

The Protocols of Zion: The Facts, The Myths and The Lies (Part I)

Possibly the most controversial area in the whole of the study of anti-Semitism and the charges that it makes against the Jews is the study of what has come to be called '*The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*'. Before I began writing this article I did; in fact, hesitate for a few minutes to think about whether I should write a preliminary defense of them on the basis of the multitude of studies of this small inflammatory book that have appeared.

However as much as I consider myself to be in the anti-Semitic agnostic tradition on the Protocols; with people like Joseph Goebbels, Arthur Keith Chesterton, Revilo Oliver and William Pierce, I do think there is actually a good case for arguing that the Protocols are not as '*absurd*' and '*intellectually stupid*' as angry academic Jews with an axe to grind; like Stephen Eric Bronner, (1) argue.

I would point out that while I don't consider the Protocols to be the '*key to world events*', which as Chesterton pointed out is an intellectually lunatic position (2) and is fodder for the likes of Bronner and Ben-Itto, I do think there is now a reasonable case to put forward for the document's original authenticity and also that it was actually meant to be a '*world plan*' of a sort, but that the original document was subsequently mutilated and redacted by its later publishers; particularly the infamous mystic Sergei Nilus, as well as being badly translated (3) which has led to a plethora of denunciations of the Protocols as fake based on alleged and actual problems with the text.

I will here reiterate that this is merely a preliminary essay to a book length defence of the Protocols that I am now beginning the process of researching and writing as well as that this is a written indication of some of my conclusions as of this moment as stated in my recent radio appearance with Deanna Spingola. (4)

To make this article easier to read and refer to back to I have opted to split up each part of the case into its own self-contained section.

Now; as Revilo Oliver declared, forward to the abyss!

The Many Lives of the Protocols of Zion

One of the many myths that circulates about the Protocols of Zion is that the text we have reached us fully formed and has not been altered in transmission: this is true both of anti-Semitic work (5) and philo-Semitic work (6) on the subject. Even the attempt of the famous Jewish cartoonist Will Eisner; which included a foreword and afterword from authors on the subject (Eco and Bronner

respectively), did nothing to disabuse the notion of this complete transmission and repeated the myth; (7) in spite of citing specialist works by authors such as Cohn and de Michelis who have written extensively on the formation of the Protocols, as well as the century old conspiracy theory that the Okhrana office (the Tsarist secret political police) in Paris had deliberately forged the text to induce Tsar Nicholas II into a belief in a mass Jewish plot against his throne, (8) which incidentally he didn't actually need any help in believing. (9)

Now as I have stated this idea of a '*complete transmission*' is a myth as we know of numerous differences between the editions, but a detailed linguistic and textual analysis of this has only been attempted recently by de Michelis. (10) I here summarize the transmission into chronological format correcting Levy's erroneous version (11) that is based on the a priori assumption of the truth of the theory of the Okhrana office in Paris being the originator of the Protocols based directly on Cohn's oversubscribed argument on this point which the CIA's historical analysis of Paris Okhrana's operations notably criticises by simple omission (in spite the fame and age of the hypothesis). (12)

The chronology of the Protocols of Zion should read thus: (13)

Late 1901/1902: Original document discovered/written/created. Mikhail Menshikov mentions the existence of the Protocols in '*Novoe Vremya*' (*The New Times*) in April 1902.

1903: Publication of original Protocols in '*Znamia*' (*The Banner*) by Pavlov Krushevan in a series of seven installments beginning in September.

1904: Partial republication in the third edition of Ljutostansky's '*Talmud I everi*' (cleared for publication by censor on the 3rd November 1903), this includes the first suggestion of a link to Zionism.

1905: Sergei Nilus publishes a longer and heavily-edited version of the Protocols as an appendix to his book about the coming of the Anti-Christ: '*Velikoe v Malom*' (*The Great in the Small*) in addition to three anonymous editions which are shorter than Krushevan's original that date from this time. Introduction of Freemasonry into and the removal of Old Testament references from the text.

1906: Georgi Butmi de Kacman publishes a different version of the Protocols as an appendix to the third edition of his book '*Vragi Roda Chevlovecheskago*' (*Enemies of the Human Race*) (preface is dated 5th December 1905).

1907: Georgi Butmi de Kacman publishes a slightly re-edited version of the Protocols as an appendix to the fourth edition of his book '*Vragi Roda Chevlovecheskago*' (*Enemies of the Human Race*).

1911: Sergei Nilus re-publishes his book '*Velikoe v Malom*' (*The Great in the Small*) in a second edition: no substantial change to the Protocols text.

1912: Sergei Nilus re-publishes his book '*Velikoe v Malom*' ('*The Great in the Small*') in a third edition: no substantial change to the Protocols text.

1917: Sergei Nilus re-publishes his book '*Velikoe v Malom*' ('*The Great in the Small*') in a fourth edition: a substantial change to the Protocols text and the beginning of the attribution of the Protocols to Theodor Herzl.

This chronology clearly demonstrates two key issues:

Firstly that the first mention of the Protocols occurs early in 1902, while the first text we have of the document itself comes from 1903 as well as how the Protocols began to be redacted and added to as early as late 1903/early 1904 and how they continued to be added to and changed.

Secondly that the edition that is popularly reproduced comes from the fourth edition of Sergei Nilus (in 1917) and which has been subsequently revised in some quarters by the use of the first edition of 1905.

This thus informs us that contrary to the received popular wisdom on both sides of the argument: we are in fact dealing; in terms of the common version, with a composite document that has been changed by different authors until a '*definitive*' version (of the document and its origins) happened to be created largely by the accident of Ludwig Mueller von Hausen (whose nom de plume was Gottfried zur Beek) having brought them back to Germany and publishing them; allegedly, through the Thule Society. (14)

Now clearly we are faced with a problem in the orthodox account of the Protocols once we recognise that we are dealing with different traditions and versions of the same document, because many key arguments against the Protocols; such as the Joly plagiarism assertion and the internal '*contradictions*'/'*absurdities*', lose much; and indeed frequently all, of their explanatory power.

You might ask: why is that?

Well put simply if we are dealing with a complete transmission of the original document then we can reasonably place it under the analytical microscope to see how it holds up to skeptical scrutiny. However we cannot place that document under the analytical microscope if we do not know or cannot use its original form precisely because if we are not dealing with the original then we are only dealing with an edited or changed edition of that document: so we cannot criticise; let alone disregard, the original document because we have analysed a substantially altered later version of it.

Instead the process must necessarily be to reconstruct and/or obtain a copy of the original document so that we can work with that as otherwise we are dealing in inconsistent intellectual propositions in terms of trying to negate the issue of edition and text in attacking the original by a later version (rather like trying to analyse a wolf by analysing a breed of dog instead).

Some might object here and argue that what anti-Semites use is this later edition and while that is indeed true: (15) it is an invalid argument in so far as it is arguing that because anti-Semites; as well as critics of the Jews in general, have incorrectly used the later edited text to try to explain world events. (16) It is thus fine for Jews to use that same text to *'disprove'* the original document in spite of their tacit (and sometimes even open) acknowledgement; by citing work which informs them in detail of this problem, that the document they are actually attacking is not that original document.

This attitude is thoroughly intellectually dishonest and is exemplified in the recent work by Alex Grobman who uses Cohn to *'prove'* that the *'primary author'* of the Protocols was Matthieu Golovinsky (a journalist somewhat linked to the Paris office of the Okhrana) while not mentioning the issue of multiple editions: (17) instead Grobman appears to be using the *'primary author'* notion to imply the age old plagiarism and anti-Jewish conspiracy meme that actually pre-dates any evidence at all that would suggest such a theory. (18)

We therefore have to conclude that because the original document is not the one that is actually being criticised; especially as most start from Nilus' 1905 edition which contains a significant number of major variations, in nearly all literature on the Protocols: we cannot admit any argument for or against the Protocols' authenticity without clarification of what the original text actually said.

We can demonstrate the futility of criticism based on these later editions by pointing out several major issues with using later versions of the Protocols as Cohn's study and the many who have followed him do. (19)

To wit:

A) The text of the Nilus edition is significantly longer when compared to the Krushevan edition. (20)

B) The amount of allegedly *'plagiarised'* material (as a percentage of the total) substantially increases in later editions but the most notable jump is from the Krushevan edition to the Nilus edition. (21)

C) There are Old Testament references and quotes in the Krushevan edition that are simply omitted in the Nilus edition. (22)

D) There is no mention of Freemasons in the Krushevan edition but these are numerous in the Nilus edition. (23)

E) The Krushevan edition is not divided into Protocols while the Nilus edition is. (24)

F) The Krushevan edition contains numerous Ukrainianisms and clarifying sentences that the Nilus edition omits. (25)

We can see therefore the significant problems of using the Nilus text as a basis for '*debunking*' the Protocols of Zion as Jacobs and Weitzmann have; for example, tried to do (26) in the tradition of earlier Jewish partisans like Segel (27) and Bernstein. (28) Therefore we can suggest that any attempt to '*debunk*' or confirm the Protocols based on the existent translations cannot be correct as there is as yet no foreign language translation of de Michelis' Russian language reconstruction (or a peer review of that reconstruction).

