal of England, on April 2, 1801 a large English fleet appeared before Copenhagen and bombarded the city and its fortifications. In defending the city the Danes are said to have caused the loss of a thousand English seamen and inflicted considerable damage on the English ships. Hostilities ceased when news arrived of the assassination of Czar Paul causing the dissolution of the neutral confederacy. Denmark angered the British policy makers of the times by maintaining neutrality in following years.

On July 31st, 1807 Lord Castlereagh declared in Parliament:

A large expedition will be fitted out, but those whom it concerns will not hear of it until they feel the deathblow in their neck.

On August 16th thirty-six English warships and a considerable number of transports (the number has been placed at 500 by some historians) appeared before Copenhagen to land an army of 30,000 men which besieged the city while the fleet blockaded the harbor and shelled the city for five days and nights. After much damage had been done and more than 2,000 Danes killed, the city surrendered. Denmark was forced to surrender her entire navy to the English who, before departing, destroyed the wharves and all machinery and equipment that could not be carried off.

IRELAND

England scourged the high level of culture attained in Ireland in the Middle Ages by frequent raids until during the days of Cromwell the whole of Ireland was subjected to British rule. From 1641 to 1652 over 500,000 of the Irish perished by sword, famine and disease. Sequestered property was handed over to British colonists. Irish cattle breeding, industry and commerce were suppressed to favor English business. In 1699 exports of Irish worsteds to foreign countries was forbidden. To prevent competition with the ports of England the magnificent harbors of Ireland were closed and became desolated.

By 1840 in their misery and poverty as tenants on their own land, they could not pay the rent demanded by the absentee English owners and were driven from the land by soldiers brought from England. Crops failed, starvation ensued and thousands died. From 1841 to 1880 over three million emigrated, mostly to the United States.

INDIA

In India, The East India Company, by intrigue and force, succeeded in not only crippling their Portuguese, Dutch and French rivals but gained influence over native rulers by supporting one against the other. This policy found its most audacious and unscrupulous operator in Robert Clive who had come to Madras in 1744. His rapacity led some members of Parliament to demand his arraignment as a criminal. The House of Commons instead substituted a decision, "that Lord Clive has rendered to his country great and valuable services."

Hastings, the successor to Clive after his suicide, was little better. In 1786 on account of "high crimes and misdemeanors", a number of high-minded Englishmen demanded his impeachment. The proceedings lasted eight years. The House of Lords verdict was, not guilty.

CHINA

In China the East India Company was responsible for the large expansion of the opium trade after the company displaced the Portuguese. The Opium War was fought to prevent the Chinese Government from banning opium imports.

The Boers of South Africa

The British began to scourge the Boers as early as 1795 and in 1815 they took possession of their Capeland country. The Boers, trekking into the interior to escape British rule, were followed by the British when diamonds and gold were discovered. J. A. Hobson, in *THE WAR IN SOUTH AFRICA*, describes how a non-British group of international financiers used British imperialism to dominate the economic and political life of South Africa. At the time of the Boer War, Jean Carrere, correspondent of *Le Temps*, reported, "Captain G., an English officer told him at Bloemfontein: 'It is, however, in order to give gold to some financiers, at present one knows not where sheltered, that the soldiers of Great Britain have come here.'"

In October, 1899, the English began the war against the Transvaal. The war was cruel beyond description. In an official report addressed to President Kruger, the Boer General Jan C. Smuts stated:

Lord Kitchener began to carry out in the two republics a policy distinguished by unheard of barbarity and disregard of the elementary principles of all martial law. . . the war has long since degenerated into an enterprise for the extermination of the Boer people.

More than 20,000 Boer women and children perished in Kitchener's concentration camps.

GERMANY

The rise of Germany's industry and shipping caused jealousy in England. On September 11, 1897 the Saturday Review published a critical article about Germany wherein this sentence appeared:

If Germany were extinguished tomorrow, the day after tomorrow there is not an Englishman in the world who would not be the richer. . . Germania delenda est.

On the eve of the Second Hague Conference (1905) President Theodore Roosevelt asked Mr. Henry White, distinguished American diplomat, then in Brussels, to go to London to see Mr. Balfour to secure his cooperation in making the coming conference a success. The conversation Mr. White had with Mr. Balfour is typical of similar statements that appeared from time to time in British political literature during this period:

"Balfour (somewhat lightly): 'We are probably fools not to find a reason for declaring war on Germany before she builds too many ships and takes away our trade.'

"White 'You are a very high minded man in private life. How can you possibly contemplate anything so politically immoral as provokinug a war against a harmless nation which has a good a right to a navy as you have? If you wish to compete with German trade, work harder.'

"Balfour: 'That would mean lowering our standard of living. Perhaps it would be simpler for us to have a war.'

"White: 'I am shocked that you of all men should enunciate such principles.'

"Balfour (again lightly): 'Is it a question of right or wrong? Maybe it is just a question of keeping our supremacy.' " (from Henry White, *Thirty years of American Diplomacy*, by Allan Nevins, pp257-8)

Balfour's attitude indicates no change had taken place in the policies of the ruling English Establishment since Carlyle, in the previous century, had made known his gloomy view of England's future.

Although Thomas Carlyle's outlook alienated many well placed people of the English literary world of his time (1795-1881), he has proved to be a prophet. He lived in what, in the sorrow of his heart, he termed the Latter Days of England, her 'penultimate ages, or times immediately before the last'; wherein he warned her that, if she did not repent and turn from the course she was on, nothing save destruction could lie before her.

After the panic of 1908, there was only one man of prominence who had the courage to speak his mind upon this matter (powers that have shaped British foreign policy since Waterloo-Ed.). Lord Welby, who was once the head of the British Treasury, said:

"We are in the hands of an organization of crooks. They are politicians, generals, manufacturers of armaments, and journalists. All of them are anxious for unlimited expenditure, and go on inventing scares to terrify the public and to terrify Ministers of the Crown."

He was in a position to gather the facts and know what he was talking about. (Francis Neilson, *Makers of War*, p. 56)

E. D. Morel, former Member of Parliament expressed a similar view of the years of diplomatic intrigue that led to the 1914 debacle:

"British policy' was the policy not of Britain, but of the handful of liberal cabinet ministers who, with their accomplices in the world of foreign office and embassy officialdom, journalism and finance, were running the country onto the rocks. "(Secret History of a Great Betrayal).

Theodore Herzl, who was honored by the National Jewish Welfare Board, is the inspirer of the Balfour Declaration, that prevented a negotiated peace to end World War I, the lack of which resulted in the destruction of the established

order as predicted by the Zionist Dr. Max Nordau in his famous ladder speech in 1903. The Bolshevik revolution in Russia, directed by Jews, that liquidated millions of native Russians, would not have occurred. There would have been no Versailles Treaty which caused the rise of Nazism in Germany resulting in Jewish influence again to bring about another World War more destructive than the first.

In THE LIFE OF LORD GEORGE BENTINCK, Benjamin Disraeli wrote in 1852:

The people of God co-operate with atheists; the most skillful accumulators of property ally themselves with communists; the peculiar and chosen race touch the hand of all the scum and low castes of Europe. And all this because they wish to destroy that ungrateful Christendom which owes them even its name and whose tyranny they can no longer endure. (page 456)

In the Gospel of St. John, Chap. 8, verse 44, Jesus spoke to the Pharisees who questioned him:

Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.

Why has this tragedy come upon the world? The Apostle Paul gives the answer in II Corinthians, Chap. 6; verse 14:

Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?

Those of all the nations of the earth who remember their millions of dead should be informed that their dead suffered their fate because of the Balfour Declaration, the greatest warrant for genocide in the history of mankind.

**PRESIDENT WILSON
and the
BALFOUR DECLARATION**

Why did President Wilson "attach the greatest importance to the advice of a very prominent Zionist, Mr. Justice Brandeis of the United States Supreme Court?"

A paragraph from Anatole France's *Penguin Island* will be an appropriate introduction.

"The Sofa of the Favorite" . . . on it were decided the destinies of a great people; nay on it was accomplished an act whose renown was to extend . . . over all humanity. Too often events of this nature escape the superficial minds and shallow spirits who inconsiderately assume the task of writing history. The fall of Empires and the transmission of dominions astonish us and remain incomprehensible to us because we have not discovered the imperceptible point or touched the secret spring which, when put into movement, has destroyed or overthrown everything."

Grover Cleveland's support had elected Wilson President of Princeton in 1902. By 1908 Wilson's progressivism had alienated Cleveland who branded Wilson intellectually dishonest. Furthermore, Wilson's immoral life had become so well known that he had received private but official notice that it would be desirable for him to resign. This was the reason Wilson made such strenuous efforts to obtain the nomination for Governor of New Jersey.

At the time Wilson received the nomination for Governor of New Jersey there had been filed with the Court an action by Mrs. Wilson asking for a decree of divorce from her husband on statutory grounds. Wilson's political backers asked Mrs. Wilson to withdraw the application for divorce and have it expunged from the Court records. It was realized if Mrs. Wilson's action for divorce became publicly known it would in all probability, make it impossible to elect Wilson Governor of New Jersey.

Wilson was elected and served as Governor from 1911 to 1913.

The reason for Mrs. Wilson asking for a decree of divorce was her husband's relations with Mrs. Peck, the wife of a Princeton professor. Later Mrs. Peck was divorced from her husband and lived in Washington with her second husband, a Mr. Hulburt who had a grown son. Apparently, in Washington, Mrs. Peck, as it appears she was known, continued her relations with the President as it was a notorious fact, not denied by anyone having knowledge of Washington affairs at the time, that Wilson again led an openly immoral life with a woman employed in the Department of Commerce by the name of Peck. Wilson was frequently referred to by newspaper men and others as "Peck's Bad Boy" after a book with that title had obtained some popularity throughout the country. Mrs. Wilson, it is said, died of a broken heart because of this unsavory affair and the disgrace and humiliation it brought upon her.

Mrs. Peck, in her role as Mrs. Hulbert is said to have been fond of her stepson and sought to repay \$40,000 he was obliged to reimburse the bank for which he worked or be prosecuted. Mrs. Hulburt decided to ask President Wilson to aid her in return for the love letters he had written while President of Princeton University. Samuel Untermyer approached the President for Mrs. Hulburt.

The President knew Mr. Untermyer for his aid during his campaign for the Presidency along with Bernard Baruch, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., Abram Elkus and other Jewish financiers who, unknown to McCombs, his campaign manager, were committing Wilson to the program of the Internationalists. It is said that the President was gratified that Mr. Untermyer's involvement in the affair prevented the Republicans making his private life public for their political advantage.

President Wilson informed Mr. Untermyer that he did not have \$40,000 to pay Mrs. Hulburt. Mr. Untermyer asked the President to give the matter some thought and he would return in a few days.

When Mr. Untermyer returned the President again informed him that he did not have \$40,000 to pay Mrs. Hulburt. Mr. Untermyer then volunteered to pay Mrs. Hulburt if the President would appoint to the first vacancy on the Supreme

Court a nominee selected by Mr. Untermyer. The President accepted Mr. Untermyer's offer. Mr. Untermyer then paid Mrs. Hulburt \$40,000 in currency in exchange for the packet of love letters President Wilson had written to her.

Mr. Untermyer suggested to President Wilson the appointment to the Supreme Court of the radical Boston lawyer, Louis Dembitz Brandeis, an ardent Zionist. On January 18, 1916 President Wilson submitted his name to the Senate for confirmation. Strong opposition delayed the confirmation of Brandeis, the first Jew to sit on the Supreme Court, until June 5th. The date was about five months before James Malcolm had his autumn conversation with Sir Mark Sykes, at the British War Cabinet Office, about getting the United States into the war on the side of the Allies.

Thus, for good and sufficient reasons, President Wilson attached the greatest importance to the advice of a very prominent Zionist, Mr. Justice Brandeis.

It was the ardent Zionist, Mr. Justice Brandeis who, knowing the reason for his appointment to the Supreme Court, guided Wilson along the road to war on the basis of further talks held by Mr. Malcolm in various Government Departments (British-Ed.), at which Dr. Weizmann was present. "The talks resulted in a general, which I (Mr. Malcolm-Ed.) called a "gentleman's agreement", that the Zionists should work for active Jewish sympathy and support for the Allied cause, especially in the United States, so as to bring about a radical pro-Allied tendency in that country and that the British Cabinet would help the Jews to gain Palestine in return for this." (Malcolm, Origins of the Balfour Declaration, p. 5)

Mr. J.M.N. Jeffries, author of FRONT EVERYWHERE, an account of his experiences as a foreign correspondent during World War I and after, in his just about unknown, massive 700 page detailed study of the Balfour Declaration, PALESTINE: THE REALTY published in 1939, there was no other edition, on pages 135-6 provides the information that follows:

"A passage in extenso may now be taken from Mr. Landman's article (World Jewry, Feb. 22 and March 1st, 1936). He writes:

"'After an understanding had been arrived at between Sir Mark Sykes and Weizmann and Sokolov, it

was resolved to send a secret message to Justice Brandeis that the British Cabinet would help the Jews to gain Palestine in return for active Jewish sympathy and for support in the U. S. A. for the Allied cause, so as to bring about a radical pro-Ally tendency in the United States. This message was sent in cipher through the Foreign Office . . . Secret messages were also sent to the Zionist leaders in Russia to hearten them and to obtain their support for the Allied cause, which was being affected by Russian ill-treatment of the Jews, Messages were also sent to Jewish leaders in neutral countries, and the result was to strengthen the pro-Ally sympathies of Jews everywhere.

" . . . Dr. Weizmann was able . . . to secure from the Government the service of a half dozen younger Zionists for active work on behalf of Zionism.

At that time conscription was in force, and only those who were engaged on work of national importance could be released from active service at the front. I remember Dr. Weizmann writing a letter to General Macdonogh (Director of Military Operations) and invoking his assistance in obtaining the exemption from active service of Leon Simon, Harry Sacher, Simon Marks, Hyamson Tolkowsky and myself (Samuel Lanman-Ed.) . . . Simon Marks actually arrived at the Office in khaki, and immediately set about the task of organizing the office which, as will be easily understood, had to maintain constant communication with Zionists in most countries.

" 'From that time onward for several years Zionism was considered an ally of the British Government, and every help and assistance was forthcoming from each government department. Passport or travel difficulties did not exist when a man was recommended by our office. For instance, a certificate signed by me was accepted by the Home Office at that time as evidence that an Ottoman Jew was to be treated as a friendly alien and not as an enemy, which was the case with the Turkish subjects.' "

Mr. Jeffries has these further comments about the Balfour Declaration:

"As happens now and then in the course of public events, words which were written to be a eulogy have stayed to be an impeachment.

"These were its (the Balfour Declaration-Ed.) principal characteristics:

- 1. Its publication broke our pledged word to the Arab race.**
- 2. Its object was to establish the Jews in a privileged position in Palestine without the consent of the population, as a prelude to the absorption of the latter, under plea of their co-operation, in a future Jewish State.**
- 3. It was written in great part by those who were supposed only to have received it, and was deliberately worded so that the truth might be hidden by it, its guarantees to the Arabs be useless and its promises intangible.**
- 4. It was ostensibly a recognition of Zionist aspirations to return to Palestine under the sanction of historic rights, but in reality it was the published clause of a private bargain by which war-spoils were to be given in payment for war help.**

"It is a pity that it (The Balfour Declaration) cannot be lost from sight, and a greater pity that it has not yet been removed from our public records. Unlawful in issue, arbitrary in purpose, and deceitful in wording the Balfour Declaration is the most discreditable document to which a British Government has set its hand within memory. "(pages 200-1)

THE BALFOUR DECLARATION

Jacob de Haas introduced Zionist doctrines to Brandeis when he already was a prominent man in Boston. In 1913 Brandeis made his first speech on behalf of the creed. "Early in 1914" states Mr. de Haas, "Brandeis perceived the identity of purpose in American idealism and Zionist aims. Hence he did not hesitate to approach President Wilson, who sympathized fully with Brandeis's Zionist views, and then proceeded to discuss the future of Palestine with the British and French Ambassadors in Washington. "(Palestine: The Realty, page 158)

It was the personal intervention of Dr. Weizmann that turned the Zionist scale to the side of the Allies and defeated a standing German offer which at that time was being considered seriously by the non-Allied branches of the Zionist Organization. (ibid. page 169)

Mr. Samuel Landman states (page 5) that "the Balfour Declaration of 1917 was but the public confirmation of the necessarily secret gentlemen's agreement of 1916.

The Declaration having accomplished its purpose and brought America into the war on the side of the Allies, Mr. de Haas states that "The American ascendancy in the war-councils led the British to ask for President Wilson's consent and approval of the terminology of the declaration before its issuance. The draft cabled from Government to Government was handed to the Brandeis regime for its approval."

Observe how Mr. de Haas describes those who managed the President and the character (as regards Palestine) of the Wilson Administration—"The Brandeis regime."

The Declaration was dispatched in the form of a letter from the Foreign Secretary to Lord Rothschild, as follows:

Foreign Office
November 2, 1917

Dear Lord Rothschild,

I have much pleasure in conveying to you on behalf

of His Majesty's Government the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations, which has been submitted to and approved by the Cabinet.

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

I should be grateful if you would bring this Declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.

Your sincerely,

Arthur James Balfour

(Palestine: The Reality, pages 169,170-1)

"Nothing more cynically humorous than the final couple of lines of this letter has ever been penned," writes Mr. Jeffries.

Why?

The Declaration was the concoction of the Zionist Jews of the Federation. It launched the Zionist Organization on its career as a world power and started these United States on its disastrous path of world imperialism. Felix Morley writes about this metamorphosis of traditional American policy as outlined by George Washington in his Farewell Address:

Felix Morley Thinks:

This is an appropriate time, for those who can remember, to look back fifty years. We were then reluctantly preparing to enter World War I, to "end Prussian militarism" and "make the world safe for democracy." Today there is no Prussia and not much democracy. But there is still plenty of militarism, much of it on our side of the fence.

That is not to say that nothing was accomplished by our unwilling entry into Europe's essentially suicidal conflict. It marked the beginning of the end, both for the white man's global domination and for the American Republic as originally conceived. There can be little doubt that history will confirm these conclusions.