We can further assert that the details of the Krushevan edition of 1903 suggest to us that the '*explanation*' for origins of the Protocols in offices of the Paris Okhrana is thrown into deep doubt as de Michelis has beautifully demonstrated. (29) I cannot however concur with de Michelis overly respectful treatment of the '*Paris Okhrana*' hypothesis precisely because it predates any evidence to suggest it (30) (a tantalizing suggestion; which de Michelis has overlooked, of which is found in Bernstein's introduction to the memoirs of Mendel Beilis) (31) and also bases itself on three testimonies all of which we have significant reasons for doubting the veracity of. (32)

References

- (1) Stephen Eric Bronner, 2003, '*A Rumor about the Jews: Antisemitism, Conspiracy, and the Protocols of Zion*', 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: New York, pp. 5; 39; 56-57; 62; 72; 77; 122; 126
- (2) Arthur Keith Chesterton, 1961, '*The Learned Elders and the BBC*', 1st Edition, Britons: London, pp. 3-4
- (3) See Cesare de Michelis, 2004, '*The Non-Existent Manuscript: A Study of the Protocols of the Sages of Zion*', 1st Edition, University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln.
- (4) See http://republicbroadcasting.org/?page_id=109 to listen to the show concerned ('*Spingola Speaks*' [25/05/2012]).
- (5) Kerry Bolton, 2003, '*The Protocols of Zion in Context*', 1st Edition, Renaissance Press: Paraparaumu Beach, pp. 10-11 ; Herbert Pitlik, 1999, '*Die "Protokolle" der Weisen von Zion aus der Sicht nach 100 Jahren*', 1st Edition, Edition Secret News: Vienna, pp. 7-8
- (6) Bronner, Op. Cit., pp. 74-80
- (7) Will Eisner, 2005, '*The Plot: The Secret Story of the Protocols of Elders of Zion*', 1st Edition, W. W. Norton: New York, pp. 53-60
- (8) Ibid, pp. 62-64; also see Robert Wistrich, 2010, '*A Lethal Obsession: Anti-Semitism from Antiquity to the Global Jihad*', 1st Edition, Random House: New York, p. 28; Hadassa Ben-Itto, 2005, '*The Lie That Wouldn't Die: The Protocols of Zion*', 1st Edition, Valentine Mitchell: London, pp. 80-83, for other examples.
- (9) Erich Haberer, 2004, '*Jews and Revolution in Nineteenth Century Russia*', 2nd Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, pp. 189-190 ; Reginald Zelnik, 1997, '*Revolutionary Russia*', p. 206 in Gregory Freeze (Ed.), 1997, '*Russia: A History*', 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: New York
- (10) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 2

- (11) Benjamin Segel, Richard Levy (Trans. and Ed.), 1995, *'A Lie and A Libel: The History of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion'*, 1st Edition, University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln, p. xi
- (12) Rita Kroenbitter, n.d. (1993?), *'Paris Okhrana 1885-1905'*, (<https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/books-and-monographs/okhrana-the-paris-operations-of-the-russian-imperial-police/art1.pdf>) in Ben Fischer, 1997, *'Okhrana: The Paris Operation of the Russian Imperial Police'*, History Staff Center for the Study of Intelligence (<https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/books-and-monographs/okhrana-the-paris-operations-of-the-russian-imperial-police/5474-1.html>)
- (13) I have adapted this chronology based on de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 171; I do not concur with him that Nilus should not be viewed as a kind of *'editor'* of the Protocols as Norman Cohn (2006, *'Warrant for Genocide: The Myth of a Jewish World Conspiracy and the Protocols of the Elders of Zion'*, 2nd Edition, Serif: London, p. 179) has argued as it is clear that Nilus' text and the context in which Nilus placed it has informed nearly all interpretations for and against the Protocols since.
- (14) Bronner, Op. Cit., p. 113; de Michelis, Op. Cit., pp. 11-12 contradicts this however.
- (15) This is the basis for Steven Jacobs, Mark Weitzmann, 2003, *'Dismantling the Big Lie: The Protocols of the Elders of Zion'*, 1st Edition, Ktav: New York as well as Bolton's (Op. Cit., pp. 46-53) unconvincing attempt to link the Protocols directly to Judaism through the Mishnah, Gemara and Zohar (which could almost be read as an indirect reply to Jacobs and Weitzmann).
- (16) Pitlik (Op. Cit., pp. 84-96) for example links them more to Freemasonry than he does to Jews and then uses them to provide an intellectual framework for rationalising selected world events since 1945.
- (17) Alex Grobman, 2011, *'License to Murder: The Enduring Threat of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion'*, 1st Edition, American-Israel Friendship League: New York, pp. 33-35
- (18) For example the attribution to a gentile conspiracy against the Jews before any evidence to suggest this had been discerned per Henri Rollin, 1991, *'L'Apocalypse de Notre Temps: Les Dessous de la Propagande Allemande d'apres les Documents Inedits'*, 2nd Edition, Editions Allia: Paris, pp. 452-454.
- (19) For example Cohn's central evidential proposition of so-called *'coincidence'* (i.e. magical thinking) in Cohn, Op. Cit., pp. 441-444
- (20) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 6
- (21) Ibid, p. 8
- (22) Ibid, p. 12
- (23) Ibid, pp. 11; 14 (although p. 7 points out that they were attributed by Krushevan to both Jews and Masons in 1903); this removes the argument that the Protocols were originally a Masonic document with no references to Jews as an argument exemplified in William Guy Carr, 1962, *'The Red Fog over America'*, 3rd Edition, Britons: London, pp. 1-9
- (24) De Michelis, Op. Cit., pp. 7-8; 13-14
- (25) Ibid, pp. 8-9
- (26) Jacobs, Weitzmann, Op. Cit., p. xiii
- (27) Segel, Op. Cit., pp. 98-108
- (28) Herman Bernstein, 1921, *'The History of a Lie: The Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion'*, 1st Edition, J. Ogilvie: New York, pp. 7-8
- (29) de Michelis, Op. Cit., pp. 120-123

(30) Ibid, pp. 69; 120-123

(31) Mendel Beilis, 1931, *'The Story of My Sufferings'* (original in Yiddish), 2nd Edition, Self-Published: New York, pp. 10-12

(32) de Michelis, Op. Cit., pp. 23-37

Posted by Karl Radl

The Protocols of Zion: The Facts, The Myths and The Lies (Part II)

The Problem of Paris

That the Protocols of Zion originate from Paris has been the central element of the myth that surrounds them in so far as it purports to explain where they have come from (33) and also why they are important (as Paris was; at this time, a major centre of Jewish life in Europe). (34) This explanation has been utilized by both sides of the debate, which are best described by juxtaposing them into two different majority propositions:

A) Philo-Semites and Jews portray the alleged events of Paris; dating them to between 1894 and 1897, as being when an anti-Semitic conspiracy by the Station Chief of the Paris Okhrana; Peter Rachkovsky, decided to try to gain favour in the Russian court for their views by '*uncovering*' a document; forged by an exiled Russian journalist named Matthieu Golovinsky, that proved beyond doubt the truth of the contention that there was a Jewish conspiracy against Russia. (35) This was however not circulated at court for reasons that are not made clear by this theory's proponents let alone suggesting reasonable evidence for their case other than '*coincidence*' and the detective principle of *cui bono* (who benefits).

B) Anti-Semites; as well as some anti-Zionists who maintain a strong anti-Zionist line, (36) portray the events of Paris; dating them to between 1894 and 1897, as being when either a Jewish double-agent; Schorst or Efron, (37) for the Okhrana infiltrated and stole the Protocols from a Masonic Lodge in Paris in 1894/1895 or the First Zionist Congress of 1897 (it is sometimes suggested that they were stolen from Herzl's private belongings) or a long-time Russian expatriate in Paris; Madame Justine Glinka, (38) stole them from a Jew of her acquaintance. These were alternatively either transmitted to Russia where they were promptly filed and/or brought back to Russia by Major Suxotin who then had them published through the auspices of General Stepanov and Sergei Nilus on his return. (39)

Both these versions of events; established by three very different witnesses (two for the former and one for the later), seem to point to a French; and more particularly a Parisian, origin for the Protocols: don't they?

The problem with this is actually deceptively simple in so far as we are dealing with three witnesses who unfortunately don't seem to know anything about the document that they are talking about. They contradict each other, produce impossible time-lines and appear sometime after the Protocols have become famous in addition to having in each case easy to discern motivations for claiming to be an '*unknowing witness*' (to use de Michelis' terminology).

The first witness we need to interrogate is the most famous of all Protocols witnesses; as it is from her that the anti-Protocols time-line is derived, Princess Catherine Radziwill. Radziwill was a rather eccentric Polish princess, author of numerous books before, during and after the Bolshevik revolution, an obsessive-compulsive and also an occasional white collar criminal. (40)

Radziwill claims that she saw either the edition of Ljutostansky or Nilus; which we can discern from her dating, in 1904 or 1905 in the offices of the Paris Okhrana and she names Rachkovsky and Golovinsky as being the principle architects. (41) However as Burcev pointed in '*La Tribune Juive*' in 1921: she wasn't in Paris at the time! (42)

Some following Cohn try to negate this chronological issue by asserting that Radziwill was simply mistaken years after the fact and try to buttress this by pointing out that both Radziwill and du Chayla say they saw a document on yellowish paper, with an ink stain and different handwriting. (43) This is indeed true, but such a coincidence between two witnesses who differ on all other details cannot be admitted for the simple reason that we have no proof they even saw the document in the first place other than their say so.

Besides the description; as others have to my knowledge have failed to note, is not very specific: it is very general and as such could have easily been conceived of independently and been just a happy coincidence for Protocols '*debunkers*' like Lucien Wolf: who was already championing the idea of anti-Semitic conspiratorial origin of the Protocols from the Paris Okhrana before there was any actual evidence for it. (44)

In addition we have to remember that Radziwill does not have a good character; she was after all a convicted criminal and an obsessive-compulsive, and that as much as some may want to believe her testimony; as it confirms their pet theory, we cannot hold her to be anything but a dubious source at best. After all the question must be: why did she wait so late to '*remember*' all that she did and why could she recall such general details of yellowish paper, ink stains and different handwriting but then get the year she allegedly saw it out by a decade?

Now what if Radziwill is somehow telling the truth and she saw an edition of the Protocols (which she identifies as either the 1904 or 1905 edition) in the office of the Paris Okhrana?

Now we know she was unaware of the 1903 publication and this puts pay to the notion of her having seen an original copy, but at the same time it is also quite reasonable to suggest that she saw the Ljutostansky or Nilus edition: especially when we remember that Ljutostansky's work was actually a source book on anti-jewish literature and was frequently published with updates. This

would neatly explain Radziwill's claim without disregarding it and also answering the issue of how Radziwill knew that the document she generally describes was the Protocols (as the Protocols title and linkage to Zionism; which she mentions, had now come into use).

Thus even if we wish to admit Radziwill it is obvious that she is not a reliable source and that her testimony can be explained in a more plausible alternative scenario that; to my knowledge, has not been explored by any Protocols author.

The second witness we need to interrogate is Armand Alexandre de Blanquet du Chayla who is a somewhat mysterious French nobleman who spent a lot of time in Russia in early twentieth century. Now as I have above suggested by implication: du Chayla is the key piece of the puzzle in that it is he and nothing else that is used by Cohn to build his theory of the origin of the Protocols in the Paris office of the Okhrana.

Unfortunately for Cohn and the many others who argue this hypothesis du Chayla is far more problematic than even Radziwill in so far as he claims to have seen Nilus' 1905 version in 1901 when Nilus was introduced to the Russian court. The problem with that; of course, is that Nilus' version we definitively know was published in 1905 not 1901 and that Nilus was introduced at court in 1905 not 1901. Further du Chayla's account of Nilus replacing another mystic; one Phillippe, at the Tsar's court places the incident definitively in 1905. (45)

Among other things du Chayla reproduces an account of the travels of Nilus going to Germany; commonly vapidly attributed; following Cohn, to a '*lapse of memory*', (46) in late 1918 to early 1919 is actually the account of Nilus' son. (47) This is all dubious enough given the fact that du Chayla is; as before stated, supposed to corroborate Radziwill and this scale of divergence and general inaccuracy is simply unacceptable in sources central to an already speculative theory.

However there is another problem with du Chayla in that he seems to have been an agent of the Soviet Union at least as early as 1919 when he was expelled from the Crimea by General Wrangel for being a Bolshevik agent (48) and the only reason he was not summarily shot was because he was a French citizen. (49) Given the centrality of du Chayla's testimony and the work done by Soviet archivists (as well as the pro-Bolshevik jewish author Alexander Tager) to try and find proof for it: (50) it is quite likely; as de Michelis concludes, that du Chayla had been '*put up*' to his Protocols testimony by the USSR's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs (he was accused of working for Georgi Chicherin the head of this ministry at the time by General Wrangel). (51)

In case the reader thinks that I am here suggesting that du Chayla's story regarding Nilus is made from whole cloth: we do know that du Chayla did know Nilus for a time, (52) but the fact that du Chayla makes his mistakes in and around the Protocols as well as that he waited till 1921 to come forward with his testimony (and also singularly implausible story of how he came to '*notice*' the Protocols and write his testimony [suggesting that he had been directed towards the rapidly selling Protocols]) point to a Soviet involvement in '*debunking*' the Protocols . (53)

Then we have to conclude that not only is du Chayla dishonest, but in fact we can establish with a reasonable level of certainty that he is acting in the interests of a government trying to manipulate the Protocols and later the Bern trial with misinformation directed against the forces of radical right, which we know was Soviet policy at this time. (54)

We also know of a parallel usage by Soviet propagandists of manipulating events such as this to suit their propagandistic needs of the moment, (55) which again suggests; although detailed research is still required, that we are dealing here with a Soviet propaganda ploy and not a serious witness for the Protocols being forgery.

A fact; I might add, which largely discredits the Bern Prozess of 1934 as an argument precisely because du Chayla is the central 'witness' that links the Protocols to the Russian Okhrana after Radziwill's testimony was judged by the court to be heavily flawed.

The third witness we need to interrogate is the only anti-jewish one that we have: General Philip Stepanov. Stepanov offered pivotal; although flawed testimony, that an anonymous lady (Madame Justine Glinka) (56) received the Protocols from a jew (alternatively Efron or Schorst) who then passed them to a retired Russian major named Suxotin (57) who then passed them on to Stepanov who published them independently in 1897. (58) Normally such a wild sequence of events would be quickly dismissed if Nilus had not independently confirmed that he received his copy from a retired Russian major named Suxotin. (59)

De Michelis clearly identifies that here we find numerous issues with chronology as in the first instance: we have no evidence other than that reported by Henri Rollin of an actual edition of the Protocols before 1903 and even then we certainly do not have a copy of them. De Michelis' suggestion that we identify the Stepanov edition with one of those produced in 1905 is a sensible one given that Stepanov contradicts every other known source we have in regards to an alleged French origin in so far as he dates them as being published before the first Zionist Congress in that same year.

This contradicts the Zionist origin of the Protocols that was attached by Ljutostansky and Nilus to them: indeed I would argue that; because Stepanov's testimony comes from 1927, (60) it is not unreasonable to suggest a cross-pollination of his testimony from the later attribution of the Protocols by Nilus to Herzl in 1897, which was then popularly supported by Mueller von Hausen and Fritsch among others. I will also note that although we have circumstantial evidence of the origin from Suxotin we should bear in mind that we have no evidence; and indeed good evidence against, the transmission from Glinka. (61)

That evidence is fairly simple: we know Glinka was fluent in French and Russian, so why then would she write Russian with Ukrainianisms that we have innumerable examples of in the original Krushevan edition of the Protocols from 1903? As Glinka was not from the Ukraine: the evidence is very much against her having been the conduit for the Protocols let alone the fact that she is usually alleged to be the French to Russian translator of them. (62)

In spite of these problems and contradictions within contradictions that Stepanov's testimony causes in our chronology: Rollin has pointed out that Stepanov quite unintentionally gives us the origin of the legends of Rachkovsky's involvement in so far as he had been made a Superintendent of Police in 1905 and as such seems to have been involved in spreading the Protocols but not in creating them. (63)

This then gives us some idea of the mythologizing process behind the theories regarding the origins of the Protocols of Zion as it gives us the basis of most anti-jewish (64) and pro-jewish (65) arguments for locating that origin in Paris.

As we can see these three pieces of witness testimony are weak and/or dubious sources for a Parisian origin of the Protocols and indeed the strongest of the three; Stepanov, contradicts nearly all the interpretations as to origins that are given in the literature. It is clear then that without these witnesses (and as they are so weak and/or so dubious we cannot use them as the basis for an argument) we cannot have a French origin of the Protocols.

However before we leave the problem of a Parisian origin: it is important to explain the absurdity of locating the origins of the Protocols of Zion in the Paris office of the Okhrana.

The problem for the '*anti-Semitic conspiracy from the Paris Okhrana*' argument is a fairly elementary one in so far as it tries to make a complex internal political situation into a simple one of anti-Semites and jews. It reduces two factions who were actively conspiring against each other (the pan-Slavists and the pan-Russians [the latter is a more jingoistic and extreme variant of the former]) to obtain power and influence into two factions that were working hand in hand to help each other politically so they could blame the jews when in fact they were bitterly fighting each other in a power struggle. (66)

I would propose that this is the reason why when you read the literature on the Paris Okhrana: one notices a distinct lack of belief (through lack of mention) of the well-known theory as to the origins of the Protocols of Zion in that same organisation. I suspect that while the authors on the Okhrana don't disbelieve it: they also don't believe it as it goes contrary to their knowledge of the Okhrana's internal politics, which could in turn destroy the most popular and most viable thesis against the authenticity of the Protocols as a document (and therefore open them up to potentially being genuine).

The fact that Rachkovsky's involvement has now been established by Rollin to be later in the history of the Protocols (i.e. in 1905 not in 1894-1897) explains why his name came up in the witness testimony; as he would have been associated with Nilus at about the same time we know du Chayla was.

As du Chayla would have likely known of Rachkovsky's status as the former head of the Okhrana operation in Paris and also of Rachkovsky's involvement in distributing them in 1905. We may propose that du Chayla simply put two pieces of information from his time with Nilus together to create a plausible story as he knew Rachkovsky had been in Paris at the head of the Okhrana there,

but would not have known when he had returned which he dated to several years before he met Nilus to create plausible linkage in the Protocols story.

There I think we have the origin of the story of the Protocols in the Paris Okhrana: a myth created on a mistaken assumption by a witness who was serving as an agent for the Soviet Union and whose words fitted into early debunks of the Protocols at this time, which has allowed the origin of the Protocols in the Paris Okhrana to become an accepted theory albeit; as I have outlined, one that has little to no substance to it whatsoever evidentially.

References

(33) Ibid, p. 47

(34) Pierre Birnbaum, 1996, *The Jews of the Republic: A Political History of State Jews in France from Gambetta to Vichy*, 1st Edition, Stanford University Press: Stanford, p. 2; I will note as an oddity that Birnbaum does not mention the Protocols in either the above cited work or Pierre Birnbaum, 2003, *The Anti-Semitic Moment: A Tour of France in 1898*, 1st Edition, Hill and Wang: New York in spite of the obviously important issue of their origin in France at this time.

(35) See for example Cohn, Op. Cit.; Bronner, Op. Cit., Ben-Itto, Op. Cit.