Of course neither happening could be completed overnight. It took the second great war, the sequel of the first, to topple Europe's colonial structures and complete the centralization of American power in Washington. And it is taking minor military adventures to make us arrogant. But we are on our way. The "kill ratio" in Vietnam, says the press, is happily much in our favor. Or, as one TV pundit put it recently, we are "making long strides towards the conquest of the moon."

For several reasons this megalomania is very sad. In the first place our clumsy essay in imperialism comes too late in time to be successful. Nor do we have the talent which is far more important for empire building than mere technology and massive power. The moral and physical condition of our own big cities is enough to show the weakness of our claim to dominate this planet, let alone outer space.

Perhaps most deplorable is the loss of that restrained and balanced governmental system which once shone like a beacon light for all mankind. The federal republic that we had and the centralized empire we seem to seek are absolute political contradictions. No wonder that we are suffering from collective schizophrenia.

"You have a Republic, if you can keep it!" So spoke wise Ben Franklin to those gathered outside Independence Hall when the Constitutional Convention adjourned its labors. Now, as in Rome after Caesar, only the facade remains. But let us at least be honest in our disgrace. No tyrant has murdered our priceless heritage. By our own apathy as custodians we have let it die. We have only ourselves to blame.

In his last line Mr. Morley writes:

"We have only ourselves to blame."

But more than three-quarters of all the people have not favored what Mr. Morley describes.

Both President Wilson and President Roosevelt presented the American people with fait accomplis that gave them no choice. Between the covers of this book is documented how it was done.

**JAMES MALCOLM
ORIGINS OF THE BALFOUR DECLARATION
AND
ARCANE HISTORY**

How was it that James A. Malcolm knew as early as 1916 that President Wilson "attached the greatest importance to the advice of a very prominent Zionist, Mr. Justice Brandeis of the United States Supreme Court" when native Americans had no such awareness then or even now?

In the ORIGINS OF THE BALFOUR DECLARATION, Dr. Weizmann's Contribution, by James A. Malcolm, Mr. Malcolm writes of his background without stating his family name:

"My family, which is of Armenian stock, has been settled in Persia since before Elizabethan days. For two centuries at least it has been engaged in shipping and commerce in Bushire, and was always closely identified with British interests in Persia and Arabian littoral of the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean. We acted for the British Government in various capacities in those parts. For instance, we were fiscal agents and during the Napoleonic war we acted as treasurers to British Missions to the Shah of Persia. (My father and mother were married on board a British man-of-war by the British Admiral). Our agents at Baghdad were the well-known and important David Sassoon family, who had originally hailed from Sasoun in Armenia. On one occasion the Sassoon family had to flee the rapacity of the then semi-independent Pasha of Baghdad and had lain hidden in our home in Bushire for several weeks until arrangements could be made to put them (with their treasures) on board one of our "Dhows" at night and send them off to Bombay. For many decades the Jews in Southern Persia always looked to our family for protection and sometimes hundreds of them sought safety and sanctuary in the spacious courtyards of our houses in Bushire and Shiraz.

We also sometimes acted as agents for Sir Moses Montefiore, who sent us money for distribution amongst the indigent members of the Jewish community. This was done by our cashiers who were all Jews and who had full charge of all the cash resources of our firm. (There were no banks in those days.)

"It was therefore natural that when I came to England as a boy for my education, in 1881, I was placed under the guardianship of an old friend, and agent of the family, Sir Albert (Abdalla) Sassoon in London, and cultivated Jewish friends including Colonel Goldsmid. After leaving Oxford, while dabbling in journalism, I met Mr. Edward Fitzgerald, who was then a roving correspondent of the "Daily News" on the Continent. He had met Herzl in Vienna and Constantinople and told me a good deal about him and his Zionst ideas, which naturally interested me very much. In London, I heard from Colonel Goldsmid and other notable Jews about projected Jewish settlements in Palestine, El Arish, Argentine and Kenya. Of course, I had read Byron, George Eliot and Oliphant about the Jews. Later, during my business travels in Eastern Europe and in Russia, I saw something of the Jewish centres and I always remembered my father had told me that wherever they were, the Jews never failed each Passover to drink to 'next year in the Land of Israel.'"

As Mr. Malcolm's knowledge of the origins and purpose of the Balfour Declaration is in the realm of arcane (secret) history not to be found in the history books that the Establishment provides for native American education we will delve into this shadowy history.

It appears that "at all times there has been a central union among Jews, even those who have been scattered all over the globe. It doesn't matter where found, Jews maintained relations with this spiritual center. Never has a nation felt in such an acute a manner as Jews, the force emanating from such a center. With them, every suggestion is broadcast with the greatest speed to the extreme ends of the national organization."

We will be castigated for taking that from the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion . . . Not at all! We quote one of the adepts of the Union of Jews for Civilization and

Science, the celebrated Moses Hess, friend of Heinrich Heine and Karl Marx, whom Arnold Ruge, according to the Jewish Encyclopedia, called the "Communist rabbi". M. Seignobos (Political History of Modern Europe, p. 688) shows Moses Hess organizing the first Communist groups in the Rhineland. A quarter of a century later he will be a member of the First International and representative of Germany at the 1868 Brussels Conference and at Basle in 1869. The quotation is taken from his book Rome and Palestine, which was, says its translator, Dr. Waxman, "the herald and trumpet of Zionism" (p. 261, American edition)

The Union of Jews For Civilization and Science, was founded November 7, 1819 with the aim of "reforming Judaism in order to put Jews in harmony with the times and within the countries wherein they dwelt." Actually, its purpose, as was the purpose of Moses Mendelssohn's Hascala movement, was to assure Jewish unity throughout the world and the hope of their rise as a whole through a revolution which will give them their rightful place by overthrowing the old Christian world. The Union of Jews for Civilization and Science held over international Jewry in the 19th century the same galvanic action as did Mendelssohn and the first Maskilim in the 18th. The Union launched out to the assault of this Christian Society, which was reluctant to accept a race up to that time considered unassimiable. The Union provided Jewish leadership for the rabble-rousing and socialist agitation that was to culminate in the Revolution of 1848 "which gave the air to the German Jews" just as the French Revolution of 1789-93 had given it to the French Jews.

Rabbi Liber, replying to Salluste in the June 15, 1928 issue of the Revue De Paris, then in its thirty-fifth year of reputable service to the French, states the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science dissolved in 1824 for lack of funds. The Union had an excellent reason for announcing its dissolution without its financial situation having anything to do with it: It was about to be investigated by the Prussian police who had become alerted by its propaganda—they mistrusted its purpose to "civilize the Jews." The Union decided not to wait for the investigation. With a loud noise the Union announced its liquidation.

Did it really disappear?

For those who have studied the history of secret societies the question isn't even asked.

The first care of any group of conspirators (to infiltrate and emasculate Christian society) that senses it has been discovered is to shout that it doesn't exist anymore.

In France, Barbès and Blanquin kept the same General Staff and the same troops each time they were unmasked, declaring their group dissolved. They simply regrouped a few months later under another name, such as the Society for the Rights of Man, the Society of Families, Society of the Seasons, etc., which employed the very same personnel for identical ends.

Did the Union of Jews for Civilization and Science really dissolve in 1824? Did its moving spirits stop associating with each other; did they modify their outlook on life?

Quite the contrary.

Lazarus ben David and Leopold Zunz, a rabbi who publicly favored communistic ideas, continued Mendelssohn's work. What was Mendessohn's program?

Intensely a Jew by sentiment and solid radical ties and not by attachment to the Mosaic religion, he preserves contact with orthodox Jews by professing an outward semblance of the Jewish religion. Though agnostic, he goes to the synagogue. He publishes Jewish religious texts as a means of maintaining authority among his blood brothers while his purpose is the new promised land that he shows them: the marvelous structure of Christian society, slowly built through eighteen centuries that is to be conquered by the new Canaanites- the Jews, inspired by dynamic intellectuals, such as Lazarus ben David, pupil of Mendelssohn and close collaborator of Leopold Zunz, life time associate of Heinrich Heine, the ardent and mystical revolutionary who made the pilgrimage to Munster to pay homage to Jena Brockenraw, called John de Leyde (John of Leyden), head of the 16th century communists. The Union of Jews for Civilization and Science entrusted to Heine its courses in history which couldn't have been much different from those of a Leninist school of our own days where they also talk of history, sociology and new legislation for the emancipation of the Jews. It all ends with civil war and, we may add, in world war.

Prof. Dr. H. Graetz, giant of Jewish history has this to say:

"Do Boerne and Heine belong to Jewish history? Entirely! Not only did Jewish blood flow in their veins, but the Jewish spirit (essence) was in their nerves. The lightning-bolts that they caused to strike in Germany . . . were charged with Talmudic Jewish electricity. No doubt these two were outwardly divorced from Judaism, but only as two champions who put on the armor and the flag of the enemy the more efficiently to deal him blows and the more completely to render him ineffective." Graetz, History of the Jews from Ancient Times to Today, Leipzig, 1870; Vol. XI, p. 368.

Harold Berman in his article, Heinrich Heine, quotes Heine,

"I am . . . an admirer of communism . . . a Jew by birth, a Christian by necessity and an atheist by conviction." American Hebrew, Jan. 17, 1947.

Bernard Lazare, honored with a statue by his co-religionists, writes: in Anti-Semitism, Its History and Causes:

"Thus the complaint of the anti-Semites appears well-founded: the Jew has the spirit of revolution; wittingly or not, he is an agent of revolution. . . Truly has Darmesteter written:

"The Jew was the apostle of unbelief, and every revolt of the mind originated with him, whether secretly or in the open. In that immense foundry of blasphemy maintained by the Emperor Frederick and the Princes of Suabia and Aragon, he acted a busy part.' "

Lazare continues: **"The historian confines himself to studying the part that the Jew, considering his spirit, his character, his nature, his philosophy and his religion, has been able to take in the revolutionary process and in revolutionary movements. I understand by revolutionary process the ideological march of revolution that can be represented on the one hand by the gradual destruction of the Christian state and of religious authority and on the other a parallel development of economic revolution." (Chapter XIII, The Jew As a Factor In The Transformation of Society, Int'l. Library Publ. Co., New York, 1903)**



THE KHAZARS

Research~~ers~~ into the history of the Jews indicates that the promoters and supporters of Zionism were not Orthodox Biblical Jews but descendants of a pagan people of mixed stock with Mongol and Turkic affinities known as Khazars whose territory embraced the area of Southern Russia from the Caspian to the Black Sea.

Jews expelled from Constantinople sought a home amongst the Khazars, developed Khazar trade and contended with the Mohammedans and Christians for the theological allegiance of this pagan people. George Vernadsky in his *ANCIENT RUSSIA* states that the ruling chieftain (khakan or chagan) probably Bulan, adopted a form of the Jewish religion (c 741 A.D.) partly because of incipient tension between Christians and the adherents of the new Mohammedan faith and partly because of fear of becoming subject to the power of the Byzantine emperor.

The Slavs, especially those in the area now known as the Ukraine, were engaged in almost constant warfare with the Khazars and finally, in 1016 A.D., destroyed the Khazar government and took a large portion of Khazar territory. Some subject Khazars remained in the Slav held lands, others migrated to Kiev and other parts of Russia. The Judaized Khazars dispersed further northwestward into Lithuanian and Polish areas at the time of the incursion of the Golden Horde of Jhenghis Khan (c. 1222). When Kiev was devastated by Batu (c. 1240), nephew of the Great Khan, the Khazars fled and became widely distributed in Western Russia.

Relations between Slavs and Judaized Khazars were never cordial, not for racial but for ideological reasons. The Khazars were zealots for the Babylonian Talmud due to the intransigent attitude of the rabbis who realized that their power would be lost if their people accepted controls other than Talmudic. The Judaized Khazars scorned Russian civilization and stubbornly refused to be Christianized.

It was these Eastern Judaized Khazars with no racial affinity to Biblical Judeans, as the Jews were known in

biblical times, who gave the first impetus to Zionism. They wished to escape the restrictions imposed on them by the Czar's government and many did by emigrating to the United States.

Peter The Great, reign 1682-1725, spoke of the Jews as rogues and cheats and his daughter Elizabeth (Petrovna) I. reign 1741-1762, issued an expulsion order in the following terms,

"Jews are still existing in various parts of Russia. From these Christ haters we can expect nothing good. On account of these circumstances I give the following order: All Jews, male and female, regardless of their rank and wealth, with all their property, have to leave immediately across the border . . . From these enemies of Christ I want no profit".

The World War I British Government gave political Zionism its world-wide power by being convinced, as outlined by James Malcolm, that the Westernized Zionist Jews in the United States had sufficient influence to bring the United States into the war on the side of the Allies. The Jews, at first pro-German because of Czarist Russia's treatment of her Khazar Jews and because the Zionists had hoped to make arrangements with the Kaiser's Germany, in event of victory or stalemate which seemed likely in 1916, for a homeland for the Jews in Palestine, did not hesitate to betray Germany when betrayal offered the opportunity to become an important and, as it came to be, a deciding influence in the affairs of the liberal democracies of the West, as Dr. Dillon reported in *The Inside Story of The Peace Conference*.

Hilaire Belloc states:

"In point of fact the Jew has collectively a power today (1922-Ed.), in the white world, altogether excessive. It is not only an excessive power, it is inevitably a corporate power and; therefore, a semi-organized power. It is not only excessive and in the main organized, it was, until the recent reaction began, a rapidly increasing power—and most people believe it to be still increasing. To that, the whole world outside the Jewish community will testify. (*The Jews*, pages 191-2)

Likewise the Zionist Jews did not hesitate to betray the best interests of the people of the United States by using

their influence in 1916-17 to involve these United States in an overseas war contrary to the advice given by President George Washington in his Farewell Address.

Again in 1940-41, as attested to by Col. Charles Lindbergh in his Des Moines, Iowa, speech on September 11, 1941, and by others, the Jews were influential, through their dominant position in the publicity media, in conditioning the American mind for involvement in yet another overseas war.

To the influence of the Zionist Jews in the affairs of these United States can be attributed the fantastic wonderland of astronomical Federal debt together with the anarchic state of world affairs.

In his long, thirteen page Preface in *The World Significance of the Russian Revolution* by George Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers, B.Sc. (Oxon) F. R. A. I., late Captain The Royal Dragoons, formerly Fellow Commoner, Worcester College, Oxford, Dr. Oscar Levy wrote:

" . . . Men and women of the Jewish Race . . . From Moses to Marx, Isaiah to Eisner (Prime Minister of Bavaria), in practice and in theory, in idealism and in materialism, philosophy and in politics, they are to-day what they have always been: passionately devoted to their aims and to their purposes, and ready, nay, eager, to shed their last drop of blood for the realisation of their visions.

"But these visions are all wrong," you will reply . . . "Look where they have led the world to. Think, that they have now had a fair trial of 3,000 years standing. How much longer are you going to recommend them to us and to inflict them upon us? And how do you propose to get us out of the morass into which you have led the world so disastrously astray?"

"To this question I have only one answer to give, and it is this: 'Your are right.' This reproach of yours, which— I feel for certain—is at the bottom of your anti-Semitism, is only too well justified, and upon this common ground I am quite willing to shake hands with you and defend you against any accusation of promoting Race Hatred: If you are anti-Semite, I, the Semite, am an anti-Semite too, and a much more fervent one than even you are . . . We have erred, my friend, we

have most grievously erred. And if there was truth in our error 3,000, 2,000, nay a 100 years ago, there is now nothing but falseness and madness, a madness that will produce an even greater misery and an ever wider anarchy. I confess it to you, openly and sincerely, and with a sorrow, whose depth and pain an ancient Psalmist, and only he, could moan into this burning universe of ours . . . We who have posed as the saviors of the world, we, who have even boasted of having given it "the" Savior, we are to-day nothing else but the world's seducers, its destroyers, its incendiaries, its executioners . . . we who have promised to lead you to a new Heaven, we have finally succeeded in landing you into a new Hell . . . There has been no progress, least of all moral progress . . . And it is just our Morality, which has prohibited all real progress, and—what is worse—which even stands in the way of every future and natural reconstruction in this ruined world of ours . . . I look at this world, and I shudder at its ghastliness: I shudder all the more, as I know the spiritual authors of all this ghastliness (Written July, 1920).

NINETEENTH CENTURY MONEY

In wartime 1942, Macmillan (London) published **ENGLAND'S SERVICE** by Sarpedon. No biographical data was given about the author.

The two paragraphs excerpted from the text of 177 pages indicates an uncommon understanding by the author of the Nineteenth Century Money created by England.

"By the proper handling of their invention, Nineteenth Century Money, the London merchants managed to regulate and to limit the imports and exports of every country in the world. Beyond that they even controlled and directed the development of business, of industry and of production in every quarter of the globe. And by their wise handling of their tremendous international power the London merchants achieved the reasonably smooth development of the rapidly growing world economy in the age of steam and electricity.

"This was England's Service to the world, and this is the service she must resume and continue to render in any reasonably constituted world. There is no other nation that can pretend to render that service. It was the breakdown of this service that brought misery, unrest and war into the world." (pages 120-1)

In his book, **THE JEWS**, Hilaire Belloc reviews the relation of Nineteenth Century Money to England's international commerce and Jewish international finance:

"They (the Jews-Ed.) returned, as everybody knows, under Cromwell. Their numbers, and still more their wealth, increases at the end of the seventeenth century and concomitantly with this, partly as an effect of it (but here we must not exaggerate), a number of novel financial features appeared in the English State each of which shows the increased power of the Jews. The institution of the Bank, of the National Debt, of

speculation in Exchange and in the fluctuation of stock.

"But the real causes of that alliance between the English and the Jews which is seen in the late seventeenth century, which quickened throughout the eighteenth and became so very marked in the nineteenth century, was the cosmopolitan position of England as the leading commercial State. This it was which led to something like identity between the interests of Israel and the interests of Britain, an identity which has lasted so long that now, when divergence is beginning to appear (1922-Ed.), it still seems odd and novel to the older generation that there should be any Jewish action which is not favorable to England. They cannot understand what the new indifference to Jewish interests, let alone the new hostility to them, can mean.

"There were, of course, many other causes contributory to the peculiar position which the Jews came to enjoy in modern England, a position which he has not yet lost in external circumstance though it is so badly shaken morally. There was the fact that England was the Protestant power of the West.