(36) See for example Israel Shamir, n.d. (2002-3?), *The Elders of Zion and the Masters of Discourse*, p. 6 in Anon., n.d. (2002-2003?), *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, 1st Edition, Historical Review Press: Uckfield

(37) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 68

(38) Rollin, Op. Cit., p. 371

(39) Bolton, Op. Cit., pp. 18-19

(40) de Michelis, Op. Cit., pp. 27-28; Brian Roberts, 1969, *Cecil Rhodes and the Princess*, 1st Edition, Hamish Hamilton: London

(41) de Michelis, Op. Cit., pp. 120-121

(42) Ibid, p. 28

(43) Ibid, pp. 120-121

(44) Ibid, p. 128, n. 41; Lucien Wolf, 1921, *The Myth of the Jewish Menace in World Affairs*, 1st Edition, MacMillan: New York, pp. 2; 19

(45) de Michelis, Op. Cit., pp. 121-122

(46) Ibid, p. 27

(47) Michael Hagemeister, 1995, *Die 'Protokolle der Weisen von Zion': Einige Bemerkungen zur Herkunft und zur Aktuellen Rezeption*, p. 157 in Erhard Hexelschneider, Manfred Neushaus, Claus Remer (Eds.), 1995, *Russland und Europa: Historische und Kulturelle Aspekte eines Jahrhundertproblems*, 1st Edition, Rosa Luxemburg-Verein: Leipzig

(48) de Michelis, Op. Cit, p. 28

(49) Ibid.

(50) Ibid, pp. 81; 85; Still the main authority on the Beilis trial: his involvement with du Chayla's testimony may be benign but it is quite possible that it was not given that it was he who forwarded documentation from Moscow to the Bern trial in 1934 in support of du Chayla's testimony.

(51) De Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 29

- (52) Ibid, p. 30
- (53) Ibid, p. 29
- (54) Sean McMeekin, 2003, *The Red Millionaire: A Political Biography of Willi Muenzenberg, Moscow's Secret Propaganda Tsar in the West*, 1st Edition, Yale University Press: New Haven, p. 263-269
- (55) World Committee for the Victims of German Fascism, 1933, *The Brown Book of the Hitler Terror and the Burning of the Reichstag*, 1st Edition, Victor Gollancz: London, pp. 244-247
- (56) Rollin, Op. Cit., pp. 370-371
- (57) Ibid, pp. 30-35
- (58) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 24
- (59) Segel, Op. Cit., p. 72
- (60) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 23
- (61) If you directly compare Stepanov's statement against Nilus' later statement (per Segel, Op. Cit., pp. 71-72 for example) then it is clear that one is a potentially slightly confused paraphrase of the other.
- (62) De Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 123
- (63) Rollin, Op. Cit., pp. 482-483
- (64) For example Bolton, Op. Cit., pp. 18-19
- (65) For example Bronner, Op. Cit., pp. 79-80
- (66) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 122
- Posted by Karl Radl

The Protocols of Zion: The Facts, The Myths and The Lies (Part III)

The Satirical Origins of the Protocols?

The inevitable question on the reader's mind; after having removed the evidence for a French and more specifically Parisian origin for the Protocols is: where do they come from then?

Well the simplest answer is; in fact, the right one: the Russian Empire. We can see this in so far as we do not have a copy of the original Protocols from 1903 or before in any other language but Russian.

After all if there is no French original; as de Michelis rightly asserts, (67) then all that is left is a document that came out of Russia in 1903 and was first mentioned in April of 1902. If we understand this then we realise that the question of the authenticity of the Protocols is actually thrown wide open again (rather than being simply a minority theory), as here we have a document whose alleged back-story we know to be very likely false and whose origins are in the country it was supposed to be particularly plotting against.

Now I don't doubt some will; and indeed some have, seized on this revelation to argue that the Protocols is a '*crude anti-Semitic hoax*' originating from Russia at a time of great upheaval and insecurity. (68) Now the problem with that argument is quite fundamental in that it assumes that; because the Protocols are now revealed to come from the Russian Empire not France and/or Paris, they are ipso facto a hoax.

There is no reason for drawing such a quick; and I would say, illogical conclusion for the simple reason that no longer is the Protocols ascribed to the First Zionist Congress or to a theft from a Masonic Lodge in Paris, but rather to a country where jews were openly organising propaganda and revolts against the government and more particularly were; as a group, solidly against it. (69)

This means then that the theory that a jewish origin of the Protocols is actually just as simple as a solution; if we use the logical principle of Occam's Razor, as an anti-Semitic origin of the Protocols. This then removes some of the most rhetorically effective arguments against the Protocols by placing them not as a Masonic or an international Zionist document, but rather as a local document to the Russian Empire, which both explains the document's focus on Russia and also some of its very Russian characteristics that have long been used to attack it. (70)

Now if we factor in that the original Krushevan edition of the Protocols in 1903 had numerous Ukrainianisms within it: we can with de Michelis link the Protocols to either the Ukraine or the Ukrainian diaspora. (71) This again might be used as evidence of a '*crude anti-Semitic hoax*' but I think it is important to understand that this particular time in Ukrainian history is the right time and right place for a conspiratorial document of this kind for both theories of a jewish or anti-jewish origin of the Protocols. Precisely because this is a time when feelings against the jews were running high, there had been recent local pogroms against the jews for real and imagined offences (72) and there was a strong undercurrent of both Zionist and Marxist radicalism in the jewish community itself. (73)

It was a time of change and flux: when moderate solutions were out and radical solutions were in. This; as I have said, was the ideal time for a Protocols-type document to be created by either jews or their opponents.

De Michelis; for example, tacitly recognises this problem for the anti-Protocols argument when he seems to be in an internal contradiction himself: he wants to argue the Protocols are an anti-Semitic hoax from the Ukrainian diaspora, (74) but he also knows that much of his case is speculative and that he has severe problems putting a person's name or organisation's name to the origin of the Protocols. So as a stop-gap measure he claims that Cohn's theory of the origin of the Protocols being from the Paris office of the Okhrana is actually an '*evidence-based theory*' (75) while having just demonstrated that it actually isn't one. (76) After all on the back of the same logic he uses to defend Cohn he would have to concede that Fry's theory of Asher Ginzberg (pen name Ahad Ha'am) being intimately-involved was similarly '*evidence-based*' which he is loathe to do.

De Michelis' argument is based on the idea that because we know that Menshikov, Krushevan and Butmi were all associated with each other and did have contacts in the Ukraine: (77) that it must have been one of their contacts who wrote it, which would; to be intellectually equitable, account for a lot of the evidence, but I would point out that it doesn't account for several issues that de Michelis has overlooked.

Firstly de Michelis ignores the problem of why the Ukrainianisms were kept in a document that was published in a Russian newspaper and why they were then edited out in 1904. The problem there; of course, is that if this was a Ukrainian anti-jewish writer who had written a '*satire*' on Zionism; which is what de Michelis locates it as, (78) for '*Znamia*' then why did Krushevan not edit them out as was the usual journalistic practice? After all they are not integral to the document itself: so why leave them in and make the '*Learned Elders*' into proverbial country bumpkins (thus disrupting the satirical intent)?

I point to this particularly because de Michelis' suggested developmental chronology hinges on the unpolished nature of the Protocols and the fact that they were originally intended to be a satire; based on a somewhat trite reading of Menshikov's article of April 1902, which is made nonsense of when we understand that the 1903 version of the Protocols does not include any '*in the know*' references to them as a satire and as such we are forced to ask the fundamental question of why keep such obvious problems for a reader (i.e. Ukrainianisms would not have been pleasant or easy reading for most Russians) in a document merely meant as a '*satire*'?

De Michelis ignores this and instead focuses on the alleged connections between Menshikov's article; which he suggests is an '*in the know*' wink that could be read as such by others (but offers no meaningful substantiation of this allegation), (79) and the Krushevan's original 1903 edition of the Protocols. This is obviously problematic as it entails reading Menshikov's article from a priori conclusion in that if you read it as an article believing it to be a coded message of a sort in order to agree with the conclusion: rather than taking a more literal reading of Menshikov as indicating that he has knowledge of a Jewish secret document that might shed insight into what is going on. This is; I think, a more accurate reading of Menshikov's article and does not require reading too deeply into what Menshikov is saying without any evidence to support such an overly-complex interpretation.

Secondly one has to wonder why; if a Ukrainian friend of Menshikov's and Krushevan's wrote the Protocols, it appeared under Krushevan's name rather than their own or perhaps more appositely: why did the Protocols appear with a commentary from Krushevan rather than the original Ukrainian author?

The problem here is central to de Michelis' argument in that if we have a Ukrainian anti-jewish author writing the Protocols: why do we not know who they were and why they originally wrote them? De Michelis' theory of it originally being a '*satire*' cannot hold precisely because it assumes intimate collaboration between three different parties on a single document over; presumably, nearly two years (which he has insufficient evidence for) and that it is '*satire*' seems manifestly unknown to Krushevan whose commentary on the Protocols is predicated on their authenticity.

Also we have Butmi; an editor of the Protocols himself three years later, to contend with in so far as de Michelis' asserts he was part of the same circle as the said Ukrainian, Menshikov and Krushevan, but then offers no reasoning as to why Butmi would not have known that the Protocols were not genuine when he included them in the third edition of his book *'Vragi Roda Chevlovecheskago'* as piece of evidence to support his case.

This then leads us onto the third problem with de Michelis' proposition in so far as it is manifestly absurd as it necessarily implies that these men; who lets not forget knew each other, were either deliberately propounding a *'satire'* as a real document (i.e. they were being malicious) or they were taken in a *'crude hoax'* (i.e. they were being foolish). De Michelis has no actual evidence for either suggestion, but makes them anyway and seems to believe that they are inherently valid because the Protocols are; in De Michelis' characterisation of Jouin's argument, a *'true forgery'*. (80)

In essence then de Michelis commits the cardinal intellectual sin of assuming the Protocols are fake a priori; although I am sure he would argue that this has been *'proven'* by the alleged *'plagiarism'*, (81) and that this therefore; in typical circular logic, means that anti-Semitic Russians and/or Ukrainians must have written them. De Michelis is effectively saying then that because he knows the Protocols are fake we know that they are fakes and have to focus on who wrote them!

De Michelis' argument is then; of course, intellectually absurd and as such needs to be discarded. I would also note in passing that because de Michelis well-knows that the *'alleged plagiarisms'* are problematic (as they usually refer to the later Nilus and not the original Krushevan edition) and that the Protocols likely originally come from the Russian Empire not France: he is trying to; as he puts it, *'square the circle'* for another anti-Semitic conspiratorial origin rather than re-opening the question of the authenticity of the Protocols as his evidence and analysis otherwise require.

This is; to use a metaphor, de Michelis' guilty little secret of course as having destroyed nearly a century of anti-Protocols literature and arguments he likely well realises that the authenticity of the Protocols is now once again arguable and thus he has done something that few to my mind could possibly do: give the Protocols of Zion a new lease of life. Hence de Michelis' almost habitual attempt to attribute them to anti-Semites rather than even consider any kind of jewish authorship, which incidentally other Protocols scholars such as Begunov and Rollin have.

Fourthly de Michelis spectacularly fails to admit context into his theory; although he does mention it in passing, as to the origin of the Protocols: this; as I have stressed above, is very important for understanding any historical event and particularly one so controversial as the origin of the Protocols. That the Protocols were written and then appeared at a time of instability and flux in the world as well as in the Russian Empire is central to understanding what the Protocols are, who potentially wrote them and also why they had an increasing amount of explanatory power.

If we admit the fact that the jews were a very active element of this instability and flux (particularly in the Russian Empire): then it indicates that there is no reason for a simple ascription of the Protocols to anti-jewish authorship, because jewish authors were similarly looking for solutions to the jewish question and could just have easily come under the influence of then current ideas about

Masons and secret conspiratorial societies being the way to change things (much as Trotsky did at about the same time I might add).

Also it is not outside of the realms of possibility that jews may have copied ideas from anti-Semitic authors and incorporated them into their own strategic vision. Much as we know that the Protocols mirrors Herzl's *'Der Judenstaat'*, (82) which according to both Cohn's and de Michelis' models is part of an inexplicable mass plagiarist methodology. Can we not then turn this round and suggest that the inverse is also possible in that the *'plagiarisms'*; when they cannot be ascribed to later additions and redactions, could be seen as the transmission of ideas from anti-jewish authors to jewish ones (in much the same conceptual process as the hypothesized transmission of Mithraic festivals and ideas into early Christianity in the Roman Empire)? Or as de Michelis himself puts it; (83) following Segel, (84) anti-Semites have tended to use the Protocols as a blueprint for how they themselves should operate: so why could not the jews do the same with anti-Semitic literature prior to the Protocols?

This example illustrates that it is perfectly possible for two warring groups to actually use each other's ideas in modified form and as such it is perfectly feasible that this what we could be looking at here: jews having read anti-jewish texts, imbibing some of the ideas and transliterating them into a document of their own. Thus we can see that we do not need to automatically ascribe the authorship of the Protocols to anti-Semites and can easily show that the jews are just as viable candidates for having written them.

Having thus dealt with de Michelis' argument of a Russian/Ukrainian *'satirical'* origin for the Protocols: we can finally begin the process of outlining what the probable origins of the Protocols are.

References

(67) Ibid, p. 26

(68) Segel, Op. Cit., pp. 114-115; Bronner, Op. Cit., p. 67

(69) Haberer, Op.Cit., pp. 168-169

(70) Segel, Op. Cit., pp. 102-105

(71) de Michelis Op. Cit., pp. 72-75

(72) Jacob Lestschinsky, 1949, *'Jewish Migrations, 1840-1946'*, pp. 1212-1214 in Louis Finkelstein (Ed.), 1949, *'The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion'*, Vol. 4, 1st Edition, Jewish Publication Society of America: Philadelphia; John Doyle Klier, Shlomo Lambroza (Eds.), 1992, *'Pogroms: Anti-Jewish Violence in Modern Russian History'*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York

(73) Orlando Figes, 1996, *'A People's Tragedy: The Russian Revolution 1891-1924'*, 1st Edition, Random House: New York, p. 82; Haberer, Op. Cit., pp. 206-209

(74) de Michelis, Op. Cit, p. 74

(75) Ibid, p. 120

(76) Ibid, pp. 121-123

(77) Ibid, pp. 72-75

(78) Ibid, pp. 80-82

(79) Ibid.

(80) Ibid, p. 110

(81) Ibid, pp. 170-180

(82) Pierre-Andree Taguieff, 1992, *'Les Protocoles des Sages de Sion'*, Vol. 2, 1st Edition, Editions Berg International: Paris, pp. 459-471 (N.B. There is a second edition from 2004 but I have not had time to read and annotate this as of yet.)

(83) de Michelis, Op. Cit. pp. 157-158

(84) Segel, Op. Cit., p. 106

The Protocols of Zion: The Facts, The Myths and The Lies (Part IV)

The Zionist Protocols

Theodor Fritsch famously called the Protocols; *'Die Zionistischen Protokolle'*, echoing Ludwig Mueller von Hausen's estimate of them based upon the theory as to their originating from Theodor Herzl in the First Zionist Congress in Basel in 1897. (85) Now as I have previously mentioned this; in contrast to popular myths circulated about the Protocols, actually has a basis in fact in so far as numerous passages of the Protocols have been noted to potentially derive; or in terminology the literatures likes to use *'plagiarise'*, from Theodor Herzl's *'Der Judenstaat'*.

I take issue with Taguieff's conclusion (86) that; because Herzl's mentions of the jews are *'positive'* in *'Der Judenstaat'* and the Protocols turn these into *'negative'* references, we cannot ascribe a Zionist origin to the Protocols. My issue with this is quite simple: in so far as Taguieff does not recognise the extent of the additions and redactions from the text and concentrates on the Nilus edition more than he does the Krushevan edition. Thus his focus is somewhat distorted and his study needs to be revised in the light of de Michelis' analysis of the transmission of the Protocols before it can be seriously considered. (87)

In addition to this I would argue that assigning the subjective label of positivity and negativity in regards to the Protocols is rather misleading in so far as it removes the Protocols from their context. As if the Protocols were based on a Zionist document; which de Michelis styles document Q (equals the German term *'Quelle'* or literally *'Source'*), and that the Krushevan edition is a redaction of this original (as de Michelis asserts) then we are seeing the sense of the original document being redacted to fit Krushevan's world-view. (88) This necessarily means that the published edition would have a switch in its positivity in that it is summarising and quoting an original document in a negative form by changing the context in which something is said.

To give an example of this process in the inverse (i.e. an anti-Semitic comment becoming a Jewish comment) what I have termed the Goldwin Smith quotation will serve. Where the original quote from Goldwin Smith is: (89)

'The Jew alone regards his race as superior to humanity, and looks forward not to its ultimate union with other races, but to its triumph over them all and to its final ascendancy under the leadership of a tribal Messiah.'

Which was modified and transmitted by one anti-Jewish tradition as:

'Listen to the Jew, Goldwin Smith, Professor of Modern History at Oxford University, October 1881, "We regard our race as superior to humanity, and look forward not to its ultimate union with other races, but its triumph over them."'

And then modified to:

'We Jews regard our race as superior to all humanity, and look forward, not to its ultimate union with other races, but to its triumph over them.'

Goldwin Smith, Jewish Professor of Modern History at Oxford University, October, 1981'

It is clear here that; with a few words having been changed, an original quotation's outlook on its subject; specifically Jews, can be changed to the inverse of what it was previously: this is particularly true if we are dealing with something of an open tradition; like Russian anti-Jewish circles of this time, which did edit documents to make them fit their ideas better. (90)

We also need to remember that if we are dealing with an open tradition with multiple additions and redactions as well as no clear source of the original text: then we cannot use normal methods of textual criticism; such as those used by Taguieff, precisely because we may well be dealing with substantially modified ideas and quotes that mean the complete opposite of how they were originally intended.

Therefore I would argue that the fact that the Protocols contains near direct quotes from Herzl's *'Der Judenstaat'*; as opposed to the alleged paraphrasing of Joly, is actually evidence that we are here dealing with something that originally appeared in the source for the Krushevan edition as opposed to text that was later arguably added to the Protocols.

If this is indeed true then we need to realise that this does raise the very real possibility that the source of the Protocols is a document that derives from Zionism: since as de Michelis has correctly pointed out *'Der Judenstaat'* envisions a dictatorial/autocratic type of Jewish government and that Herzl's transition to thinking in terms of a *'democratic'* Jewish state only occurs later in his novel *'Altneuland'*. (91)

Now while it is indeed possible that anti-Semites used Herzl's *'Der Judenstaat'* to give credence to their alleged forgery: it is unclear as to why they would go to the trouble of copying out direct quotes from it and then paraphrasing Joly's *'Dialogues'* as well as the numerous works that have been alleged to have been plagiarised to create the Protocols (which; as Bolton rightly observes, actually demolishes the whole *'plagiarism'* argument on the grounds of common sense). (92)

It just doesn't follow that a *'satire'* or *'forgery'* would be quite so illogical as to plagiarise one source directly and then steal lots of other quotes from additional sources (some Jewish and some not) that would then be paraphrased when the *'satire'* or *'forgery'* would be more effective if it simply quoted these sources as being examples of what it has achieved (a-la the original *'translators note'* concerning Darwin, Nietzsche and Marx, which Nilus then added into the text of the Protocols). Also why did they only plagiarise Herzl and why not other Jewish Zionist sources that we know they had access to?