"This religious motive played a great part. Between the Catholic Church and the Synagogue there had been hostility from the first century. In so far as it was possible to take sides in that quarrel it was natural for the Protestant power to take sides against the Catholic tradition and therefore in favor of the Jews. Again, the English were not only Protestant, their middle classes were steeped in the reading of the Old Testament. The Jews seemed to them the heroes of an epic and shrines of a religion. You will find strong relics of this attitude in Provincial England to this day. One should add a certain national distaste for violence, which feeling was exasperated by hearing of the Jewish persecution abroad. One should also further add the pride which modern Englishmen take in the feeling that their country is an asylum for the oppressed.

"Meanwhile there was not, until quite lately, any considerable body of poor Jews in the country to excite the animosity of the populace. That was an im-

portant negative factor in bringing the Jew within the boundaries of the English State. But with all these factors fully considered, it remains true that the main cause of the accidental Jewish position in England was the cosmopolitan character of English commerce and the essentially commercial character of the English State. As English export and English shipping began to cover the globe, the English financial system covered it as well. London became after Waterloo the money market and the clearing house of the world. The interests of the Jew as a financial dealer and the interests of this great commercial polity approximated more and more. One may say that by the last third of the nineteenth century they had become virtually identical.

"Every new economic enterprise of the British State appealed to the Jewish genius for commerce and especially for negotiation in its most abstract form—finance. Conversely, every Jewish enterprise, every new conception of the Jew in his cosmopolitan activities (until these became revolutionary) appealed to the English merchant and banker.

"The two things dovetailed one into the other and fitted exactly, and all subsidiary activities fitted in as well. The Jewish news agencies of the nineteenth century favored England in all her policy, political as well as commercial; they opposed those of her rivals and especially those of her enemies. The Jewish knowledge of the East was at the service of England. His international penetration of the European governments was also at her service—so was his secret information. With the consolidation of the Indian Empire after the Mutiny the Jews were again an ally from their traditional hatred of the Russian people, which hatred has led them in our time to wreak so awful a vengeance upon their former oppressors. The Jews might almost be called a British agent upon the Continent of Europe, and still more in the Near and Far East, where the economic power of England extended even more rapidly than her political power.

"And the Jew pointed to the English State as that one in which all that his nation required of the goyim

was to be found. He here enjoyed a situation the like of which he could not hope to enjoy in any other country of the world. All antagonism to him had died down, He was admitted to every institution in the State, a prominent member of his nation became chief officer of the English Executive, and, an influence more subtle and penetrating, marriages began to take place, wholesale, between what had once been the aristocratic territorial families of this country and the Jewish commercial fortunes.

"After two generations of this, with the opening of the twentieth century those of the great territorial English families in which there was no Jewish blood were the exception. In nearly all of them was the strain more or less marked, in some of them so strong that though the name was still an English name and the traditions those of a purely English lineage of the long past, the physique and character had become wholly Jewish and the members of the family were taken for Jews whenever they travelled in countries where the gentry had not yet suffered or enjoyed this admixture.

"Specially Jewish institutions, such as Freemasonry (which the Jews had inaugurated as a sort of bridge between themselves and their hosts in the seventeenth century) were particularly strong in Britain, and there arose a political tradition, active, and ultimately to prove of great importance, whereby the British State was tacitly accepted by foreign governments as the official protector of the Jews in other countries. It was Britain which was expected to interfere, within the measure of her power, whenever a persecution of the Jews took place in the East of Christendom: to support the Jewish financial energies throughout the world, and to receive in return the benefit of that connection." (end of quote, pages 220-4)

THE BANKERS ACT PREAMBLE

Careful study of the article, The Bankers Act, attributed to Hilaire Belloc, places in a different light "the liberties that we have enjoyed for hundreds of years" spoken of by Mr. Chamberlain in his Birmingham speech of March 17, 1939.

It would appear that the democracies spoken about by Mr. Chamberlain, who must resist the domination of the world by force, happen to be at the same time the banking nations, who have gathered to themselves the liberties of the whole world. They, at that time, 1938 and 1939, were engaged, with a great show of piety, in sharing these liberties in a kind of share-cropping deal, with the nations who were proving themselves to be righteous, proof of righteousness being judged by a nation's subservience to the banking interests, that is, to the International Finance that Dr. Dillon wrote about in his book *The Inside Story of The Peace Conference*, that accounted for the "friendliness of the Allied Governments toward the Bolshevik bandits" to quote Dr. Dillon (page 8).

THE BANKERS ACT

A bitter struggle is going on as to how international trade and international financial relations shall be conducted in the future. On the one side are the banking nations notably England and the United States—together with those countries which have found it expedient to side with them, and on the other, the authoritarian States of whom Italy and Germany are leading examples.

The quarrel, reduced to its simplest terms, consists in the question whether or not the usurious loan system shall continue to be the basis of international—and in a secondary degree, national—dealings. A nation's success in it is dependent upon two things which are supplementary to each other: a strong gold backing and the possession of the machinery of world banking. Granting the continuance of the sys-

tem as a world habit, a country possessing these two advantages is able to impose its will on its other less fortunate neighbors, for it has the power to dry up their resources of wealth and make it impossible or very difficult for them to carry on. Nor is it an easy task to break the system and thus win economic freedom. This can only be done by determination on the part of the rulers of the revolting country backed by preponderant military strength.

Through all modern history the power exercised by money has been challenged by monarchies and the reason for this is that monarchy is a monarchy only in name until it has subordinated to itself, and thus destroyed, the effectual supremacy of the banker. A banking monarchy is a contradiction in terms. It is thus not surprising that the new monarchies (for Germany, though not strictly speaking a monarchy, possesses many of the characteristics of that type of government) now that they have attained to a position of military strength, should set their faces against any sort of subordination to the world banking system.

The battle is joined, and on a vaster scale than any similar struggle in the past.

The methods adopted by the opponents of the money power have been largely forced upon them by circumstances and made possible by the strict disciplinary regime they have set up within their respective countries. They refuse foreign interest-bearing loans (and as far as possible repudiate those previously contracted), and obtain the imports that they require by direct exchange of goods, subsidizing where necessary, their own exports to an unlimited extent. Such subsidies, which are rendered possible by governmental control of labour, raw materials, etc., naturally cause strains and stress in the internal economy of the population, especially since so large a proportion of the imported goods are the raw materials for armaments, but the currency of the country remains practically unaffected, and the disasters of headlong inflation are avoided.

On the other side the banking nations, which depend for their prosperity on the issuing of loans, bearing high interest, to nations in economic difficulties, and on the speeding up of international trade to make the payment of that interest possible, are being hard hit by repudiation, contraction of their borrowing field, and a severe check upon in-

ternational trade as they understand it. England is especially feeling the brunt of the attack partly because she is of all nations the least self-sufficient, and partly because of the enormous expenditures on armaments that she has recently undertaken. Evidence of the strain she is feeling has been apparent in the steady fall in the value of the pound sterling.

At the end of last week the Government took action. It transferred no less than three hundred and fifty million pounds' worth (reckoning at the present value of the pound) of bar gold from its function as backing to the currency to the new function of supporting the Exchange Equalization Fund, which is another way of keeping the pound from falling further, particularly when a serious beginning is made of subsidizing our own manufactured exports to compete with foreign subsidies. This action, which in itself amounts to no more than transferring one's purse from one pocket to another, had the immediate effect of slightly raising the value of the pound; for those who control these things cannot refrain from admiration of any nation that publicly manipulates a large sum of money. But the ultimate intention behind the action is a more serious business. It is a challenge to the nations who are revolting from what has become the orthodox money system, to the effect that England is prepared to expend this gigantic sum in breaking the revolt.

It is a proud gesture, but one unlikely to prove successful, for it is pitting capital against savings from labour. The savings will persist while the capital diminishes.

But the really tragic thing about England's part in this struggle is not her possible failure but that she is on the wrong side. It is one thing for her to refuse for herself the authoritarian regimes of the continent; it is quite a different one to waste her resources on trying to perpetuate a system which is as subversive of freedom and productive of war as the most tyrannical of despotisms and far more widely extended.

If she desires appeasement, it is madness to attack the virtues of those with whom she would live in peace.

The Weekly Review (London), formerly G.K.'s
January 12, 1939

Germany was trying to escape the entanglements of world debt. England was quite willing to lend money to buy

raw materials but Germany insisted upon exchanging goods for goods. Germany would not be drawn into the system of increasing debt, booms and slumps. The London Times stated that Germany's barter system made her an aggressor in the world market:

"One of the fundamental causes of this war has been the unrelaxing efforts of Germany since 1918 to secure wide enough foreign markets to straighten her finances at the very time when all her competitors were forced by their own debts to adopt exactly the same course. Continuous friction was inevitable.

Germany adopted a new monetary policy . . . after which Germany ceased to experience any financial difficulty."

In England, writes Robert J. Scrutton in his book, *A PEOPLES RUNNYMEDE*, the people suffer the burdens of heavy and increasing taxation, but in Germany, the Times reports:

"Nothing is ever heard of the necessity of increasing taxation, compulsory savings, or the issue of enormous public war loans. Quite the contrary. Recently an important tax was abolished. Public savings bank deposits touch new monthly records again and again. Money is so plentiful that the interest rate on Reich loans could recently be reduced from 4½ to 4 per cent.

These changes may well call for drastic readjustments in our established conventions. A hidebound persistence in methods and doctrines which were sound fifty years ago may easily prove as costly in the financial and economic field as actual war. It might not lose the war; it would certainly lose the peace." (London Times, October 11 and 12 and November 13, 1940)

"Germany was trying to break the credit ring of the money monopolists by the force of economic sanity and that was unforgivable. She was acting like a worker who went on strike against a system which deprived him of adequate food supplies though he was quite willing to exchange his labor to pay for them.

"In 1937 Hitler said:

'Germany will enter into no obligations to pay for her imports than she is capable of fulfilling. The Ger-

man Government thus takes the standpoint of the respectable merchant who keeps his orders in harmony with his power to pay. We laugh at the time when our national economists held the view that the value of a currency is regulated by the gold and securities lying in the vaults of a State Bank; and more especially we laugh at the theory that its value was guaranteed thereby. We have instead come to learn that the value of a currency lies in the productive capacity of a nation.'

"The world financial monopoly stood aghast. If Germany succeeded in her plan of economic penetration, other nations might follow her example. The whole world would then exchange goods for goods on a basis of equality and good fellowship. No one would want to borrow and the financial pyramid of debt, from the apex of which Almighty Finance ruled the world, would collapse. Humanity would be well fed, but the financiers would lose their power.

"If the German monetary experiment had been allowed to develop on the basis of a friendly exchange of goods it would have provided the world with useful information to assist it in solving its commercial problems. What was a laudable effort on the part of Germany has become a world war—a war of ideas in which Hitler strives to form a European economic monopoly opposed to the financial monopolies of the world.

"Statesmen began to prepare the public mind for war. No mention was made of the real causes of the crisis—the bitter scramble for world markets, the trickery and inhuman methods used to obtain spheres of influence for surplus investments and for increasing the burden of world debt. Statesmen again were preparing to sacrifice the youth of their country on the bloody altar of Mammon. As in peace, so in war. Humanity must be sacrificed to save a worthless economic system.

"Once again the peoples were told that if they destroyed the leader of the German nation all would be well with the world. Germany worshipped its leader. Britain trusted its Government. Both peoples believed their leaders would save the world. It was a tragedy of faith in men. One nation has to fight for a new economic and political system the other to preserve the old ones.

"Once again men, women and children are being mowed down in bloody swathes because the ports and granaries of some nations are glutted with goods and others empty. Surely the wrath of God will descend upon the statesmen who will not give humanity a secure place in the world where they can be fed and clothed and live without fear, but by their practices aggravate each other and each generation strews the fruitful earth with the corpses of their children.

"On public platforms politicians talked empty words. Rarely was it suggested that the surplus food might be distributed amongst their own people. Instead they were preparing to fight other nations to make them buy it. One cannot blame the politicians who got their economics from text books which never have been changed for over a hundred years. They had been taught to think in terms of economics, not in terms of human need. They talked moral platitudes but never seriously thought of linking economics with moral justice.

"Ludwell Denny, in *America Conquers Britain*, indicates the irony of a situation which impoverishes the exporting nation and produces war abroad:

'It seems to mean that if we work very hard, we can send more wealth abroad and thus acquire more capital abroad, and thus possibly receive still more capital abroad, and so on, generation after generation without finding any way whereby we, or our children, or our children's children can benefit greatly by our increased productivity.

'According to this theory, our own standard of living must remain the same as though we had never produced all this 'surplus' wealth. The complacency with which this theory is accepted is amazing.' "

After Germany was vanquished Karl von Wiegand reports in an article titled "Potsdam Planted Seeds of War" that the Potsdam Conference (summer 1945) repeated the errors of the Treaty of Versailles:

"After stating that the German nation and people will not be destroyed" the three peace makers . . . "proceed with what can scarcely be interpreted as other than Germany's destruction . . . Germany will be practically destroyed economically . . . Once America's second best foreign trade customer and Britain's third

best, but also a large exporter and a formidable rival of the two countries for foreign markets, Germany, it is decreed, will be destroyed and removed root and branch, both as customer and as competitor."

In 1945 the same influences that made the Peace of Versailles were at work again. "Will it never end? . . . Or is there a curse on us all: on all our pacts, treaties and covenants?" asks William B. Orton in his book *Twenty Years Armistic—1918-1938*:

"Twenty years ago the great guns of the west ceased firing. Millions of exhausted men sought home and work, leaving their dead behind them. But up in the Artic Circle, across the Polish marshes and the Russian plains, along the Danube and the Mediterranean, in Asia Minor and Serbia, the war went on. Suicide, assassination, and revolution swept through the Western world. Bounteous harvests brought ruin and not rejoicing, debt piled on debt, hatred across frontiers reflected the deepening privation within.

"The first decade brought general economic disaster. In the second the political structure began to crack, as a settlement backed by force felt the strain of an answering counter thrust. No more than a collapsing house can suddenly be rebuilt could Europe swiftly be reconstructed; instead came an inconceivable rearmament. Such effort as had never been mobilized for living was again mobilized for destruction. While babies were masked against poison from the sky, old men dug holes in the ground for refuge, and millions of youths trod their fathers' tracks the road to death.

"Will it never end? May our children live? Is there anywhere, in this shame of civilization, the germ of a new conscience, the hope of a true peace? Versailles, Geneva, Locarno (and Potsdam, 1945-Ed.)—where and how did we fail? Or is there a curse on us all: on all our pacts, treaties and covenants? It is of no more use to group ourselves into rival gangs to defame and denounce each other, with the good men all on one side—one's own—and the bad men all on the other. That way lies everlasting war. It is of no more use to hope that men will become brothers overnight with a sudden

dawn of reason triumphant over centuries of passion. But hope itself we cannot abandon: because we dare not.

"It is time to take stock; to survey these two ghastly decades from the depth of our economic and political distress, and face our errors. War is now (1938-Ed.), as it never was before, the major industry—in dollars and cents—of nearly all 'civilized' peoples (and 1972-Ed.). Even America renounces war on paper and arms to the teeth in practice; every frontier of the old world, every capital prepares for the coming death. Something is wrong—not merely with day to day policy, but the fundamental attitudes and assumptions which that policy reflects. Perhaps a review of the record will help to reveal what is wrong. The construction of a social order based on peace instead of war cannot be accomplished by a priori schemes of any sort whatever; it must proceed from realistic study of what has actually happened, why and how." (Preface)

The influence of Nineteenth Century Money in fomenting the world wars of the twentieth century has been cited.

Secretary of State Lansing in 1916 had written to President Wilson about the necessity of floating United States Government loans for the belligerent nations (Entente-Ed.), which are purchasing such great quantities of goods, in order to avoid a serious financial situation which will not only affect them but the United States as well. If the European countries (Entente-Ed.) cannot find means to pay for the excess of goods sold to them over those purchased from them, they will have to stop buying and our present export trade will shrink proportionately. The result would be restriction of outputs, industrial depression, idle capital and idle labor, numerous failures, financial demoralization and general unrest and suffering among the laboring classes.

M. Gabriel Hanoteaux, Minister of Foreign Affairs for France stated:

"France was ready to make peace the latter part of 1914 but was persuaded not to by three Americans, Robert Bacon of the Financial House of J.P. Morgan and Co., Myron T. Herrick and Wm. G. Sharp, pledging to French officials that if France would continue in the war these three men would organize a propa-

ganda to put the United States into the war on the side of the Allies. . . ”

As early as the end of 1914 the traffic in war materials with the Allies had become deeply entrenched in American's economic organization. When the Allies credit to purchase war materials was nearing exhaustion J.P. Morgan's friend Strong and Delano, both of the Federal Reserve Board called on Colonel House. As a result of their meeting, House wrote to President Wilson:

“Delano and Governor Strong of the New York Federal Reserve Bank ^{were} ~~was~~ here yesterday to see me concerning the serious condition that confronts us in regards to foreign exchange. They believe that unless the Federal Reserve System broadens its basis of credits that another month or two will bring about a crisis and almost complete breakdown of our foreign trade. . . ”

Charles A. Lindbergh, Sr., placed in the Minority Report on the Federal Reserve Bill this statement:

“It violates every principle of popular Democratic Representative Government and every declaration of the Democratic Party and platform pledges from Thomas Jefferson down to the beginning of this Congress.

“It recognizes the superior sovereignty of the embodied institution of money over any power of government so that neither the government, in its sovereign capacity, nor the people or their representatives can initiate the placement of one dollar of monetary functionary into actual exchange among the people except through the agency of organized money loaners with purely selfish interests.

“The Glass Bill positively abolishes the United States Treasury and the public money of the people and substitutes the so-called Federal Reserve Banks, which by the term of the Bill, are to be the exclusive stock of the bankers. It reduces the people's Treasury Department and the Bureau of Printing and Engraving to the position of a job printing house for the private use of bankers.”

The debt system of banking is essential to the monopoly

of power upon which the great banks depend to control the policies of governments.

It is unlikely that a new order in the affairs of men can be developed by industrial expansion dependent on the spending and investment of funds at interest as this procedure would be controlled by the central banks (Federal Reserve System in the United States) already overwhelming power. As the central banks control the money expended it is they who will control the industries that are expanded.