We can see then the problems for the anti-Protocols arguments simply multiply when we ask awkward pertinent questions about the conclusions that they have reached from their study of what we know about the Protocols.

Thus because the Protocols quotes Herzl's *'Der Judenstaat'* directly and paraphrases all its other *'plagiarisms'* we can see that Herzl's *'Der Judenstaat'* was likely part of the source document for the Protocols and that therefore it was either some kind of anti-Semitic dissertation linking ideas on power-politics and Zionism together or it is a Jewish document likely of Zionist origin.

The former is plausible, but we have no actual evidence; circumstantial or otherwise, to suggest that it is the case (other than the wishful thinking of the anti-Protocols side of the debate), but in the latter case we have circumstantial evidence to point to such a conclusion.

That evidence we can derive from the context in which the Protocols came to light as we can accurately date the origin of the Protocols to between late 1901 and early 1903 given the references to world events (such as the McKinley assassination in 1901). (93) This combined with the Ukrainianisms in the Krushevan edition gives us a very specific locale and time period: late 1901 to early 1903 in the general area of and/or close to the Ukraine.

Now the Ukraine at this time was a tinderbox of conflict between revolutionary Jewish movements; both Zionist and Marxist, and anti-Jewish movements associated with anti-Jewish Ukrainian nationalists or the famous *'Black Hundreds'* (who actually opposed each other as well). This means we have a situation where radical political and intellectual programs are likely to have been put forward and adopted: as well as a climate of *'learning from your enemies'* where anti-Jewish ideas would have filtered into Jewish thought and vice versa.

Then on 6th and 7th April 1903 we have the famous Khisinev pogrom (next to the Ukraine and now in Moldova) that was conducted by locals against the Jewish population on the charge of the Jews having ritually murdered a young Christian boy in a town slightly to the north and poisoning a Christian girl in a Jewish hospital. This violent rising of the Russian workers and peasants against

the jews was egged on and pushed further by a widely-read local newspaper entitled *'The Bessarabian'* whose publisher and leading light just so happened to be Pavel Krushevan: the first publisher of the Protocols. (94)

Now we know quite a lot about the Kishinev pogrom and that it was close to a major centre of Zionist activity; Odessa, (95) where Vladimir Jabotinsky gives his first lecture on his extreme Zionist variant; Revisionist Zionism, on the 7th April after hearing about the pogrom. (96) We know that for example a large number of Jewish Torah scrolls were desecrated and that the pogromists took a large quantity of money, goods and objects from the Jews during the pogrom itself. (97)

Now with a direct connection to the first editor of the Protocols, a major centre of the Zionist movement in the Russian Empire (where extreme variants; like Revisionist Zionism, were forming) and that we know objects of importance to Jews were either damaged or taken. We can make a rather revolutionary suggestion: the source document that the Krushevan edition was based on was actually taken from the Kishinev pogrom and that it was some kind of Zionist document or local plan.

This is not quite so outlandish as it might at first sound given that we know of several supporting facts for just such a source origin.

The first is all that I have just stated and in particular the proximity to Odessa; which as I have stated was a major centre of the Zionist movement, and the singular use of direct quotes from Herzl's *'Der Judenstaat'*.

The second is that in September 1902 there was the *'Pan-Russian Zionist Congress'* in Minsk, which included moderate as well as extreme Zionists from all over the Ukraine and the southern Russian Empire. (98) This would have meant that there was a drive to write down various ideas and concepts for discussion, which at a Zionist conference would have included heavy quotation of Herzl, which explains the direct quotes as opposed to the paraphrasing that is otherwise used.

The third is that Krushevan; as the celebrated local publisher and a well-known critic of the Jews, would have been the first port of call for any pogromist who had found something they considered to be important but did not want to hang on to as at that time the authorities; who considered the pogrom an international embarrassment (although Jews have consistently claimed it was an anti-Semitic conspiracy by the central government), were actively prosecuting those involved. (99)

It is thus reasonable that they would have given the incriminating evidence to Krushevan who could then spirit it away to friends like Menshikov and Butmi: outside of the sphere of the official investigation by the authorities from Odessa which was then being conducted.

The fourth is that Krushevan would have had to publish the Protocols away from the Ukraine and Bessarabia: precisely because of this official investigation which was focused on his role as an instigator of the pogrom locally and as such it would have aroused an official investigation if he had come forward with the source document for the Protocols at this stage which would have inevitably

lead to his being put on trial for complicity in the pogrom as well as the trial of his human source for similar charges as well as theft. (100)

We should remember here that each of the twenty-two pogromists brought to trial in relation to the Kishinev pogrom were charged separately (rather than as a group) and would stand trial not as a group, but as separate individuals: this would allow further charges to be easily brought by the ensuing investigation. (101) One that I might add would almost inevitably result in the conviction and punishment of Krushevan and his human source for stealing such a document from the jews irrespective of the document's contents.

That means in effect that if Krushevan published the source document from which the Protocols comes it would have meant certain punishment as it is unlikely that Krushevan did not know of the substantial diplomatic pressure being placed on the Russian Empire by the United States; at the behest of a jewish minority (102) that was growing in power and was already utilizing the scare tactics they later adopted (as a group) of exploiting gentile innocents to bolster and front their causes, which he would have interpreted as part of a jewish attempt to revenge itself on him and others associated with the Kishinev pogrom as well as the 1903 Gomel pogrom in Belarus, (103) which occurred at about the same time as the Protocols were published in '*Znamia*'. (104)

'*Znamia*' was located outside the jurisdiction of the court of Odessa (published as it was in Petrograd) and to legally attack Krushevan the court of Odessa would need to go through the higher levels of the Russian government from which Krushevan could expect; as a patriotic anti-jewish publisher, an amount of the legal protection that would be more difficult to exercise locally in a major centre of jewish influence in the Russian Empire: Odessa.

If we bear this in mind we can see that we have a fairly good circumstantial case (and we must bear in mind that any case assigning an original source for the Protocols is inevitably based on circumstantial evidence and/or is speculative) for assigning the source document for the Protocols to a local jewish group or individual; that was likely associated with Zionist thought, and that this source document was then transmitted through another one of Krushevan's publishing channels out of concern for the well-being of his source and/or himself.

Such an origin for the Protocols also neatly explains several problematic issues that are difficult to explain from a conventional perspective all at once. To wit: (105)

A) The '*open tradition*' of the document and why several individuals (notably Krushevan, Nilus and Butmi); if we follow de Michelis' reconstruction, seem to give us several different versions of the same basic text. If the document's providence was unclear when it reached them then it explains why they both believed but rephrased the document to meet their own ideological needs and priorities.

In essence our three editors knew of the original source document and because its providence was unclear; only deriving as '*something recovered*' from the jews (a-la Krushevan's original commentary), they sought to utilize it by adding to and redacting it to fit the type of jewish

conspiracy they argued in their work was a reality. Hence Krushevan's note about the supposed Masonic origins (which are not in the actual text), Nilus' removal of the Old Testament references and insertion of Masons into the text in addition to Butmi's playing up of the age of the conspiracy (using specifically Orthodox Christian dating) and downplaying a Zionist role in it.

This also accounts for why Krushevan's edition is likely the closest to the original source of the Protocols in so far as it retains much of the structure of a series of drafted policy ideas and ideological priorities (hence the numbering system [a-la '*Protocols*'] of self-contained but linked ideas), which include the Ukrainianisms because that is how the original text had been drafted and Krushevan simply published the document as he received it with a few alternations (suggested by cross-referencing against the specific language used by the Nilus and Butmi editions).

B) The contradictory explanations given by Nilus for the origin of the Protocols and his receiving a copy of them; likely a copy of the source document, from an ex-Major Suxotin (or alternatively Sukhotin), which is also mentioned by General Stepanov and which is the one difficult point of the '*Paris origin*' testimony to explain. This would potentially explain why Nilus contradicts himself in that he says he received the Protocols in either 1901 or 1905 as he is thinking of when first published his predictions of a Jewish anti-Christ (1901) and when he received his copy of the source document that later became central to his vision of this Jewish anti-Christ (1905). It also neatly explains; if we suppose that Stepanov is somewhat correct, why he also mentions an ex-Major called Suxotin (or alternatively Sukhotin) in that this individual was helping disseminate the source document of the Protocols to interested parties and also explains Rackovsky's involvement in doing precisely the same thing in 1905.

C) The idea of a Zionist origin; noted by Ljutostansky in 1904 (although as stated in fact written in late 1903), is thus vindicated as Ljutostansky was ideologically close, but not directly associated with Krushevan; as far as I am aware, and could easily have found out (as he was a major compiler of material against the Jews) that Krushevan's original was a Zionist publication.

This also explains why in later versions Nilus was convinced that the Protocols was a Zionist document stolen from France, while Butmi thought that it was in fact a Masonic document: precisely because while both had received information of the tradition of its being something to do with Zionism: Nilus had integrated this into his world-view of a coming Jewish anti-Christ while Butmi insisted on seeing in it a Judeo-Masonic plot against Russia which was in tune with what his associate Krushevan had originally thought.

D) The confusion about the alleged French origin of the Protocols. In that the idea propounded by Krushevan in his commentary alleged that the Protocols were a Jewish document linked to the Freemasons; in spite of the presence of no such indicators in the original text, (that was then followed by Butmi) in addition to Ljutostansky's and Nilus' argument (which I take as representative of what Major Suxotin/Sukhotin told Nilus [which he then later enlarged on to include Theodor Herzl]) that it was a Zionist document recovered from the Jews.

This then gives us the origin for why Radziwill, du Chayla and Stepanov all give us three very different accounts of origins the Protocols and why they do not match up in terms of detail: in that all three of them are recounting very different versions of the origin of the Protocols that they were told separately.

These were a series of stories that were created by blending some of the truth into them (the theft and involvement of the local Russian police [who were in favour of Kishinev]) (106) but using a bigger canvas (to broaden the meaning and appeal of the Protocols [as an international Zionist or Masonic agenda is a very different beast to a local Zionist extremist's proposals] and distract attention away from their origin in southern Russia) to remove Krushevan from having to explain where he had acquired them and thus directly admitting complicity in the illegal acts of the Kishinev pogromists (and avoiding a prison sentence). (107)

E) Also we can then explain Menshikov's reference to a Protocols style document existing in April 1902, which he may have heard of in relation to the '*Pan-Russian Zionist Congress*' already mentioned and would explain both his belief in the possibility of such a document existing as well as his skepticism about whether it could in fact be found. It may also explain Menshikov's later disbelief of the Protocols precisely because he did not believe such a document could have been captured and it is unlikely that Krushevan would have told him the true origin of such a document. (108)

Thus we can see that if we remove the myths and legends surrounding the Protocols and then place them in their historical context using what we know about them: we can actually narrow down what the source for the Protocols originally was. To wit a Jewish document recovered from Kishinev by pogromists and then given to Krushevan who then published it outside the jurisdiction of the court of Odessa, which was looking for a way to prosecute him (and for which the Protocols would have been suitable ammunition) and which is the reason why de Michelis rightly suspects the document to have come from pogromist circles (although he concludes that it was a smear on the Jews in contrast to my own opposing conclusion). (109)

Having thus located the Protocols in the Zionist milieu of the southern Russia Empire we can move on to the other most common attack on the Protocols: that of the charge of plagiarism, which we need to address and explain in the light of its near universal use on the anti-Protocols side of the debate.

References

(85) Theodor Fritsch, 1933, '*Die Zionistischen Protokolle: Das Programm der Internationalen Geheimregierung*', 14th Edition, Hammer-Verlag: Leipzig, pp. 2-3; 77-78

(86) Taguieff, Op. Cit., 2, pp. 470-471

(87) As Taguieff has published a second, updated edition in 2004 that I haven't had the time to study yet this is quite possible.

(88) de Michelis, Op. Cit., pp. 174-179

(89) <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2012/05/origin-of-goldwin-smith-quotation.html>

- (90) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 6
- (91) Ibid, pp. 48; 114
- (92) Bolton, Op. Cit., p. 19
- (93) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 63
- (94) <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/9350-kishinef-kishinev>
- (95) Steven Zipperstein, 1986, *'The Jews of Odessa: A Cultural History, 1749-1881'*, 1st Edition, Stanford University Press: Stanford, pp. 141-149
- (96) <http://forward.com/articles/8544/kishinev—the-birth-of-a-century/>;
<http://www.betar.org.uk/betaris/zeev.php>
- (97) <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/9350-kishinef-kishinev>
- (98) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 76
- (99) <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/9350-kishinef-kishinev>
- (100) Ibid.
- (101) Ibid.
- (102) Leon Poliakov, 2003, *'The History of Anti-Semitism'*, Vol. 4, 2nd Edition, University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia, pp. 113; 119
- (103) http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/judaica/ejud_0002_0007_0_07636.html
- (104) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 49
- (105) I have summarised all these points from de Michelis and have also previously noted the exact origin of these in his text in my foregoing notes.
- (106) Poliakov, Op. Cit., p. 113
- (107) De Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 80
- (108) Ibid.
- (109) Ibid, pp. 77; 81

The Protocols of Zion: The Facts, The Myths and The Lies (Part V)

One Thousand and One Plagiarisms

Possibly the most common theme trotted out by the anti-Protocols camp is the alleged plagiarism of the Protocols from Maurice Joly and Hermann Goedesche (writing under the pseudonym Sir John Retcliffe): so much so that it features in every academic and popular treatise on the subject of the Protocols with the most thorough treatment of it being Cohn who reproduces quotation against quotation in an effort to demonstrate this is the case. (110) This is; it is frequently held, the most definitive of all anti-Protocols arguments: (111) in part because the origin of the Protocols will always be speculative pending any future discovery of any or all of the substantial pieces of the intellectual puzzle of their origins.

Now; as I have pointed out several times above, this oft-cited idea is actually a selective misstatement of the case against the Protocols that has been extensively discussed in the literature on the subject.

Firstly a large number of the quotes that Cohn identifies are from the Nilus edition of 1905 and not from the Krushevan edition of 1903. (112) Further to this we have alleged plagiarisms being added and redacted from the text by later editions (including Nilus), but on balance the amount of allegedly plagiarised material from Joly is substantially lower in the 1903 Krushevan edition than in the 1905 Nilus edition. (113)

Secondly the Joly claim is the second accusation; not the first, of plagiarism that was made against the Protocols: the first is claimed in relation to Hermann Goedesche's 1868 novel '*Biarritz*'. (114) This charge was in fact taken up before the alleged Joly plagiarism was exposed by Philips Graves of the London Times (whose editor; Henry Wickham-Steed, was a believer in the authenticity of the Protocols) and represents a problem to the anti-Protocols argument in that it shows a desperate international jewish community looking to invent arguments against the Protocols, which suggests that we need to be particularly careful of the '*plagiarism*' charge from the outset precisely because it was politicised by the jews themselves before they had evidence to argue it cogently. (115)

Thirdly the Joly text is only the best known text of many that the Protocols have been claimed to knowingly plagiarise and/or borrow from. I have already mentioned Goedesche's '*Biarritz*', but in addition we have Eugene Sue's '*The Wandering Jew*' and '*The Mysteries of Paris*', Alexandre Dumas' '*Marquis de Sade*', Houston Stewart Chamberlain's '*The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*' and '*The Jews*', Edouard Drumont's '*Jewish France*', Osman Bey's '*The Conquest of the World by the Jews*' and '*The Talmud and the Jews*', Benjamin Disraeli's '*Coningsby*', Jacob Brafmann's '*The Book of the Kahal*', Nicolo Machiavelli's '*The Prince*' and Abbe Barruel's '*History of Jacobinism*', which accounts for those many readers will have heard of. (116)

Fourthly; as de Michelis points out, the only text to be more-or-less directly quoted rather than paraphrased is Theodor Herzl's '*Der Judenstaat*', (117) which is again not something you are usually told in the popular literature on the Protocols. (118)

This then gives us a very different picture of the whole plagiarism argument in that we are being told by a multitude of authors on the Protocols that the author or authors of the Protocols sat down and plagiarised a large number of different contemporary and classic texts to create the Protocols, which then proves the Protocols to be a fraud. We should remind ourselves once again that the amount of borrowings and what is borrowed differs significantly between the Krushevan edition of 1903 and the Nilus edition of 1905. (119)

So to simplify the picture that the anti-Protocols camp are painting for us: we have an anti-Semitic author who is either trying to defame the jews and/or writing a satire about Zionism. Who then decides the best way to achieve this is to paraphrase a large amount of material from a multitude of different works: some novels, some exposes written by jews, some anti-jewish treatises, some works of political philosophy and one anti-Freemasonry treatise.

But hang on a moment: why would the author of the Protocols do this when they could just as simply innovate from their own style of writing, based on their own theories and just crib a few ideas; as opposed to plagiarising/paraphrasing whole passages, from a book or two they had read?

In addition to this; again to simplify the picture presented by the anti-Protocols camp, they would have us believe that not only did one author (Krushevan) paraphrase (well sorry they like to incorrectly call it plagiarism with all the emotional ideas of intellectual theft that concept evokes in readers) a large number of different works, but also that a later editor (Nilus) used the same works in addition to several new ones to add to the Protocols!

We thus end up with a case of logical fiddlesticks from the anti-Protocols camp in that their; often hyper-intellectual, textual and literary criticism has actually landed up in their presenting not only a rather illogical series of events as logical, but also showing up the fact that they are being... for lack of a better term... very stupid.

The origin of this case of logical fiddlesticks from the anti-Protocols camp can be located in one of the lesser known problems of textual and linguistic analysis in that if a scholar looks at a text long enough he can find any number of paraphrases, plagiarisms and literary borrowings. This is caused; as Allegro has noted in relation to Biblical study, (120) by there being a finite range of expression in any language and that therefore natural parallels; particularly when two documents are talking of similar issues, are going to happen (i.e. what we may call '*parallel textual evolution*'). Not taking into account principles such as these leads to all sorts of strange theories; based on largely invented linguistic parallels, such as Jesus taking his ideas from Buddhism, most of Renan's famous parallels between Mithraism and Christianity not to mention a large chunk of Kabbalistic numerology-based mysticism.

We can use this simple principle of parallel textual evolution to remove all but three of the alleged plagiarisms/borrowings on the grounds of there being few textual parallels and that there is no '*system*' to the alleged plagiarism/borrowing.

The remaining three alleged plagiarisms/borrowings are:

A) Hermann Goedesche's '*Biarritz*'

B) Maurice Joly's '*The Dialogue in Hell Between Machiavelli and Montesquieu*'

C) Theodor Herzl's '*The Jewish State*'

However before we move on to discuss these in turn it is important to provide the reader with an example of the alleged plagiarisms/borrowings that we have dismissed and briefly explain why we have dismissed them using the example as a short case study.