Professor Frederick J. Soddy, scientist and Nobel prize winner, originator of the virtual wealth theory of economics and author of **WEALTH, VIRTUAL WEALTH AND DEBT**, made this statement about bank-deposit money:

"The most sinister and anti-social feature about bank-deposit money is that it has no existence. The banks owe the public for a total amount of money which does not exist. In buying and selling, implemented by check transactions, there is a mere change in the party to whom the money is owed by the banks. As the one depositor's account is debited, the other is credited and the banks go on owing for it all the time.

"The whole profit of the issuance of money has provided the capital of the great banking business as it exists today. Starting with nothing whatever of their own, they have got the whole world into their debt irredeemably, by a trick.

"This money comes into existence every time the banks 'lend' and disappears again every time the debt is repaid them. So that if industry tries to repay, the money of the nation disappears. This is what makes prosperity so 'dangerous' as it destroys money just when it is most needed and precipitates a slump!

"There is nothing left now for us but to get ever deeper and deeper into debt to the banking system in order to provide the increasing amounts of money the nation requires for its expansion and growth. An honest money is the only alternative."

Having in mind the trying experience through which the country had passed as colonies which were denied the privilege of creating their own purchasing power and were forced to accept the banker-created, interest bearing, Bank

of England money, the delegates to the Constitutional Convention of 1787 made sure that provisions were made by the Constitution for an honest and debt-free monetary system. The Convention adopted Article I, Section 8, Paragraph 5, which reads:

Congress shall have the power to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin.

Thomas Jefferson feared the power of the banking institutions to be dangerous to the liberties of the citizens. He expressed himself in these words:

"I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies. Already they have raised up a monied aristocracy that has set the Government at defiance. The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the Government and the people to whom it rightfully belongs."

NEW WORLD ORDER PLEGED TO JEWS

Arthur Greenwood of British
War Cabinet Sends Message
of Assurance Here

RIGHTING OF WRONGS SEEN

English Rabbi Delivers to Dr.
S. S. Wise New Statement
on Question After War

In the first public declaration on the Jewish question since the outbreak of the war, Arthur Greenwood, member without portfolio in the British War Cabinet, assured the Jews of the United States that when victory was achieved an effort would be made to found a new world order based on the ideals of "justice and peace."

Mr. Greenwood, who is Deputy Leader of the British Labor party, declared that in the new world the "conscience of civilized humanity would demand that the wrongs suffered by the Jewish people in so many countries should be righted." He added that after the war an opportunity would be given to Jews everywhere to make a "distinctive and constructive contribution" in the rebuilding of the world.

The message was delivered last week to Dr. Stephen S. Wise, chairman of the executive committee of the World Jewish Congress, by Rabbi Maurice L. Perlsweig, chairman of the British section of the congress. Rabbi Perlsweig arrived from England Monday evening.

Intention to Right Wrongs

Comparing the statement with the Balfour Declaration of 1917, Dr. Wise declared that in a sense it had "wider and farther reaching implications," as it dealt with the status of Jews throughout the world. He said that Mr. Greenwood's message could be interpreted as a statement of England's firm intention to help right the wrongs

which Jews have suffered and continue to suffer today because of Hitler's "disorder and lawlessness."

Mr. Greenwood, sending the Jews of America a message of "encouragement and warm good wishes," wrote:

"The tragic fate of the Jewish victims of Nazi tyranny has, as you know, filled us with a deep emotion. The speeches of responsible statesmen in Parliament and at the League of Nations during the last seven years have reflected the horror with which the people of this country have viewed the Nazi relapse into barbarism.

"The British Government sought again to secure some amelioration of the lot of persecuted Jewry both in Germany itself and in the countries which were infected by the Nazi doctrine of racial hatred. Today the same sinister power which has trampled on its own defenseless minorities, and by fraud and force has temporarily robbed many small peoples of their independence, has challenged the last stronghold of liberty in Europe.

New World Order Forecast

"When we have achieved victory, as we assuredly shall, the nations will have the opportunity of establishing a new world order based on the ideals of justice and peace. In such a world it is our confident hope that the conscience of civilized humanity would demand that the wrongs suffered by the Jewish people in so many countries should be righted.

"In the rebuilding of civilized society after the war, there should and will be a real opportunity for Jews everywhere to make a distinctive and constructive contribution; and all men of good-will must assuredly hope that in new Europe the Jewish people, in whatever country they may live, will have freedom and full equality before the law with every other citizen."

In an interview at the Hotel Astor, Rabbi Perlsweig declared he was certain Mr. Greenwood "speaks for England." There is a clear realization, he added, that freedom and emancipation for the Jewish people are tied up with emancipation and freedom for people everywhere. The message, Rabbi Perlsweig remarked, was the subject of earnest consideration by the British Government.

"This is a declaration in behalf of the whole world," he observed. "Here the British Government expresses clearly what it hopes will take place after the war is won."

NEW WORLD ORDER PLEDGED TO JEWS HISTORICAL REVIEW

As there was not another Palestine for Jewish occupation that England could offer Zionist Jews to use their influence to bring the United States into yet another overseas European war a different approach was required. An issue whose emotional appeal could override the strong opposition of native Americans to another involvement abroad was the persecution of an innocent people—"the aristocrats of the world", Samuel Untermyer termed them in his call for all nations of the earth to join in a holy war against Germany (broadcast Aug. 7, 1933 WMCA). This would be a substitute for the horror stories about German atrocities in World War I, all proven to be false (Falsehood in War-Time, Sir Arthur Ponsonby, M.P.).

The emotional appeal of persecution did create a fervor amongst Jews and other like minded internationalists for war against a Germany that was doing everything possible to avoid a United States involvement despite numerous provocatons by the Roosevelt Administration. For quicker action a fait accompli had to be found.

On November 26, 1971 an ultimatum was sent to Japan (see page 89) to foment the attack on Pearl Harbor where, in addition to the loss of a prearranged sitting-duck Pacific Fleet, more than 3,000 American naval men lost their lives. The lady in the Whitehouse knew what was coming as New York Times reporter Kathleen McLaughlin reported in her Sunday piece . . . 'she (Mrs.. Roosevelt) recalls there was only a little more commotion than usual following receipt that morning (December 7, 1941) by the President of the historic message from Pearl Harbor . . . December 7 was just like any other D-days to us. . . it was far from the shock it proved to be to the country in general. We had expected something for a long time. (John J. O'Donnell, Capitol Staff N.Y. Daily News, Aug. 13, 1945)

Dr. Stephen S. Wise compares the 1940 statement by Arthur Greenwood with the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and declared the 1940 statement had "wider and farther reaching implications" as it dealt with the status of Jews throughout the world. This is an oblique admission, never mentioned in the American circulation press, that the Balfour Declaration sought the influence of the Jews in the United States to bring the United States into World War I. The 1940 statement sought the influence of Jews throughout the world to bring all nations of the world into World War II against Germany.

Interestingly, the message was delivered to Dr. Wise during the last week of September 1940 by Rabbi Maurice Perlzweig who, on February 26, 1940, told a Canadian audience:

The World Jewish Congress has been at war with Germany for seven years. (Toronto Evening Telegraph)

Waging war requires weapons. The poet, N.H. Bialik, in an address at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, May 11, 1933, spoke of the weapons used by Jews to undermine Christian society:

"Judaism, which was destroyed politically (as a result of the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D.), went forth into the great world. It adapted its possessions to its wanderings. I once compared it to any army going to war—a 'movable State.'

"Jews were compelled to smuggle their goods across from frontier to frontier; so they chose abstract wares, easy to smuggle; and this gave them ability, despite ghettos and restrictions, to enter everywhere; and so it is that the Hebrew people have penetrated everywhere.

"The argument is that Judaism, by penetrating among the Gentiles (in Christian guise or otherwise), has gradually undermined the remnants of paganism. Such penetration has not been without deliberate Jewish conniving in the shape of assistance bestowed in a thousand ways, devices and disguises. It has been effected in great measure by crypto-Jews, who have permeated Christianity and spoken through the mouth of Christianity.

"By these devices, through Jewish will and through the power of their Jewish blood; and owing to an instinct for 'requitai,' they have gradually induced Christianity to shed what was left in it of pagan elements; and it is they who, in principle (even though they are called by great Gentile names), are the creators of the Renaissance, of Liberalism, of Democracy, of Socialism, and of Communism.

"All this achievement . . . has come about chiefly through unknown anonymous Jews, Jews in secret, either crypto-Jews who mingled among the Gentiles and nurtured great thinkers from among them; or, through the influence of Jews, who, in the great crises of liberty and freedom, have stood behind the scenes; or through Jewish teachers and scholars from the time of the Middle Ages. It was disciples of Jewish teachers who headed the Protestant movements.

"These dogs, these haters of Israel, have a keen nose. In truth, Jewish influence in Germany is powerful. It is impossible to ignore it. Marx was a Jew. His manner of thought was Jewish. His keenness of intellect was Jewish; and one of his forebears was a most distinguished rabbi endowed with a powerful mind.

"The newspapers, under Jewish control, obviously served as an auxiliary in all movements in favor of freedom. Not in vain have Jews been drawn toward journalism. In their hands it became a weapon highly fitted to meet their needs.

"The Gentiles have at last realized this secret—that Judaism has gradually penetrated them like a drug. The Gentile nature is in revolt, and is trying to organize the final battle. Paganism is minded to organize its last war against Judaism. And there is no doubt that this warfare . . . is being waged specifically against Democracy, against Socialism. This is another worldwide warfare again against the forces of Judaism. I venture to think that Socialism in its highest form is the fruit of the Jewish spirit, and the fruit of the world outlook of the prophets. It is they who were the first Socialists.

"War is now being waged against us, against Judaism—not in our own land, but in the great outer world

where we are scattered. They would 'smoke us out' of all the cracks and crannies where we have hidden. They would exterminate us like bacilli, and be rid of us." (from *Lines of Communication*, Palestine, July, 1933)

Mr. Bialik was well informed—better informed than Christians bemused by that weapon journalism which Mr. Bialik tells us is highly fitted to meet the needs of the Jews.

In more erudite language, in a book of 700 pages, *JEWISH INFLUENCE ON CHRISTIAN REFORM MOVEMENTS* (Columbia University Press, 1925), Dr. Louis Israel Newman confirms Mr. Bialik. Bernard Lazare does likewise in *Anti-Semitism, Its History and Causes*, Chapter XIII, *The Jew As A Factor In The Transformation of Society—Political and Religious Causes of Anti-Semitism* (Int'l. Libr. Publ. Co., New York, 1903).

Hilaire Belloc, in his book, *The Jews*, tells how the circulation press in New York City censors news unfavorable to Jews. Writing about the Spanish Civil War:

"In so far as propaganda can win a war the Reds hold all the trumps. (Why?—Ed.)

"This is only natural, considering the motive power behind the revolutionaries which works everywhere by the suppression of truth on the one side and propagation of falsehood on the other. During a long visit to the United States in this summer of 1937 I found the effects of the propaganda everywhere formidable and in many places extreme. The presence of Moses Rosenberg, the Russian Jew, as chief organizer of the (Spanish-Ed.) Reds (he absurdly calls himself "Marcel" Rosenberg), I found had not been heard of in New York and none of the main newspapers would mention it" (page xxxix, 1937 edition).

The rights inherent in private correspondence prevent the publication of a letter documenting the Jewish control of the motion picture industry that prevented the wonderful pictures of the Games of the XI Olympiad (1938) taken by Leni Riefenstahl, the best sports pictures ever taken, being viewed by the American people.

Douglas Reed, for eleven years foreign correspondent for the *London Times*, tells how the Jews use the weapon journalism:

“But on this occasion chance has enabled me, in an additional chapter, to give you the best possible example of the way organized world Jewry works and of the immense power it wielded in goading world opinion against Germany” (page 477).

Then about his American publisher declining to publish DISGRACE ABOUNDING, he writes:

“The real meaning of that decision is that you may slander and libel Germany as much as you like and be paid for it, but you must not discuss the Jewish problem, you must not assert that there is a Jewish problem . . . One publisher, not a Jew, said that an American publisher would court misfortune by publishing it because 90 per cent of the American newspapers are Jewish and the Jewish influence extends in similar proportion throughout the whole ring of trades connected with publishing . . . The importance of this, for you, is that you should realize that what is presented to you as ‘American Approval’ or ‘American Disapproval’ of this or that British policy is not American but Jewish opinion . . . If you are to fight Germany again, you must do it for England’s sake. You must not allow yourselves to be egged on by Jews masquerading to day as ‘German public opinion,’ the day after as ‘English public opinion and the next day as ‘American public opinion.’ ”

In his book, UNFINISHED VICTORY, published in 1942 by the prestigious English publisher Macmillan (there was never an American edition), the English historian Arthur Bryant substantiates the statement of Douglas Reed about Jewish control of publishing. Americans have never been permitted to know of conditions in Germany during the Weimar Republic as Mr. Bryant describes them in Unfinished Victory:

“At this time in Germany it was not the Aryans who exercised racial discrimination. It was discrimination which operated without violence. It was one exercised by a minority against a majority. There was no persecution, only elimination. ‘It seems,’ Montz Goldstein, the Jewish essayist, had written before the war, ‘as if German cultural life was to be completely transformed into Jewish hands . . . Consequently we

are now faced by the following problem. We Jews guide and administrate the intellectual property of a nation which denies our qualification and competency to do so.' By the third decade of the century the process had reached a new stage. It was the native Germans who were now confronted with a problem—that of rescuing their indigenous culture from an alien hand and restoring it to their own race."

Over a number of pages Arthur Bryant continues:

"The change in the distribution of German wealth that followed this great disaster (the inflation—Ed.) amounted to nothing less than a revolution . . . the chief gainers were those who had been able to command foreign currency. . . . It was the Jews with their international affiliations and their hereditary flair for finance who were best able to seize such opportunities. . . . They did so with such effect that even in November 1938, after five years of anti-semitic legislation and persecution, they still owned according to the Times (London) correspondent in Berlin, something like a third of the real property in the Reich. Most of it came into their hands during the inflation. . . . The Jews obtained a wonderful ascendancy in politics, business and the learned professions. . . . In the artistic professions the Jewish supremacy was as marked. Authorship in Germany almost seemed to have become a kind of Hebrew monopoly" (pages 135-137).

The Versailles Treaty imposed severe hardships on the German nation (as cited by many well placed people) during the years of the Weimar Republic. Just before his end, Stresemann declared:

"If you had granted me one single concession I could have saved this generation for Peace. That you did not has been my tragedy and your crime."

The Allies including the United States viewed the travail imposed on a nation in the heartland of Europe without concern. The hardships of Versailles was no cause for a crusade to ameliorate its terms—just bear what has been imposed as the normal working of the Treaty.

It was the intransigent attitude of the Entente that brought the National Socialist Government to power. This government was aware that Zionist Jews had been influential

in bringing the United States into World War I on the side of the Allies, upsetting a stalemate that could have resulted in peace as stated by Winston Churchill. Samuel Landman verifies this in his brochure, previously cited:

“... the fact that it was Jewish help that brought the U.S.A. into the War on the side of the Allies, has rankled ever since in German—especially Nazi minds and has contributed in no small measure to the prominence which anti-semitism occupies in the Nazi program.”

The Germans were resentful of their betrayal by the Jews as they had been well treated in the Germany of the Kaiser. Walter Rathenau was the Bernard Baruch of Germany, Ballin was a leader in German shipping, Cassell, the Cologne banker whose son's (Sir Ernest Cassell) daughter, wife of Lord Mount Temple (previously Mr. Wilfred Ashley) is the mother of the wife of Admiral Earl Mountbatten whose grandmother was Julie Hauke (once Hauck) whose great-grandfather, of uncertain racial antecedents, had been a tradesman in Mainz. Her father, Maurice Hauke in 1820 had been appointed Minister of War in the Russian-controlled puppet government of Congress-Poland. In 1829 Tsar Nicholas had bestowed on him the title of Count. A year later, in November 1830, the Poles rose against the Tsarist regime. The rebels marched on Palais Bruehl, dragged out War Minister Hauke and hacked him to pieces in the presence of his wife and children. His wife, Countess Sophie died of a broken heart in 1831. Julie was five when her father was murdered. She was brought up with the daughters of aristocratic families at the celebrated Smolny Institute. Although born in Poland she was German on her father's side and French-Hungarian on her mother's. Because she spoke German, she was chosen as a Maid of Honour to Marie, Princess of Hesse when the latter became the wife of the Tsarevitch in 1841, and later one of her Ladies-in-Waiting.

When Julie Hauke met Alexander, son of the Grand Duke of Hesse (parent line of the Glucksburgs) she was twenty-three, parentless and poor. When they were married in 1851 an old family title, Battenburg was revived and they became the Count and Countess of Battenburg. Here the Battenburg line begins. Later Alexander was made Prince of Battenberg. Their eldest son was Prince Louis of Battenberg who came

to England to join Queen Victoria's Court and family. He rose to Admiral in the British Navy and top socialite friend of Edward VII. During World War I he changed his name to the literal translation, Mountbatten and became Marquess of Milford Haven. His daughter Alice married back into the Glucksberg family (the Danish-Greek group of direct Hesse ancestry) and she is the mother of Philip—the Queen's husband. Prince Louis' second son is the Admiral Earl Mountbatten, Philip's most influential uncle and top-serving Admiral in the British Navy, last Viceroy to India, close friend of socialite-intellectual Fabians, great "democrat" and a power behind the Throne as well as of Churchill. The Admiral's wife's grandmother, daughter of Sir Ernest Cassell, whose father, the Jewish banker of Cologne, was the financier of Edward VII. When Philip, the Queen's consort, came to England he was educated at a liberal, unorthodox and progressive school at Gordonstoun, Scotland whose founder and headmaster was Kurt Hahn, a Jewish refugee from Germany.

There were the important Warburgs of Hamburg. Paul Moritz Warburg was brought up in the banking business in Hamburg where he participated in the operation of the Reichsbank. In 1902, while still in Germany, he became a member of the banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb and Company. He came to the United States in 1906, became a citizen in 1911, was decorated by the Kaiser in 1912 and in 1914 President Wilson appointed him Vice-Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. In 1910 he had participated with American financiers, at the secret Jekyll Island meeting, in planning what was to become the Federal Reserve Bank. Mr. Edwin R. A. Seligman in his introduction to a series of essays by Mr. Warburg, writes:

"It may be stated without fear of contradiction that in its fundamental features the Federal Reserve Act is the work of Mr. (Paul) Warburg more than of any other man in the country."

The preferred position of Jews in the Kaiser's Germany did not prevent the Zionist Jews from using their influence in liberal democratic countries to betray Germany into defeat by using their influence to bring the United States into the war when a negotiated peace was still possible.

The effects of this betrayal of Germany eventually led to the election of a government that not too harshly, as attested to by Arthur Bryant, author of UNFINISHED VICTORY, sought to redress the wrong Zionist Jewry had imposed on their country. The immediate response was the cry of persecution which was given wide coverage in the circulation press of the liberal democratic countries.

Samuel Landman, the Zionist writer, has stated that Jewish help that brought the United States into World War I (through the implementation of the Balfour Declaration—Ed.) “contributed in no small measure to the prominence which anti-semitism occupies in the Nazi program.” Ignoring their responsibility for anti-semitism in Germany, the Jews maligned Germany for being the cause of American boys dying in the Philippines:

“It may seem a far cry from the Philippines and the war to the peacefully developing movement for a better understanding between Christians and Jews in the United States. But is it? Whenever an American or Philippino fell at Bataan or Corregidor or any of the now historic spots where MacArthur’s men put up their remarkable fight, their survivors could have said with truth: the real reason that boy went to his death was because Hitler’s anti-Semitic movement succeeded in Germany” (The American Hebrew, July 24, 1942).

Here the American Hebrew admits that the United States was brought into World War II because anti-Semitism triumphed in Germany. The facts are:

That boy went to his death because in 1916 the Zionist Jews betrayed both Germany and the United States by using their influence to bring the United States into World War I.

Rev. John Haynes Holmes, staunch supporter of the peacefully developing movement for a better understanding between Christians and Jews, in the influential journal of Jewish life and letters, Opinion (September, 1940), edited by Hungarian-born Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, wrote:

“And now the Jews are actually clamoring for war again, under the insane delusion that this new war can bring any different or better results than the last war. If the Jews know what is good for them, to say nothing of what is good for Europe and the world, they will

do everything in their power to stop this war, and especially to keep America out of it. If this war goes on, with Jews doing their part to foment it and feed it and idealize it. Europe will be plunged a decade hence into a horror of anti-Semitism which will make Hitler's pogroms look like a Sunday School kindergarten. If America gets into this war and is fooled again, our wealth wasted and the lives of our boys thrown away the second time for no result save that of utterly wrecking our civilization and ending democracy forever, then a wave of anti-Semitism, already started in this country, will sweep the land with horror. Disillusioned and desperate Americans are in no way different from disillusioned and desperate Germans. They will seek a scapegoat for their own folly just as quickly and infallibly. I can hear now the cries which will be lifted a decade hence, if we go into this war today. 'The Jews did it. They took us into the war because they hated Hitler. They own the newspapers. They run the movies. They control the banks. The Jews did it. Down with the Jews.' "

Samuel Untermyer's provocative call for a holy war against Germany by all nations of the earth for crimes against the Jewish people, which had never taken place, did not help the position of the Jews in Germany. On August 7, 1933, the day of his arrival from Europe where he had gone to attend a meeting of the International Jewish Congress at The Hague, Mr. Untermyer spoke over Radio Station WABC:

"I deeply appreciate your enthusiastic greeting on my arrival today, which I understand is addressed not to me, personally, but to the holy war in the cause of humanity in which we are embarked. . . . It is a war that must be waged unremittingly until the black clouds of bigotry, race hatred and fanaticism, that have descended upon what was once Germany, but is now Medieval Hitler land, have been dispersed. If we once admit, as is brazenly insisted by the German government, that such fiendish persecution of the people of one race or creed is an internal domestic affair, and not a world concern, how are we to know whose turn will be next? Now or never must all nations of the

earth make common cause against the monstrous claim that the slaughter, starvation and annihilation without rhyme or reason . . . is an internal affair against which the rest of the world must stand idly by and not lift a hand in defense . . . for the Jews are the aristocrats of the world."

As the Jews were an important influence for getting the United States into World War I, Samuel Untermyer and Bernard Baruch apparently were joint chiefs of staff of a super-national war planning board to bring the United States into World War II. Mr. Baruch knew what he was talking about when he told General George C. Marshall in 1938:

"We are going to lick that fellow Hitler. He isn't going to get away with it (New York Times, May 25, 1944).

These people, allowed to rampage freely through the liberal democratic countries crying persecution, have disturbed the peace, tranquility and natural development of all nations of the western world.

How is it that the remarkable government given these United States at the Constitutional Convention of 1787 has allowed the alien, non-Christian Jew to achieve such dominance in its affairs?

When the cry persecution sensitizes the feeling of guilt and a sense of shame allows this couplet, persecution coupled with guilt, to prevail in a liberal democratic country such as the United States where the people have been mind conditioned to accept this couplet, mental paralysis inhibits opposition to Jewish dominance.

The government of 1787 was set up for the white, racially homogenous population of the time, lacking pressure groups agitating elected representatives about their civil rights being violated. Now these groups are sufficiently numerous to elect their own representatives. When their fecundity allows them to elect sufficient congressmen to legislate for their specific demands, the intent of the government set up in 1787 will remain but those people for whom it was created will be inundated by a rising tide of racially heterogenous and alien minded people that always results in discord and strife. This will be conquest by fecundity.

An examination of papers devoted to Jewish affairs will reveal their main theme to be "tolerance" and "democracy"

In the January, 1946 issue of *The Jewish Layman*. *The National Brotherhood Magazine*, there is an article entitled *The Fountainhead of Democracy* by the famed Chaplain Alexander Goode. He writes as follows: "These villages (medieval European) may have had a strong love of freedom and independence, but such love of freedom is to be found the world over; it does not become democratic freedom until it is extended to the alien and enemy." If this means anything, it means that to have democratic freedom, the alien and the enemy must be allowed complete freedom to do as they like without regard to racial and national traditions. To have democratic freedom the native people must place themselves at the mercy of aliens and enemies in their midst. The chaotic state of the democratic world today is an example of national and racial traditions destroyed by alien ideologies. Chaplain Goode then proceeds to find the mainstay for his political democracy in "the Christian doctrine of universal brotherhood, itself based on the earlier teachings of the Hebrew prophets—nor is democracy the product of any or all religions but solely of the Jewish-Christian religion."

There is no such religion as a Jewish-Christian religion.

In *THE TALMUD*, Arsene Darmesteter tells us what the Talmud is:

"... Judaism accommodated itself to the constantly shifting needs of a society constantly in a state of upheaval, and, consecrating the aspirations of each new generation, it could develop and progress boldly on the path of reforms (p. 74).

"The Judeo-Christians, mindful of the Master's word (Christ—Ed.), "My Kingdom is not of this world," refuse to fight at the side of the Jews." In a revolt against Tinnius Rufus started by Bar Coziba, Coziba, "by threats of punishment, forces them to take up arms . . . the Judeo-Christians break the last bond uniting them with the Jews and throw themselves into the arms of the Paulinians" (p. 83).

"... We are investigating only their dogmatic development (religion—Ed), insofar as it can be abstracted and extracted from the rest of human faculties. . . . Taken in this way, that of Judaism has been most logical, since without hesitation it has proceeded to extreme consequences. If these consequences incur

condemnation, then the system as a whole must be condemned, for the starting point is wrong. If the starting point is accepted, it is necessary to go to the bitter end, and endorse all the consequences. At all events, the Talmud has done so, and thanks to it we have Judaism in the completest, and consequently the most perfect, expression of the religious idea" (pgs. 89-90).

Those who are mindful of the teaching of Christ, "My Kingdom is not of this world", must renounce Judaism as did the Judeo-Christians in the time of Bar Coziba.

That we have attained the final step on the evolutionary ladder of war is most unlikely. For mechanical and chemical weapons may disappear and be replaced by others more terrible. This method of imposing the will of one man on another may in turn be replaced by purely psychological warfare wherein weapons are not even used or battlefields sought of loss of life and limb aimed at. But in its place the corruption of human reason, the dimming of the human intellect and disintegration of the moral and spiritual life of one nation by the will of another is accomplished.

Major General J.F.C. Fuller
Tanks in the Great War (1920)

The great tragedy of the West is that its leaders . . . and they are all good Christian, patriotic men, is that they are psychologically incapable of grasping or understanding the true nature of the enemy openly and implacably bent upon our destruction.

Ambassador William Bullitt

COL. LINDBERGH'S DES MOINES SPEECH

September 11, 1941

"It is now ~~two years~~ since this latest European war began. From that day in September, 1939, until the present moment, there has been an ever-increasing effort to force the United States into the conflict. That effort has been carried on by foreign interests and by a small minority of our own people, but it has been so successful that, today, our country stands on the verge of war.

"At this time, as the war is about to enter its third winter, it seems appropriate to review the circumstances that have led us to our present position. Why are we on the verge of war? Was it necessary for us to become so deeply involved? Who is responsible for changing our national policy from one of neutrality and independence to one of entanglement in European affairs?

People Should Know Truth

"Personally, I believe there is no better argument against our intervention than a study of the causes and developments of the present war. I have often said that if the true facts and issues were placed before the American people, there would be no danger of our involvement.

"Here, I would like to point out to you a fundamental difference between the groups who advocate foreign war and those who believe in an independent destiny for America. If you will look back over the record you will find that those of us who oppose intervention have constantly tried to clarify facts and issues; while the interventionists have tried to hide facts and confuse issues.

"We ask you to read what we said last month, last year, and even before the war began. Our record is open and clear, and we are proud of it. We have not led you on by subterfuge and propaganda. We have not resorted to 'steps short of' anything in order to take the American people where they did not want to go. What we said before the elections we say 'again, and again, and again' today. And we will not tell you tomorrow ~~that it was~~ 'just campaign oratory.'

Calls Subterfuge Obvious

"Have you ever heard an interventionist, or a British agent, or a member of the administration in Washington, ask you to go back and study a record of what they have said since the war started? Are these self-styled defenders of democracy willing to put the issue of war to a vote of our people? Do you find these crusaders for foreign freedoms advocating the freedom of speech, or the removal of censorship here in our own country?

"The subterfuge and propaganda that exists in our country is obvious on every side. Tonight I shall try to pierce through a portion of it to the naked facts which lie beneath.

"When this war started in Europe, it was clear that the American people were solidly opposed to entering it. Why shouldn't we be? We had the best defensive position in the world; we had a tradition of independence from Europe; and the one time we did take part in a European war left European problems unsolved, and debts to America unpaid.

"National polls showed that when England and France declared war on Germany in 1939, less than 10 per cent of our population favored a similar course for America.

Pro-War Groups Named

"But there were various groups of people

here and abroad whose interests and beliefs necessitated the involvement of the United States in the war. I shall point out some of these groups tonight, and outline their methods of procedure. In doing this, I must speak with utmost frankness, for in order to counteract their efforts, we must know exactly who they are.

"The three most important groups who have been pressing this country toward war are the British, the Jewish and the Roosevelt administration. Behind these groups, but of lesser importance, are a number of capitalists, Anglophiles, and intellectuals who believe that their future, and the future of mankind, depends upon the domination of the British empire.

"Add to these the communistic groups who were opposed to intervention until a few weeks ago, and I believe I have named the major war agitators, not of those sincere but misguided men and women who, confused by misinformation and frightened by propaganda, follow the lead of the war agitators.

Only a Small Minority

"As I have said, these war agitators comprise only a small minority of our people; but they control a tremendous influence.

"Against the determination of the American people to stay out of war, they have marshaled the power of their propaganda, their money, and their patronage.

"Let us consider these groups, one at a time. First, the British. It is obvious and perfectly understandable that Great Britain wants the United States in the war on her side. England is now in a desperate position. Her population is not large enough, and her armies are not strong enough to invade the continent of Europe and win the war she declared against Germany. Her geographical position is such that she cannot win the war by the use of aviation alone, regardless of how many planes we send her. Even if America entered the war, it is improbable that the allied armies could invade Europe and overcome the axis powers.

Can Shift Responsibility on U. S.

"But one thing is certain. If England can draw this country into the war she can shift to our shoulders a large portion of the responsibility for waging it, and for paying its cost. As you all know we were left with the debts of the last European war and unless we are more cautious in the future than we have been in the past we will be left with the debts of the present one.

"If it were not for her hope that she can make us responsible for the war financially, as well as militarily, I believe England would have negotiated a peace in Europe many months ago, and be better off for doing so.

"England has devoted and will continue to devote every effort to get us into the war. We know that she spent huge sums of money in this country during the last war in order to involve us. Englishmen have written books about the cleverness of its use. We know that England is spending great sums of money for propaganda in America during the present war.

"If we were Englishmen we would do the same. But our interest is first in America and, as Americans, it is essential for us to realize the effort that British interests are making to draw us into their war.

A Dangerous Policy

"The second major group mentioned is the Jewish. It is not difficult to understand why Jewish people desire the overthrow of Nazi Germany. The persecution they suffered in Germany would be sufficient to make bitter enemies of any race. No person with a sense of the dignity of mankind can condone the persecution the Jewish race suffered in Germany. But no person of honesty and vision can look on their pro-war policy here today without seeing the dangers involved in such a policy, both for us and for them.

"Instead of agitating for war the Jewish groups in this country should be opposing it in every possible way, for they will be among the first to feel its consequences. Tolerance is a virtue that depends upon peace and strength. History shows that it cannot survive war and devastation. A few farsighted Jewish people realize this and stand opposed to intervention. But the majority still do not. Their greatest danger to this country lies in their large ownership and influence in our motion pictures, our press, our radio, and our government.

Using War as a Pretext

"The Roosevelt administration is the third powerful group which has been carrying this country toward war. Its members have used the war emergency to obtain a third presidential term for the first time in American history. They have used the war to add unlimited billions to a debt which was already the highest we had ever known. And they have used the war to justify the restrictions and congressional power, and the assumption of dictatorial procedures on the part of the President and his appointees.

"The power of the Roosevelt administration depends upon the maintenance of a wartime emergency. The prestige of the Roosevelt administration depends upon the success of Great Britain to whom the President attached his political future at a time when most people thought that England and France would easily win the war. The danger of the Roosevelt administration lies in its subterfuge. While its members have promised us peace they have led us to war heedless of the platform upon which they were elected.

If One Stops, All Stop

"In selecting these three groups as the major agitators for war, I have included only those whose support is essential to the war party. If any one of these groups—the British, the Jewish, or the administration—stops agitating for war, I believe there will be little danger of our involvement. I do not believe that any two of them are powerful enough to carry this country to war without the support of the third. And to these three, as I have said, all other war groups are of secondary importance.

"When hostilities commenced in Europe, in 1939, it was realized by these groups that the American people had no intention of entering the war. They knew it would be worse than useless to ask us for a declaration of war at that time. But they believed that this country could be enticed into the war in very much the same way we were enticed into the last one. They planned, first, to prepare the United States for foreign war under the guise of American defense; second, to involve us in the war, step by step, without our realization; third, to create a series of incidents which would force us into the actual conflict. These plans were, of course, to be covered and assisted by the full power of their propaganda.

Start Glorifying War

"Our theaters soon became filled with plays portraying the glory of war. Newsreels lost all semblance of objectivity. Newspapers and magazines began to lose advertising if they carried anti-war articles. A smear campaign was instituted against individuals who opposed intervention. The terms fifth columnist, traitor, nazi, anti-semitic were thrown ceaselessly at any one who dared suggest that it was not to the best interests of the United States to enter the war.

"Men lost their jobs if they were frankly anti-war. Many others dared no longer speak. Before long, lecture halls that were open to advocates of war were closed to speakers who opposed it. A fear campaign was inaugurated. We were told that aviation, which has held the British fleet off the continent of Europe, made America more vulnerable than ever before to invasion. Propaganda was in full swing.

"There was no difficulty in obtaining billions of dollars for arms under the guise

of defending America. Our people stood united on a program of defense. Congress passed appropriation after appropriation for guns and planes and battleships, with the approval of the overwhelming majority of our citizens. That a large portion of these appropriations was to be used to build arms for Europe, we did not learn until later. (That was another step.)

Planes Sent Abroad

"To use a specific example; in 1939 we were told that we should increase our air corps to a total of 5,000 planes. Congress passed the necessary legislation. A few months later, the administration told us that the United States should have at least 50,000 planes for our national safety. But almost as fast as fighting planes were turned out from our factories, they were sent abroad, although our own air corps was in the utmost need of new equipment.

"Today, two years after the start of war, the American army has only a few hundred thoroughly modern bombers and fighters, less, in fact, than Germany is able to produce in a single month. Ever since its inception, our arms program has been laid out for the purpose of carrying on the war in Europe far more than for the purpose of building an adequate defense for America.

The Old Refrain Begins

"Now at the same time we were being prepared for a foreign war it was necessary, as I have said, to involve us in the war. This was accomplished under that now famous phrase, 'steps short of war.' England and France would win if the United States would only repeal its arms embargo and sell munitions for cash, we were told. And then a familiar refrain began, a refrain that marked every step we took toward war for many months, . . . 'the best way to defend America and keep out of war,' we were told, was 'by aiding the allies.'

"First, we agreed to sell arms to Europe; next, we agreed to loan arms to Europe; then, we agreed to patrol the ocean for Europe; then, we occupied a European island in the war zone. Now we have reached the verge of war.

"The war groups have succeeded in the first two of their three major steps into war. The greatest armament program in our history is under way. We have become

involved in the war from practically every standpoint except actual shooting. Only the creation of sufficient 'incidents' yet remains and you see the first of these already taking place, according to plan — a plan that was never laid before the American people for their approval.

Democracy Being Tested

"Men and women of Iowa: Only one thing holds this country from war today. That is the rising opposition of the American people. Our system of democracy and representative government is on test today as it has never been before. We are on the verge of a war in which the only victor would be chaos and prostration. We are on the verge of a war for which we are still unprepared, and for which no one has offered a feasible plan for victory—a war which cannot be won without sending our soldiers across the ocean to force a landing on a hostile coast against armies stronger than our own.

"We are on the verge of war, but it is not yet too late to stay out. It is not yet too late to show that no amount of money, or propaganda, or patronage, can force a free and independent people into war against its will. It is not yet too late to retrieve and to maintain the independent American destiny that our forefathers established in this new world.

Time to Speak Up

"The entire future of America rests upon our shoulders. It depends upon our action, our courage, and our intelligence. If you oppose our intervention in this war, now is the time to make your voice heard. Help us to organize these meetings, and write to your representatives in Washington.

"I tell you that the last stronghold of democracy and representative government in this country is in our house of representatives and our senate. There we can still make our will known. And if we, the American people, do that, independence and freedom will continue to live among us, and there will be no foreign war."

America goes not abroad in search of monsters to destroy. She is the well wisher to the freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own. She will recommend the general cause by the countenance of her voice and the benignant sympathy of her example. She well knows that by once enlisting under other banners than her own, were they even the banners of foreign independence, she would involve herself beyond the power of extrac-
tion in all wars of interest and intrigue, of individual avarice, envy and ambition, which assume the colors and usurp the standards of freedom. The fundamental maxims of her policy would insensibly change from liberty to force.

John Quincy Adams

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S PLANS FOR WAR

On December 4, 1941 The Chicago Tribune published President Roosevelt's war plans:

"The report expresses the considered opinion of the army and navy strategists that 'Germany and her European satellites cannot be defeated by the European powers now fighting against her'. Therefore, it concludes, "if our European enemies are to be defeated it will be necessary for the United States to enter the war, and to employ a part of its armed forces offensively in the Eastern Atlantic and in Europe and Africa."

"July 1, 1943, is fixed as the date for the beginning of the final supreme effort by American land forces to defeat the mighty German army in Europe."

"In the meantime, however, increasingly active participation is prescribed for the United States, to consist of the gradual encirclement of Germany by the establishment of military bases in the British Isles and in the Near East, and possible action by American expeditionary forces in Africa and the Near East."

That was December 4th, 1941, three days before Pearl Harbor.

The joint proclamation by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill on August 14, 1941—their so-called Atlantic Charter—was the confirmation of a program for war already decided upon. On July 9th the President had written to the Secretary of War Stimson asking that he explore "at once the over-all production requirements required to defeat our potential enemies."

Formerly top secret British Government papers made public January 1, 1972, indicate that President Roosevelt told Prime Minister Winston Churchill in August 1941 that he was looking for an incident to justify opening hostilities against Nazi Germany.

In August, 1941, Churchill and Roosevelt had shipboard meetings in Placentia Bay off the Canadian province of New-

foundland and issued a declaration that became known as the Atlantic Charter.

Churchill's account of Roosevelt's attitude toward the war was contained in the minutes of the War Cabinet meeting held on August 19, 1941 never before made public and not reported in Churchill's war memoirs. The minutes, quoting Churchill indirectly, said:

"He (Roosevelt) obviously was determined that they (the United States) should come in. . . . If he were to put the issue of peace and war to Congress they would debate it for months. . . . The President had said he would wage war but not declare it and that he would become more provocative. If the Germans did not like it, they could attack American forces."

The Cabinet minutes reported Churchill's account of an agreement that the United States Navy should operate a supply convoy across the Atlantic, then continued:

"The President's orders to these (United States Navy) escorts were to attack any (German) U-Boat which showed itself, even if it were 200 or 300 miles away from the convoy. Everything was to be done to force an incident."

The reporting states "that in 1941 the British were most anxious for the United States to join the war against Germany and could account for the emphasis Churchill placed on his view of Roosevelt's readiness to go to war."

The Cabinet minutes record that Churchill warned Roosevelt that the Soviet Union might be forced by the Germans to sue for peace in the East, and the British could then lose all hope of America coming into the war. According to the minutes, Churchill told the war cabinet:

"The President had taken this very well and made it clear that he would look for an incident which would justify him in opening hostilities."

As President Wilson sought an incident to bring the United States into World War I, likewise President Roosevelt sought an incident to bring the United States into World War II. Tragically for these United States and the world both were successful in their quest.

Treason doth never prosper,
What's the reason?
For if it prosper,
None dare call it treason.

—Sir John Harrington, 1561-1612
(Quoted from None Dare Call It
Treason By John Stormer)

The statement of former Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson to the Congressional Joint Committee of the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack brought from Mr. Hamilton Fish, the former congressman from New York the following statement:

"The shocking and amazing revelations of former Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson prove conclusively that charges made by me and other leading non-interventionists in Congress that President Roosevelt and his specially selected Cabinet of ardent and militant interventionists maneuvered us into war against the will of 80 per cent of the American people.

"The Stimson quotations from his diary have done more to establish the fact that President Roosevelt and Secretaries Hull, Knox and Stimson deliberately planned and sought to involve us in a war with Japan and with Germany, through the back door, than all the testimony taken by the Pearl Harbor investigating committee.

"Mr. Stimson openly states that the note sent by Secretary of State Hull on November 26, 1941, ten days before Pearl Harbor, was a war ultimatum to Japan. This is the main fact that the Democratic members of the committee sought so strenuously to keep out of the record, and actually denounced it as sheer politics and lies. This directly vindicates every statement made by non-interventionists prior to Pearl Harbor, who for years have been villified and smeared by paid agents for telling the truth.

"The complete vindication now comes from no less a person than Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War at the time, who was appointed by President Roosevelt because of his pronounced international and interventionist views. The truth is mighty, and history does not lie" (New York Daily News, March 26, 1946).

The almost total inability of the Western mind to grasp and correctly understand the nature of the world Communist movement, its strategy, tactics, and ultimate objective—world domination—has now brought us virtually to the brink of catastrophe.

The Communists have never really abated or slowed down their Cold War except during a brief period in World War II, when Russia was being driven back to the Urals and faced certain defeat. American Lend-Lease and the massive allied aid in war material, food, and supplies of all kinds, amounting to some eleven billion dollars, helped save the Soviet Union and Communism from defeat at the hands of Hitler.

(The above citations together with the Maj. Gen'l. J.F.C. Fuller and Ambassador William Bullitt quotations are to be found in the Nov.-Dec., 1971, Washington Intelligence, Report—Vol. IV, No. 6, 8001 MacArthur Blvd., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20024)

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS
(Excerpts)

Observe good faith and justice toward all Nations, cultivate peace and harmony with all; Religion and Morality enjoin this conduct; and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great Nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt that in the course of time and things the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it? Can it be, that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a Nation with its Virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent inveterate antipathies against particular Nations, and passionate attachments for others should be excluded; and that in place of them just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The Nation, which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable, when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed and bloody contests. The Nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the Government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The Government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility instigated by pride, ambition and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of Nations has been the victim.

So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one Nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite Nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite Nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the Nation making the concessions; by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained; and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate, in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld. And it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation) facility to betray, or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent Patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the Public Councils! Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of Republican Government. But that jealousy to be useful must be impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it.—Excessive partiality for one foreign nation, and excessive dislike of another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other.—Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

WINSTON CHURCHILL ON WAR

As Sarpedon explains in England's Service it was the breakdown of England's Nineteenth Century Money that brought war into the world and as no plans to attack England or to seize any part of her Empire in peace time ever have been authenticated, evidently it is England in cooperation with other influences revealed in this study that have brought war into the world.

To quotations on warfare by Clausewitz, Treitschke, von Bernhardi and Banse should be added a quotation from the writings of Winston Churchill:

"It was not until the dawn of the twentieth century of the Christian era that war really began to enter into its kingdom as the potential destroyer of the human race . . .

"The press affords a means of unification and of mutual encouragement; religion having discreetly avoided conflict on fundamental issues, offered its encouragements and consolations . . . impartially to all combatants . . .

"Instead of merely starving fortified towns, whole nations were to be methodically subjected . . . to the process of reduction by famine. . . . The air opened paths along which death and terror could be carried far behind the lines of the actual armies, to women, children, the aged, the sick, who in earlier struggles would perforce have been left untouched. . . .

"But all that happened in the four years of the Great War was only a prelude to what was preparing for the fifth year. The campaign of the year 1919 would have witnessed an immense accession to the power of destruction. Had the Germans retained the morale to make good their retreat to the Rhine, they would have been assaulted in the summer of 1919 with forces and by methods incomparably more prodigious than any yet employed. Thousands of aeroplanes would have shattered their cities. Scores of

thousands of cannon would have blasted their front. Arrangements were being made to carry simultaneously a quarter of a million men, together with all their requirements, continuously forward across country in mechanical vehicles. . . . Poison gas of incredible malignity, against which only a secret mask (which the Germans could not obtain in time) was proof, would have stifled all resistance and paralyzed all life on the hostile front. . . . The signal of relief was given and the horrors of 1919 remained buried in the archives of the great antagonists . . .

"The campaign of 1919 was never fought, but its ideas go marching along. In every army they are being explored, elaborated, refined under the surface of peace, and should war come again to the world it is not with the weapons and agencies prepared for 1919 that it will be fought, but with the developments and extensions of these which will be incomparably more formidable and fatal . . . (The Great War, Vol. 3, Page 1602).

ADOLF HITLER ON PEACE

In 1936 Hitler sent notes to the British government advocating outlawing of the bomber type plane and of air bombing.

In Geneva, Anthony Eden, then British Foreign Secretary, defended the bomber as an "effective and humane police weapon" in maintaining law and order among the unruly tribes in some of the British colonies.

On April 1, 1936, according to records of the Geneva League of Nations, Joachim von Ribbentrop, then German Ambassador to London, delivered a note from Hitler on a European pacification plan in which, among other proposals for limitations of arms, he proposed:

Prohibition of dropping of gas, poisonous or incendiary bombs.

Prohibition of dropping bombs of any kind whatsoever on open localities outside the range of medium artillery on fighting fronts.

Prohibition of bombardment with long-range guns of places more than 12 miles distant from battle zones.

Abolition and prohibition of artillery of heaviest type.

The note added:

"The German government hereby declare themselves prepared to accede to every such arrangement insofar as it is internationally valid.

"The German government believes if only a first step is taken on the road to disarmament, this will have an enormous effect on relations between nations and consequently to the return of that atmosphere of confidence which is the prior condition for the development of trade and prosperity."

Eden in his reply to von Ribbentrop five weeks later, on May 6, 1936, said the German memorandum "is most important and deserving of careful study". (Excerpt from Karl von Wiegand's cable from Rome, 19th November, 1946 to New York Journal-American)

JEWS CALL RARICK A COSTLY RACIST

**B'nai B'rith Unit Says Public
Pays to Print His Views**

By IRVING SPIEGEL

Special to The New York Times

GROSSINGERS, N. Y., Nov. 23 — The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith charged today that Representative John R. Rarick, Democrat of Louisiana, had cost American taxpayers "tens of thousands of dollars" through repeated insertions of "blatant white racism and a stark brand of anti-Semitism" in The Congressional Record.

The league's report, covering Mr. Rarick's political career since his election to the House in November, 1966, accused him of "extremist demagoguery" and serving as a "mouthpiece in Congress for anti-Jewish and anti-black extremists."

Mr. Rarick, according to the report, criticized the Nixon Administration on June 7, 1970, for its "continued programs to pacify the fanatical race-mixers."

The league quoted an assertion by Mr. Rarick in June, 1971, that he inserted in The Congressional Record saying that "once again the spectre of death looms over our culture—a culture that has only been preserved through the diligence and hard work of our resettled white population from its suburban homes."

The report noted a statement Mr. Rarick placed in The Congressional Record on June 26, 1967, in which he described Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall, a Negro, as a "scamp" and a "cheat."

Mr. Rarick, referring to Mr. Marshall's role in 1954 as a lawyer for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, called him a "user of false evidence" in the brief he prepared for the N.A.A.C.P. in the now-famous school desegregation case. How-

ever, Mr. Rarick said in the statement, "There are also Negro lawyers who are morally and professionally honest."

In another insertion in The Congressional Record, Mr. Rarick on May 26, 1969, labeled the late Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. "an errand boy" for "international communism" who engaged in a "lifetime of subversions and immorality and exploitation."

The league's report also cited remarks that Mr. Rarick inserted into The Congressional Record on Oct. 27, 1969, made by retired Marine Corps Lieut. Gen. Pedro del Valle. General del Valle, in a speech made before an extremist group in Los Angeles, warned against an alleged "one-world government dreamed up in the Protocols by Elders of Zion."

The "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion," a notorious anti-Semitic document that was exposed as a forgery many years ago, accused the Jews of secretly plotting world domination.

The league also charged that Mr. Rarick had inserted in The Congressional Record during April, 1970, an anti-Semitic speech made in 1934 by the late Representative Louis T. McFadden. Mr. McFadden, who also refers to the Protocols of Zion, accused "Jewish international money-changers" of activities designed "to perpetuate their power."

Further, the agency documents a Rarick insertion in The Congressional Record of last April of a long address made by Col. Arch Roberts, head of the far right Committee to Restore the Constitution. Mr. Roberts's long talk quoted anti-Semitic propaganda concerning "international money-lenders" who were charged with having formed "an invisible government of monetary power."

The document was submitted to members of the league holding its annual meeting here. It was presented by Bernard Nath, chairman of the league's national civil rights committee and prepared under the direction of Arnold Forster, the agency's

general counsel. It will be published by the league's periodical acts in the near future.

JEW S CALL RARICK COSTLY RACIST

Jews Call Rarick Costly Racist, is the headline of an article in the New York Times, November 24, 1971. It removes the sensitivity non-Jews have for saying the word Jew when speaking of Jewish activities. Previously, Jews only could be spoken of in a whisper as though one would be censored for speaking out loud. That restraint has now been removed.

The Zionist Jews have been and are the most costly people that live among the inhabitants of these United States as they have been an important influence getting the United States into two World Wars. The documentation in this book testifies to that.

Racism is a term Jewish organizations and liberals apply to those who value their racial heritage and instinctively oppose being exposed to the possibility of miscegenation. Racism is a term used by the circulation, press, by other media and by Jews and negroes, in a derogatory sense to strike fear into any white person who thinks in terms of racial preservation. The Jews being the most influential are the most important promulgators of the term.

Racist and racism are terms used by Jewish organizations both defensively and offensively. Their use in defense inhibits racial thinking, by white people, which could expose the Jews as a separate group in a nation among whose people they live. Identification of Jews as a separate group is prevented by developing in the mind of white people the thought that mentioning race is taboo. To be set apart from the people among whom the Jews live, to be exposed as a separate, distinct and different people is to be avoided. Such a development would weaken the idea of democracy where everyone is supposed to be the same and equal. To be different courts ostracism. "Be my brother or I'll kill you" is the slogan of democracy.

The Jews, having protected themselves by "smearing" the character of white people sensitive of their racial heri-

tage by making repugnant the term racism, offensively (both usages apply—aggressive and objectionable) promote the mixing of blacks with whites by propinquity. Federally and locally supported scatter housing is used for closing the racial gap by placing low-income, rent subsidized, high-rise apartment buildings for the poor and under-privileged (mostly negroes) in white neighborhoods of middle income, private dwelling, low-rise apartment buildings.

At a hearing on December 20, 1971, before a State committee exploring the federally mandated housing, Gordon C. Lynch (black) of NEGRO, an acronym for the National Economic Growth and Reconstruction Organization, termed scatter-site housing as genocide. Mr. Lynch said:

“ . . . if you put that \$35 million for the Forest Hills Project into letting black people rehabilitate the abandoned housing in these neighborhoods (Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant) there would be no need to integrate or scatter. Let's have good housing and good schools, then there would be no need to bus and no need to scatter. The black man has to stand where he is and build from the bottom up.”

In questioning Mr. Lynch, Republican State Senator Roy Goodman (Jewish), chairman of the committee, said the rationale for the Federal policy rested with the Kerner Commission report that indicated that unless the widening gap between the races was bridged the social fabric of the country was in jeopardy.

The Kerner report placed the responsibility for the racial disturbances a few years ago (Watts, Newark, etc.) on white racism. That is the liberal attitude.

Senator Goodman's attitude is the attitude of Jewish organizations—the gap between the races must be bridged, the Jewish people excepted—their separateness must be maintained. How is the gap to be bridged? By the mingling that leads to miscegenation.

Mr. Lynch, with the attitude of a black racist, replied to Senator Goodman:

“I submit that we've already been in two classes for 300 years and that forced integration is psychologically incorrect.”

As to Federal guide lines, Mr. Lynch said that until a few years ago they were separate and equal and that was changed (Plessy vs Ferguson doctrine of separate but equal).

Jewish organizations have been critical of the people of Forest Hills (New York City) for opposing bringing poor people (negroes) into their area by erecting low cost, high-rise housing subsidized with Federal funds. The people protesting the Forest Hills project are middle class Jews who live in pleasant surroundings of private dwellings and comparatively low-rise apartment buildings in an atmosphere that enables them to maintain their Jewishness which the intrusion of black people would destroy.

Handwritten text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is mostly illegible due to fading and bleed-through, but appears to be a list or series of entries.

THE PROTOCOLS

The Protocols of the Elders of Zion are cited in the press and literature from time to time. The latest citation appears in The Anti-Defamation League's criticism of Congressman John Rarick as a costly racist.

It is believed that the Protocols were written in Paris about the time of the Panama scandal (circa 1894-5) by never identified writers and then taken to Russia where in 1895 Philip Stepanov, former Procurator of the Moscow Synod Office in an affidavit dated April 17, 1927, witnessed by Prince Vladimir Galitzin, swears that Major Alexey Sukhotin (the Marechal de noblesse in the area of Orel) a neighboring estate owner in the province of Tula, gave him a hand written copy. Sukhotin is said to have received the document from Mlle Justine Glinka who had returned from Paris about that time and was living on her estate in Orel. Mlle. Glinka said, on payment of 2,500 francs, she obtained the document from a Jew Joseph Schorst (Shapiro) a member of the Mizraim Lodge in Paris. According to French police archives, Schorst fled to Egypt where he was murdered.

Evidently the document was known before the First Zionist Congress held in Basle, August 29-31, 1897 where it is said to have been stolen from a delegate.

In 1897 Stepanov privately printed the document. Professor Sergius A. Nilus who had received a copy from Sukhotin, published it for the first time in 1901 in a book titled *The Great Within the Small*. Since the appearance of the Protocols in the West (circa 1905-6) many articles and books have been written to prove them fraudulent and fabricated for the purpose of rendering the Jews odious.

In 1948, John S. Curtis, Professor of History at Columbia University, in an analysis, *An Appraisal of the Protocols of Zion* stated, "at a recent trials in Berne, Switzerland, the Court declared the Protocols to be forgeries." The Professor's research is incomplete. Perhaps to have written otherwise would have endangered his tenure at the University.

The trial Court did so declare. On appeal the verdict was quashed. The facts are these:

In June 1933, two Jewish societies brought an action in the court against a bookseller, Sylvio Schnell and others, to obtain a judgment that *Die Zionistischen Protokolle* by Theodor Fritsch was literary trash and to obtain an order prohibiting its publication despite their having been sold in many bookstores for several years. Judge Meyer, a social democrat, appointed a pro-Jewish Swiss author, C. A. Loosli, as presiding expert, Dr. A. Baumgarten, Jewish Professor of Criminal Law at the University of Basle, expert for the Jewish plaintiffs and Lt. Col. U. Fleischeuer, Director of World Service, expert for the defendants.

By October 1934, Judge Meyer had permitted the appearance of sixteen witnesses for the plaintiffs and only one, Dr. Zender, for the defense. Swiss law requirement for taking shorthand minutes of the proceedings by an official of the court was not observed. No legal record of the proceedings was kept.

On May 14th, 1935, judgment was entered that the Protocols were a forgery and demoralizing literature. The defendants appealed the decision.

The case was reopened in the Court of Criminal Appeal in Berne on October 27th, 1937. Counsel for the defendants requested that the verdict of the court be quashed and their clients acquitted. Counsel for the defendants submitted evidence that:

1. Evidence taken during the proceedings had not been submitted to the witnesses for signature.

2. Successfully disputed the credibility of the plaintiff's witnesses.

3. That the Russian documents submitted to the court by M. Loosli were uncertified copies of the originals and mistakes had been discovered in the translations.

Assistant Public Prosecutor Loder recognized that the manner in which the official records of the trial proceedings had been kept had not been correct and that a whole series of errors of the Penal Code had been committed.

On November 1st, 1937 the Appeal Court pronounced this judgment:

The accused is acquitted, and summed up the verdict of acquittal as follows:

1. Proof of authenticity or non-authenticity was superfluous,

2. As a political pamphlet, Bernese law did not apply,

3. The Judge in the trial Court had no right to inquire about the authenticity or non-authenticity as this was irrelevant to the consideration whether the document was an immoral publication.

The Protocols are a program for the dissolution of traditional Western Christian society. Written in the eighteen ninety's when Western Christian society was relatively lacking in turmoil, the program of the Protocols has, in a measure, been realized.

Henry Ford, Sr., whose Dearborn Independent published a series of articles on Jewish influence in the United States, stated:

The only statement I care to make about the Protocols is that they fit in with what is going on. They are sixteen years old, and they have fitted the world situation up to this time. They fit it now (New York World, February 17th, 1921).

Despite Jewish denial that the Protocols could be an expression of Jewish thinking, is there Jewish thought that indicates otherwise?

Dr. Oscar Levy's thoughts on Jewish activism in the Western world is cited on page 47.

Marcus Eli Ravage, a Rumanian born Jewish author arrived in New York's lower East side about 1900. Author of a number of books and European correspondent for the Nation, a contributor to the New Republic and Harpers, he authored an article that appeared in the January and February 1928 Century Magazine titled, A Real Case Against The Jews:

"You have not begun to appreciate the real depth of our guilt. We are intruders. We are disturbers. We are subverters. We have taken your natural world, your ideal, your destiny, and played havoc with them. We are at the bottom not merely of the latest great war but nearly all your wars, not only of the Russian but of every other major revolution in

your history. We have brought discord and confusion and frustration into your personal and public life. We are still doing it."

Seward Collins, publisher of the American Review Magazine, thought the Ravage articles were written in jest. Perhaps. Is not many a truth said in jest?

Svetozar Tonjoroff in *Jews in World Reconstruction*, wrote:

"The workings of this unrest (of Jewish discontent) are to be seen in the events that they have accomplished, since the fateful year 1914, a task that looms far larger than the French Revolution—the annihilation of the most firmly entrenched, the most selfish and most reckless autocratic system in the world, the Russian Czarism.

"That achievement, destined to figure in history as the overshadowing result of the World War (I), was largely the outcome of Jewish thinking, of Jewish discontent, of Jewish effort to reconstruct.

"What Jewish idealism and Jewish discontent have so powerfully contributed to accomplish in Russia, the same historic qualities of the Jewish mind and heart are tending to promote in other countries."

(American Hebrew, September 10, 1920)

In the Communal Arm Chair column of the London Jewish Chronicle (April 4, 1919), in an article titled Peace, War—And Bolshevism, Mentor wrote:

"There is much in the fact of Bolshevism, itself, in the fact that so many Jews are Bolsheviks, in the fact that the ideals of Bolshevism at many points are consonant with the finest ideals of Judaism . . .

In the Forum of the Chicago Rabbinical Association, Rabbi S. Felix Mendelsohn, Rabbi of Temple Beth Israel, Chicago, writing of a Platform for American Jewry stated:

"The Second World War is being fought for the defense of the fundamentals of Judaism."

(Chicago Jewish Sentinel, October 8, 1942)

In *You Gentiles*, Maurice Samuels wrote in 1924:

"We Jews, we, the destroyers, will remain the destroyers for ever. Nothing that you will do will meet our needs and demands. We will for ever de-

stroy because we need a world of our own, a God-world, which is not in your nature to build (page 155).

After World War I when intransigence at the Peace Conference allowed Jews to become the dominant influence in Russia, Jews extolled their accomplishment of Bolshevizing Russia. It was a great achievement they eulogized, never mentioning the millions of Russian lives destroyed. Through the years the influence of the native Russians has become dominant. Factual or not, the Jew has the world press publicizing Jewish persecution to the extent that these United States are to finance the exodus of Jews from Russia. Could be, who knows, it may be Soviet strategy to weaken the United States by planting unassimilable Soviet Jews in our midst.

In a public notice in the New York Times, June 20, 1967, twenty-one leading Jewish organizations in threatening the Soviets, avow that it was Jewish influence that brought death and destruction to many nations:

AN APPEAL OF CONSCIENCE TO MR. KOSYGIN

In statement after statement since the collapse of Russia's Arab allies in the Middle East, the Soviet Union has made repeated charges in the United Nations that Israel has committed "Hitlerite atrocities and war crimes".

The Soviet representatives and their supporters have indulged in vilification and abuse to represent as Nazi aggression Israel's successful defense against an enemy which has sworn to destroy her in a "Holy War".

The Soviet Government has sent insulting and threatening notes to the Government of Israel, a fellow member of the United Nations, which it insists on describing as "the Tel Aviv authorities". The Soviet Government newspaper Izvestia has made the lying charge that Israeli troops have shot down women and children in public executions.

This vicious and unscrupulous propaganda is a potentially explosive form of warfare. Under Soviet incitement the Arabs initiated and lost the hot war for Soviet influence in the Middle East. Now the USSR has taken upon itself the full responsibility for verbal aggression. This is supported by renewed arms shipments to the Arabs.

This powerful country, the USSR, has never published a word of criticism about the Nazi war criminals who are actively mobilized in Cairo and Damascus in the war against the Jews. The Soviet Government has given unstinting support to the Arab States which disseminate the crude anti-Semitism of the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion".

The very country which is preventing the development of Jewish life within its own borders does not hesitate to fasten the hideous label of Nazism on the survivors of a small Jewish nation which lost a third of its members in Nazi atrocities.

The accent of present Soviet propaganda is the accent of the Stalinist doctors' plot and the destruction of Soviet Jewish society. It is the accent of Soviet anti-Semitic propaganda against Judaism, of the fever of Jew-hatred that periodically seizes the Soviet press. It means that the incorrigible anti-Semites who infest Russian society are again being given their hour.

It is not the first time in this century that a major power has accused Jews of sub-human crimes and threatened dire punishment for imaginary evils. The world knows the terrible price the Jewish people have paid for such monstrous accusations. The Soviet Union should think again before it follows the appalling example of the power whose pathological hatred of Jews was the beginning of a process that brought death and destruction to many nations.

The undersigned, representing the Jewish community of the United States call upon the Soviet Union to put aside the delusion of quick and facile propaganda victories. Let it strive for a lasting peace in the Middle East, recognizing that Israel, like the Arab States, has every right to exist and prosper. The Soviet Union should consider carefully whether it indeed wishes to follow in the footsteps of those whose hatred of Jews led to the cataclysm of twenty-five years ago.

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish
Organizations

515 Park Avenue, New York City

American Israel Public Affairs Committee

American Jewish Congress

American Zionist Council

American Trade Union Council for Histadrut

B'nai B'rith
Central Conference of American Rabbis
Hadassah
Jewish Agency for Israel—American Section
Jewish Labor Committee
Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.
Labor Zionist Movement
Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi
National Community Relations Advisory Council
National Council of Jewish Women
National Council of Young Israel
Rabbinical Assembly
The Rabbinical Council of America
Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America
Union of American Hebrew Congregations
United Synagogue of America
Zionist Organization of America

“ . . . hatred of Jews was the beginning of a process that brought death and destruction to many nations.” (8th para.)

In that public notice organized Jewry threatened the Soviets as they threatened Germany in 1933:

“ . . . those whose hatred of Jews led to the cataclysm of twenty-five years ago.” (9th para.)

Here is a public avowal of the program of the Protocols that are termed crude-anti-Semitism in the 5th paragraph.

Protocol VII states:

“We must be able to overcome all opposition by provoking a war by the neighbors of that country which dares to oppose us. Should, however, those neighbors, in their turn, decide to unite against us we must respond by a world war.

“We must influence the Goy governments to action beneficial to our broadly conceived plan, now approaching its triumphant goal, creating the impression that such action is demanded by public opinion which in reality is secretly organized by us with the help of the so-called “great power,” namely, the press; the latter, however, with few exceptions that need not be considered, is already in our hands.”

The Jewish author Arthur Trebitsch in his book *Deutscher Geist oder Judentum* (1921) writes that the Aryan mind is incapable of writing such a document as the Protocols:

"Anybody who like the author, has long since realized, seen, and heard with ominous dread, all the thoughts, aims and intentions derived from the entirety of our economic, political and intellectual life, and expressed in those secret documents, can with absolute confidence assert that they present the most genuine and unalloyed expression of that versatile spirit which is striving towards world-domination; and that an Aryan mind, however far it might have been driven along the road of forgery and calumny by anti-Semitic rancour, could never, under any circumstances have devised these methods of action, these underhand expedients and these swindles as a whole." (page 74).



ACKNOWLEDGMENT

How This Book Happened To Be Written

As a young man, friends in Water Mill allowed me the privileges of their infrequently used bath house at the Southampton Beach Club. There I mingled with members who invited me to summer social affairs. One of these was a dance at the Meadow Club. As the evening lengthened I sauntered into the lounge by the bar. Sitting alone was a pleasant looking man in a white evening jacket, as was I. He greeted me and asked me to join him for a drink. To this day I visualize in my mind that chance meeting with Richard "Bull" Smith Emmet.

Emmet had driven to the Meadow Club from St. James, fifty miles toward New York on Long Island Sound, where is the Smith ancestral pre-revolutionary home, Sherrewogue. Richard was no stranger in Southampton. His father, Devereux Emmet, was architect for the National Golf Club course. He was a party goer with the late Colles Coe and his sister Rosalie, with Frances Breese, whose father built the summer show place on Hill Street and at Henry Huddleston Rogers pinked-walled place on the beach, danced at parties given for Millicent. On his father's side he was a descendant of the Irish patriot, Thomas Addis Emmet, brother of Robert Emmet. On his mother's side he was descended from "Bull" Smith, a contemporary of the original Lion Gardiner, Lord of Gardiner's Island. Smith was granted by the Indians all the land he could encompass riding on the back of bull from sunup to sundown. Henceforth, he was known as "Bull" Smith. Smithtown took its name from his family.

One day at Richard's apartment in the city I met Douglas MacCollum Stewart. Stewart and Emmet had met at Harvard and after World War I had seen much of each other in Paris. Doug Stewart was much interested in the history of the Republic. A Revolutionary War ancestor, Sylvanus Pond, is buried in St. Paul's Church cemetery. Broadway at Fulton Street. Stewart's mother, Anne MacCollum Stewart knew Ward McCallister, originator of the famous 400, so well as to say to him, "Ward, if you include me in that group (the 400), I'll not speak with you again."

Anne MacCullom's mother, Ella Lake, was the daughter of Joseph Seaton Lake, a Sandusky, Ohio, entrepreneur who

had come East some years before the Civil War. Ella Lake's sister, Elizabeth, married the first Jeremiah Milbank, recently arrived from England. Elizabeth Lake Milbank's son Joseph was the father of the present Jeremiah Milbank, Sr.

Doug stimulated my interest in history and during evenings reviewed the arcane history of our times that standard history books overlook. I was full of credulity and remarked, "It can't be so—I never read it in the history books." Doug's response was, "Get the straw from behind your ears—you are no longer on the farm." Doug was referring to my early youth on the farm on the banks of Shenandoah in Clarke County, Virginia. The soil of Virginia is infectious with the spirit of great Virginians, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Henry Lee, and Edmund Randolph. I knew Dr. Archie Randolph of Bluemont and was cautioned to watch my language when Victor Emmanuel of New York was coming by for dinner to discuss buying horses. Doug, for some summers, was at Prospect. Both of us remembered the chugging steam tractor that pulled the threshing machine along dirt roads to the farms where the summer wheat crops were to be threshed. This operation bustled with activity—a scene Winslow Homer should have painted. I was in the midst of it doing the odd jobs a lad could for the men operating the tractor and thresher and bagging the grain as it poured down the chute while the chaff and straw were blown on the rick.

On one occasion Doug related the efforts after World War I, of Bernard Baruch and his daughter Belle, whom Doug knew, to seek support for getting the United States into the League of Nations. The idea had been planted with Wilson by the Internationalists, in whose control he was, as a world peace keeping organization and for the protection of minorities—minorities being a euphonious word for Jews as today ghettos and poor people mean negroes.

As the thirties passed the mid-point the Roosevelt Administration and other like-minded people and organizations increased the propaganda tempo to involve the United States in a war in Europe for which the liberal Western democracies were agitating. As a side effect in the battle for righteousness was the prospect of reducing the large number of unemployed by putting some to work in armament factories and placing others on the firing line with the hope

that they would never return to the unemployment roles. With the prospect of the Administration fomenting another World War, Doug reviewed with his cousin Jeremiah Milbank, Sr. the publishing of a magazine to keep America out of the war. With his support together with that of Charles Payson, Scribner Commentator magazine started publishing articles exposing war mongering and war mongers that other magazines would not touch for fear of reprisals from the Roosevelt Administration, from Jewish pressure and smear groups or because they were collaborationists which many publishers were.

But for Scribner Commentator, Churchill's statement about staying out of World War I would never have been published. In the Autumn of 1940 I was researching material in Seward Collins American Review library when Doug telephoned, "Jerry's (Jeremiah Milbank) chauffeur will drop off a bundle of leaflets for distribution." The leaflets were the New York Times article, New World Order Pledged to Jews (page 64). Eventually I received the plate for future use.

Doug began to have frequent conferences with Colonel Lindbergh as recorded by the Colonel in his Wartime Diaries. At the time of the Colonel's, Des Moines Speech (page 79). Doug asked if researching in Seward Collins American Review library could provide documentary background of Roosevelt's war policies. We began collating research documentation with the idea of publishing a brochure. Roosevelt must have heard of it(?) and decided that he needed a fait accompli quickly, so he arranged to have an ultimatum sent to Japan (page 89) that brought on Pearl Harbor. The American Review "shop" closed down never to resume. I kept the research material and published it with additions after the war in Uncovering The Forces For War, now out of print.

Because of harassment in the East, Scribner Commentator moved to Lake Geneva, Wisconsin. With Pearl Harbor the magazine ceased publishing.

Roosevelt's fait accompli caused more than 3,000 navy men to lose their lives and the loss of the Pacific fleet.

In Chicago Doug found the Administration had him black-balled with the employment agencies. To survive in

his hall bedroom he was eating baked beans from cans, unknown to many friends who would have helped.

At last Avery Brundage gave Doug a job as a desk clerk at his LaSalle Hotel.

In 1946, a number of pre-war interventionists to give vent to their venom for Scribner Commentator having published portrait-caricatures of prominent people favoring involving the United States in the war, among them being Robert Emmet Sherwood, cousin of interventionist Christopher Emmet, arranged to have the Administration bring an action against Stewart for purporting to have received money from Baron von Strempel for propaganda purposes. As I had luncheon with Doug at the Pennsylvania Statler the day he was in New York from Lake Geneva to meet von Strempel I was called as a witness. It was thought if a conviction could be gotten against Stewart they would proceed against Jeremiah Milbank, Sr. for having financed the publication of Scribner Commentator. The trial was costly. It was necessary for Warren Magee, Doug's attorney, to make trips to Germany to secure evidence. There Mr. Magee learned that Justice Department attorneys, a Jewish refugee Kempner, a former German official who became an American citizen and John O. Rogge, had used torture to "soften-up" witnesses by tossing them into solitary confinement, starving them and threatening them with life imprisonment in Germany unless a "satisfactory" statement for use against Americans in American courts was forthcoming. Rogge wanted statements for use in his perjury case against anti-Roosevelt magazine editor Douglas Stewart of Scribner's Commentator. Baron Herbert von Strempel admitted on the stand that he signed the statement used against Stewart only after he had been questioned for eight months, been thrown into solitary confinement, starved so that he lost 40 pounds and was threatened with life imprisonment. Von Strempel's former chief in Washington, Charge d'Affaires Hans Thomsen gave similar testimony as did former Consul-General in New York, Dr. Heinrich (Hans) Borchers. The Federal jury acquitted Stewart. We quote from a letter of Douglas Chandler, an American broadcasting from Germany during the war:

East Cambridge, Mass.

April 28, 1947

I was especially interested in John O'Donnell's columns (Apr. 9 and 10, 1947) about von Strempel, Hans Thompson and poor old Dr. Borchers. We were fellow sufferers in "House Alaska". Dr. Borchers had had nine months of solitary confinement before he came to "Alaska" where we were starved but under better conditions than in the "stockade". Borchers was completely broken in body and in mind from the cruelties he suffered. Strempel and Thompson were taken away and subjected to a refinement of mental and physical torture. I know them very intimately and saw how they were wrecked. The entire personnel of "Camp King" was Jewish. The methods of handling prisoners were as bad as any Ogpu. You would scarcely credit the plausibility of some of the sadistic details which I could furnish you. Someday I'd like to give you a full account of the reign-of-terror and the awful thing is that it is still going on."

Jeremiah Milbank Sr. paid the cost of the trial otherwise there would have been a conviction. Previously Doug had been jailed for a month for being unable to answer a question the judge asked for want of knowing the answer. The judge said, "Answer, or a month in jail." In jail Doug was poisoned and was very sick with abdominal nausea for several days.

When Doug returned to Chicago after his exoneration he was placed in charge of banquet promotions of the LaSalle Hotel, an important business for hotels. Not long after he was stricken with weakness at first thought to be anemia brought on from the strain of the trial. On his return from a New Orleans business trip much weakened, he had a thorough medical examination. I remember Doug's voice when he telephoned that January evening after being informed of the findings of the medical examination, "Radi. it's leukemia." I was aghast. His condition steadily worsened until he passed away, poverty stricken, in May 1949. Fortunately Jeremiah Milbank Sr. paid his extensive medical and hospital bills.

Thus ended the career of Douglas MacCollum Stewart who gave his life to save our country from Roosevelt's de-

signs for war. But for meeting Richard Emmet at the Meadow Club I would never have met Doug Stewart and this documented collation could never have been written.

The late Arthur Goadby's grandfather came from England about the same time as the first Jeremiah Milbank. Arthur Goadby, a Harvard classmate of J. P. Morgan and Henry Stimson, shared the same sentiments about the land of his ancestors as did Carlyle. How he lamented England's record of "smash the continent" wars—allied with Germany to smash Napoleon and a hundred years later allied with France to smash Hitler. Along with the late George Montgomery, I am indebted to Arthur Goadby and Benjamin Freedman for the secret history of Woodrow Wilson's private life—knowledge of which the Zionist Jews used to bring the United States into World War I as herein documented.

Benjamin Freedman has done more than any person of position and means to publicize the arcane history of our times. To Ben Freedman I am much indebted.

To the late Catherine Palfrey Baldwin, a descendant of twelve generations of English forebears in America who shared Arthur Goadby's sentiments about England, author of that magnificently documented book of British influence in American affairs, *AND MEN WEPT*, I am indebted for documentation and cooperation.

In a letter written in Paris, dated October 5, 1925, William Astor Chanler asks Frederick Hill Meserve to aid Mrs. Leslie Fry (Shismareff) to republish the *Protocols* (of the Learned Elders of Zion, see page 101) as "... the re-appearance of the *Protocols* at this time might make some little impression upon DeLancy Nicoll." After reviewing the accomplishments of Mrs. (Nesta) Webster, author of *World Revolution—The Plot Against Civilization*; of Mrs. Fry, author of *Waters Flowing Eastward*, an early and important study of the *Protocol's* published in France in 1933 and of Mrs. Haviland Lund, a journalist of some influence during the Harding Administration, Mr. Chanler suggests that, Mrs. Lund be encouraged and aided because "of her ability to gain publicity . . . because I firmly believe that if she becomes active, the other patriotic societies which are asleep and slothful would be forced to wake up—I refer particularly to the American Defense Society."

There was a time when some top-echelon Americans were cognizant of the termitic influences undermining the constitutional government that has endured since 1787 but is now in disarray. As the cognizant generation passed from the scene the top echelon has become depleted of knowledgeable people. A cause is the unfavorable publicity and character smearing defamation proclivities of such well organized brotherhoods of alien minded people as the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith.

As reported in the New York Times November 24, 1971, the Anti-Defamation League terms Representative John Rarick, Democrat of Louisiana, a costly racist because of his extensive insertion in the Congressional Record of information that all Americans having an interest in the preservation of constitutional government should know but don't.

We hope the chance meeting at the Meadow Club years ago that made possible the publication of this documented collation will stimulate top echelon people to aid in informing the blue shirt, the white shirt and the executive level people—the whole strata of American society from the bottom to the top—of the historical background of how the affairs of these United States have come to be what they are.

In the words of Thomas Jefferson:

I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education.

Conrad Grieb

MORE ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The friend in Water Mill who allowed the author to use the family bath house at the Southampton Beach Club was Ancell Ball, son of Thomas Ball who emigrated from England and settled in Bridgehampton about 1870 where he lodged with a relative of Clarence Halsey, formerly of Cobb Lane, Water Mill. Thomas Ball with a Mr. Best founded Best's Lilliputian Bazaar which later became Best & Company. Ancell Ball related to the author that when Hayden Stone was to make the public offering of the shares of what was then known as Bests, of which Ancell was the sole owner having bought out his brother Arthur who had no talent for merchandising, he told Charlie Hayden that if his firm brought any Jews in on the deal, he, Mr. Ball, would take the business away from Hayden, Stone. Eventually control of Bests was bought in the open market by Jewish entrepreneurs and in 1970 liquidated.

INDEX

A

- Adams, John Quincy 86
- Atlantic Charter 87
- Anti-Semitism in Germany and
Corregidor 73
- Anti-Defamation League 115

B

- Bailik, Jewish Influence in Chris-
tian World 66-7
- Baldwin, Catherine 114
- Balfour, Arthur
War Against Germany 25
- Balfour Declaration. IV, 5, 8, 27,
36
- Ball, Ansell 116
- Ballin, Albert 71
- Baruch, Bernard 15, 71, 110
re: Hitler 75
- Bar Coziba 76
- Battenburg 71
- Baumgarten, Prof. A. 102
- Beck, Joseph 14, 16, 19, 22
- Belloc, Hilaire 9, 16, 46, 49, 53, 68
- Bohemia 13
- Benes 13
- Bonnet Georges 19, 20
- Boers 24
- B'nai B'rith 115
- Bolshevic Revolution 8, 9, 11
- Borchers, Hans 112
- Brandeis, Louis Dembitz 4, 29, 31,
32, 35, 39
- Breese, Frances 109
- British Agreement to Guarantee
Poland 18
- British Concentration Camps—
Boer War 25
- Bryant, Arthur, on Germany
69, 73
- Bullitt, Wm. C. 15, 78
War Decided Upon (1939) 21

C

- Carlyle, Thomas 26
- Cassell, Sir Ernest 72
- Castlereagh, Lord 23
- Chamberlain, Neville 17, 19,
20, 22
- Birmingham Speech 13, 15

Polish Guarantee 16

- Chandler, Douglas 112
- Chanler, William Astor 114
- China 24
- Churchill, Winston 7, 71, 72, 87
Atlantic Charter 87
America Should Have Stayed
Out of World War I, 2
- Revision of Polish Corridor 14
- Smash Germany 22
- Sympathy for Jewish Aspira-
tions 7
- On War 934
- Cleveland, Grover 29
- Clive, Robert 24
- Coe, Collis and Rosalie 109
- Collins, Seward 104, 111
- Congress—Coin Money 63
- Curtis, Prof. John S. 101
- Czechoslovakia 12, 13, 22
- Soviet Influence 12
- Minorities 12, 22

D

- Danzig 14, 16, 17, 18, 22
- Darmesteter, Arsene, The Tal-
mud 76
- Dawson, Wm. Harbutt 14
- de Hass, Jacob 35
- Denmark 23
- Dillon, Dr. E. J.—Peace Con-
ference 1919 —6
- Disraeli, Benjamin—Jews Seek
To Destroy Christendom 27

E

- Edward VII 72
- Elkus, Abram 30
- Elliot, Sir Walter 11
- Emmett, Christopher 112
Devereaux Sr. 109
Richard 109
Robert 109
Thomas Addis 109

F

- False Rumors 13
- Farley, James A.—Polish Visit 18
- Federal Reserve Bank 61, 72
- Fish, Hamilton 89
- Fleischauer, Col. U. 102
- Forest Hills, N. Y. 100

INDEX—Continued

Forrestal, James—Jews, England
and War 21
Ford, Henry Sr. 103
France, Anatole 29
Frankfurter 15
Freedman, Benjamin 114
Freemasonry 25
French Revolution 7, 41
Fritsch, Theodor 102
Fry, Leslie (Shismareff) 114
Fuller, Major Genl. 78

G

Galitzin, Valdimir 101
Gardiner, Lion 109
Genocide 27
Germania delende est 25
Germany 25
Glinka, Justine 101
Glucksbergs 71
Goadby, Arthur 114
Goldman, Emma 7
Goldsmid, Col. 40
Goldstein, Montz 69
Goode, Chaplain Alexander 76
Goodman Roy 99
Greenwood, Arthur 64

H

Hacha 13
Hague Peace Conference 25
Hahn, Kurt 72
Halifax 17
Halsey, Clarence 116
Hanoteaux
American Bankers and World
War I 60
Heine, Heinrich 41, 42, 43
Herzl, Theodore 1, 2, 7, 26
Hess, Moses 41
House, Col. E. M. House
Hitler 20, 56, 22
Danzig and Corridor 14, 16, 17
Peace Agreement with Cham-
berlain 19
Peace Offer 95
Protectorate of Bohemia 13
War 73
Holmes, John Haynes, Jews Want
House Alaska, Torture Com-
pound 113

Huddleston, Sisly 10
Hulbert, Mrs. 30

I

Illuminati 7
India 24
Ireland 23

J

Jefferson, Thomas 13, 115
Jeffries, J. M. N. 31, 32
Critical of Balfour Declaration
Jekyll Island 72
Jews, Call Rarick Racist 97
—in journalism and publishing
—in Kaiser's Germany 71
—persecution and dominance
75
—tolerance and democracy 75,
76,
—power in white world 46
—Belloc 49-52
Judaism 66, 76
Judeans, Biblical 45, 76

K

Kempner, U. S. Attorney in Ger-
many 112
Kennedy, Joseph 21
Kerner Committee Report 99
Kitchener 25
Khan, Jhenghis 45
Kiev 45
Kuhn, Bela 7
Kuhn, Loeb 8

L

Landman, Samuel 4, 8, 31, 71, 73
Lansing, Robert 10, 60
Layton, Walter—Critical of Po-
lish Corridor 14
Lazare, Bernard 43
Lehman, Gov. 15
Levy, Dr. Oscar 47
Liber, Rabbi 41
Lindbergh, Col. Chas. A. 21, 47,
Chas. A. Sr. 61
Loosli, C. A. 102
Lund, Mrs. Haviland 114
Luxembourg, Rose 7
Lynch, Gordon 99
Mc
McCombs 30

INDEX—Continued

M

- Malcolm, James A. 2, 5, 31
 Personal History 39
 Origins of Balfour Declaration 39
 Marshall, Geo. C. 75
 Marx, Karl 7
 Marxism 10
 McCallister, Ward 109
 Meadow Club 109, 114
 Mendelsohn, Rabbi Felix 104
 Mendelssohn, Moses 41, 42
 Meserve, Frederick Hill 214
 Meyer, Judge 102
 Milbank, Jeremiah, Sr. 112
 Milford-Haven, Marquess 72
 Montgomery, George 114
 Morgan, J. P. 60, 61, 114
 Morgenthau 15
 Morely, E. D.—Critical of British Policy 26
 Morgenthau, Henry, Sr. 30
 Morley, Felix 36
 Mountbatten 72
 Munich Agreement 12, 22

N

- NEGRO 99
 Neilson, Francis 21, 26
 Newman, Dr. Louis I. 68
 Nicoll, De Lancey 114
 Nilus, Prof. Sergius 101
 Nineteenth Century Money and War 17, 60
 Nordau, Dr. Max 1, 2, 7

O

- O'Donnell, John J. 65
 Origins of Balfour Declaration 39
 Oudendyk M. on Jews and Bolshevism 8, 9

P

- Paul, Apostle 27
 Pearl Harbor 65
 Peck, Mrs. 6, 30
 Perlzweig, Rabbi Maurice L. 66
 Peter the Great, Criticism of Jews 46
 Petrovna, Elizabeth I.—Banishes Jews 46

- Philip, Queen's Consort 72
 Pitt-Rivers, George 19, 47
 Poland 14
 Polish Corridor 14
 Potocki, Count Jerzy 15, 18
 Potsdam, Planted Seeds of War 58
 Press, Jewish Influence 66-9
 Protocols of Learned Elders of Zion 40, 98, 101, 106, 107, 114

R

- Rarick, John—Jews Call Costly Racist 97, 115
 Rathenau, Walter 71
 Ravage, Marcus E. 102
 Reed, Douglas 68
 Ribbentrop, Joachim 19
 Riefenstahl, Leni 68
 Rogers, Henry Huddleston & Millicent 109
 Rogge, John O. 112
 Roosevelt Franklin Delano 15, 16, 18, 111, 37, 22, 19
 Tribute of Synagogue 11
 War Plans 87
 Seeks Involvement 21, 65, 87, 88
 Mrs. 65
 Rostow, Walt 22
 Rothschild, Lord 35
 Russia 9

S

- Saint John, Gospel of 27
 Salluse 44
 Samuels, Maurice 104
 Sarpedon 49
 Sasoon 39
 Schiff, Jacob 8, 9
 Schiff, John 7
 Schorst (Shapiro), Joseph 101
 Scrap of Paper—Hitler and Chamberlain, 1936 vs. Belgium 1914 20, 21, 22
 Sherwood, Robert Emmet 112
 Singer, Amsterdam Atrocity Fabrication Factory 11
 Slovakia, Gains Independence 13

INDEX—Continued

- Smith, "Bull" 109
 Smuts, Gen'l Jan 25
 Soddy, Frederick, Bank Deposit Money 62
 South Africa 24
 Southampton 109
 Sparticus 7
 Steed, Wickham, The Peace Conference 8
 Stepanov, Philip 101
 Stewart, Anne MacCollum 109
 Douglas MacCollum 101-113
 Stimson, Henry L. 89, 114
 Streseman, Gustav 10, 11, 70
 Sukhotin, Alexy 101
 Sussex, S. S.—Disappearance Of 5
- T
- Talmud 45, 76
 Thomas, Hans 112
 Torture 112-3
 Treason 89
 Trebitsch, Arthur 108
 Trotsky 7
- U
- Union of Jews for Civilization and Science 41, 42
 Untermeyer, Samuel 10, 65
 Attorney for Mrs. Peck 30, 31
 Brandeis, Wilson and Supreme Court 31
 Declares Holy War Against Germany 74
- Wilson and Mrs. Peck 30
- V
- Versailles, Treaty of 2, 18, 70
 Von Strempe, Baron 112
- W
- Walmsley, Critical of Polish Corridor 14
 War and Nineteenth Century Money 49
 Warburk, Paul 72
 Washington, George 36, 91-2
 Water Mill 116
 Webster, Nesta 114
 Weishaupt 7
- Weismann, Dr. 23, 32, 35
 Weimar Republic 10
 Welby, Lord—Critical of British Policy 26
 White, Henry 25
 Wilson, Woodrow 5, 6, 29, 30, 37, 61, 72, 88
 Untermeyer and Brandeis 31
 Mrs. 29, 30
 Wise, Jennings 6
 Wise, Rabbi Stephen S. 66, 73
 Wood, Gen'l Robt. 22
- Z
- Zionist Congress, Sixth 1
 Zunze, Leopold 42

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barnes, Harry Elmer—Blasting The Historical Blackout
Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace
- Bryant, Arthur—Unfinished Victory
- Darmesteter, Arsene—The Talmud
- Dillon, Dr. E. J. —The Inside Story of the Peace Conference
- Disraeli, Benjamin—Life of Lord George Bentinck
- France, Anatole—Penguin Island
- Freedman, Benjamin—Facts Are Facts
- Grieb, Conrad—Uncovering The Forces For War
- Hess, Moses—Rome and Palestine
- Hobson, J. A.—The War In South Africa
- Huddleston, Sisley—War Unless
- Jeffries, J. M. N.—Palestine: The Reality
- Landman, Samuel—Great Britain, The Jews and Palestine
- Leese, Arnold—Jewish War of Survival
- Malcoln, James A.—Origins of The Balfour Declaration
- Morel, E. D.—Secret History of a Great Betrayal
- Neilson, Francis—Makers of War—Duty to Civilization
- Nevins, Allan—Henry White, Thirty Years of American
Diplomacy
- Newman, Louis Israel—Jewish Influence on Christian Re-
form Movements
- Pitt-River, George—The Czech Conspiracy
- Pitt-Rivers, George—The World Significance of the Russian
Revolution
- Ponsonby, Arthur—Falsehood in War-Time
- Reed, Douglas—Disgrace Abounding
- Robnett, Geo. W.—Conquest Through Immigration, How
Zionism Turned Palestine Into A Jewish State
- Salluste—Marxism and Judaism
- Sarpedon—England's Service
- Schoonmaker, Edwin D.—Democracy and World Dominion
- Scrutton, Robt. J.—A People's Runnymede
- Steed, Wickham—Through Thirty Years
- Stieve, Friedrich—What the World Rejected
- Symposium—Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Tribute of the Syn-
agogue (Rabbi Max Kleimen, Editor)
- Taylor, A. J. P.—Origins of The Second World War
- Vernadsky, George—Ancient Russia
- Veith, Cornelius Carl—Citadels of Chaos
- Vietz, Karl—High Treason Against Europe
- Wise, Jennings—Woodrow Wilson, Disciple of Revolution

DISESTABLISHMENTARIAN PUBLICATIONS

- Gary Allen—None Dare Call It Conspiracy** **\$1.25**
Paperback, 138 pages
- Francis Yockey Imperium** **\$2.75**
Philosophical and historical review
of influence of culture distorters
in affairs of Western nations.
Paperback
- Cleon Skousen—The Naked Capitalist** **\$2.25**
Details what Dr. Bella Dodd,
former member of Communist Party
terms a conspiracy much bigger
than the communist conspiracy.
Paperback, 127 pages
- Major Arch Roberts—Victory Denied** **\$1.25**
United Nations influence in “
“No-Win Wars”
Paperback, 300 pages
- Major Arch Roberts—The Anatomy of A**
Revolution
32 page brochure **.35**
- Wylie C. Sampson—The Patriot's Primer**
50 page brochure documents background of
world revolution

(Before ordering inquire if title is in print. Stamped
addressed envelope must accompany all inquiries.)

(Priced to Include Shipping)

Add sales tax — N.Y. State residents 6%

N.Y. City residents 7%