The simple example of Chabry's 1897 *'L'Accaparement monétaire et l'indépendance économique'* and the 20th Protocol will serve to make my point. The mirror texts provided are as follows.

Chabry:

'The feudal lords of international finance protect this monopoly [of loans] as a sword of Damocles suspended over the peoples.' (121)

20th Protocol (de Michelis says 19th): (122)

'The loans hang like a sword of Damocles over the heads of the governed.'

This looks similar doesn't it?

Now lets remove the translator's (in this case de Michelis') interpolation as to the meaning from Chabry and we get:

'The feudal lords of international finance protect this monopoly as a sword of Damocles suspended over the peoples.'

Now it is clear that is isn't quite as close as we've taken out the interpolation to suggest meaning, which makes the translation look a lot closer to the original text that it does without it.

We can note that there is no use or reference to *'feudal lords'* and *'international finance'* in the Protocols. In addition I would note that Chabry's original uses the context of *'the peoples'* to mean *'the peoples of the world'* (*'peuples du monde'*), which is markedly dissimilar from the idea of *'the governed'* (*'les gens gouvernés'*) as on the one hand Chabry; in the context of the twenty-four page pamphlet this is from, is telling us that *'international finance'* could use their loan-capital monopoly to get rid of problem and on the other the Protocols are telling us and that the Learned Elders will use their loan-capital monopoly to get rid of problematic goyim.

What is important here is the intent and usage of the concept: in so far as they are similar, but at the same time markedly different. If we understand this then the plagiarism theory (and indeed I suspect this was the reason for discerning the textual parallel) largely rests on the metaphor *'sword of Damocles'*; as otherwise it is normal enough French and Russian right-wing assertion for the time (bemoaning the power of Mammon over the world etc), which unfortunately for the anti-Protocols camp is equally a common metaphor connected with the insecurity of tyrants. A metaphor that could equally come out of Thomas Hobbes for example!

To demonstrate this we can point out that President John F. Kennedy could; on the anti-Protocols camp's logic, be said to be *'plagiarising'* the Protocols or Chabry when he expressed the idea that:

'Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when this planet may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness.' (123)

We can thus see when the metaphor of the '*sword of Damocles*' is used it almost always is expressed in a similar way to Chabry or the Protocols. This then demonstrates that what we are dealing with is not '*plagiarism*' or even paraphrasing, but rather a common convergence of language and a literary reference point (i.e. parallel textual evolution).

In addition to this I should note that the relevant part of the 20th Protocol in the 1920 English translation (i.e. Nilus 1905 and 1917) reads as follows:

'Loans hang like a sword of Damocles over the heads of rulers, who, instead of taking from their subjects a temporary tax, come begging with outstretched palm of our bankers.'

Even if you assume that '*over the heads of rulers*' is a later mistranslation/interpolation of/for '*over the governed*' then it is clear that the passages are actually quite different and bear only a misleading superficial similarity in terms of their metaphor and subject.

No wonder the anti-Protocols camp don't cite the entire passage!

Thus we can see with a little bit of prodding the plagiarism allegations begin to come apart at the seams.

Having thus disposed of a large portion of the anti-Protocols argument on the issue of the alleged '*plagiarisms*' we can move onto the two central and frequently repeated claims: namely that the Protocols include a large number of plagiarisms/borrowing from Goedesche's '*Biarritz*' and Joly's '*Dialogue*'.

An important introductory comment that should be made is in line with what Myers has pointed out (124) in so far as that in a document of this type the use; or rather paraphrasing, of another document is not proof against or for the document's authenticity, while in contrast a direct quote may be potentially taken as evidence for or against.

Traditionally it is presumed; following Graves (125) and Bernstein, (126) that parallels of this kind actually '*disprove*' the Protocol's originating from the jews in any way, shape or form. The logical response to that; however, is a simple one: how so?

We can examine this with a simple thought experiment as follows:

If we have a series of minutes from an important strategic meeting of one company that make their way via surreptitious means to a rival company, but that same series of minutes is partly expressed using a series of paraphrases and metaphors from a popular business book that the author of the

original minutes had recently read and been impressed by. Does that therefore mean that the minutes of the meeting concerned are invalid and not what they profess to be because terms had been paraphrased/plagiarised from that popular business book?

No: of course not.

The idea that plagiarism/paraphrasing from Joly invalidates the Protocols is essentially a tautology. As the argument of Protocols being a forgery from Joly ipso facto assumes it is made-up, because it may contain paraphrases/plagiarisms from another non-cited source without explaining why the use of such paraphrases/plagiarisms from such a source makes the document itself false in any way.

Having removed this common, but nonsensical argument from consideration we can move onto the case of Goedesche's novel *'Biarritz'* and its relationship to the Protocols.

Hermann Goedesche; a mid-to-late 19th century editor of the conservative Prussian daily *'Kreuzzeitung'*, was a noted German author of fiction and poetry under the pseudonym of Sir John Retcliffe. Segel; for example, tries to style the origin of this having been to lend *'authority'* to his work, (127) but I would argue that Goedesche's novels are more in a revolutionary conservative strain (taking a controversially strong anti-jewish stand for example) and that his position as editor of the influential *'Kreuzzeitung'* was authority enough if he wished to invoke it. Also one is forced question what unstated *'authority'* a writer of poetry and fiction is supposed to derive from being an English diplomat in Segel's view?

Regardless of this: one of Goedesche's novels *'Biarritz'*; from 1868, contains a short chapter entitled *'In the Jewish Cemetery of Prague'* which was then republished in anti-jewish circles under the title *'The Rabbi's Speech'*. (128) *'The Rabbi's Speech'* then took on a life of its own and was assumed to be an actual; rather than a fictional, report of a gathering of the princes (meaning leaders) of the twelve tribes of Israel to whom the leader of the group; Rabbi Simon ben Yehudah, gives a speech of not dissimilar general; but not specific, content to some of the later editions of the Protocols; notably to Butmi's 1906 edition, about the; primarily economic, methods the jews are using to take over the world.

This transformation from fiction to fact may have; in fact, been intended by Goedesche as he published a shorter and heavily revised version of the chapter *'In the Jewish Cemetery of Prague'* in 1881 in the French periodical *'Le Contemporain'* (alongside several other strong broadsides against the activities of the jews in Russia). (129) This version; as Bronner correctly points out, was revised to make it seem more like an actual speech rather than a work of fiction: (130) although I am not convinced that Goedesche actually intended it this way, but rather as a reworking of a popular chapter in one of his works. Given that the novel concerned (*'Biarritz'*) had already been independently translated into Russian; for example, (131) it makes perfect commercial sense for Goedesche to publish a new version of the popular story in a popular right-wing periodical in France where anti-jewish sentiment was on the rise. (132)

Segel (133) and Wolf (134) claim that *'The Rabbi's Speech'* is plagiarised by the Protocols; echoing the related expose's by Joseph Stanjek and Otto Friedrich, but base their argument on Mueller von Hausen's 1919 introduction to his 1919 German edition of the Protocols *'Die Geheimnisse der Weisen von Zion'* [*'The Secrets of the Elders of Zion'*] not the actual text itself!

'The Rabbi's Speech' is in fact only adduced by Mueller von Hausen as evidence for the authenticity of the Protocols, but crucially not part of the document itself. Segel and Wolf however misrepresent this and claim that the Protocols themselves are *'debunked'* by their alleged connection to Goedesche's *'Biarritz'*. (135) In fact if you look at the passages reproduced by Segel; from Stanjek and Friedrich, then one can clearly see; if one compares them to the article by Goedesche in *'Le Contemporain'*, that in spite the different language: they are almost identical.

Therefore what Segel and Wolf claim is that the Protocols are *'debunked'* by an inserted piece of evidence in the introduction to Mueller von Hausen's translation, which they then proceed to claim is *'plagiarised'* when in fact it is simply a piece of fiction that was shortened and slightly restyled by the original author for popular consumption in a French periodical. It is thus little wonder that *'The Rabbi's Speech'* and the chapter from *'Biarritz'* are almost identical!

We can thus begin to see that the idea that the Protocols *'plagiarise'* Goedesche's *'Biarritz'* is and has been admitted to be incorrect by modern anti-Protocols authorities. That said the anti-Protocols camp haven't abandoned this argument entirely and have modified their opinion to the idea that Goedesche's *'The Rabbi's Speech'* somehow acted as a *'prototype'* for the Protocols, but then again I would point out that this is a case of parallel textual evolution precisely as they don't reflect or mirror Krushevan's 1903 or Nilus' 1905 editions in any way (even though Krushevan had published it in *'The Bessarabian'* in 1903), (136) but only really enter the equation as an appendix to Butmi's 1906 edition. (137)

Ben-Itto; for example, asserts that *'The Rabbi's Speech'* *'presages'* the Protocols, (138) while Rollin thinks it gives us the *'framework'* for the *'adaptation'* of the Protocols from Joly's work. (139) The problem with both views is; of course, that they look at the Protocols in an intellectual vacuum in so far as they forget that the ideas propounded by *'The Rabbi's Speech'* were not only common but near universal among the followers and thinkers of the anti-Semitic European right-wing at this time. One need only read Drumont's *'La France Juive'* and Henri Roger Gougenot de Mousseaux's *'Le Juif, le judaisme et la judaisation des peuples chretiens'* to see the same assertions made in a very similar way! (140)

As to Rollin's specific argument that *'The Rabbi's Speech'* serves as a methodological framework for the Protocols; correctly doubted by de Michelis, we can easily remove this from contention by pointing out that Goedesche was never actually plagiarised/paraphrased by any author associated with the Protocols in relation to them. So how could Goedesche possibly have served as a template for the Protocols?

Or put another; more explicit, way: if critics of jews routinely argued that the jews were seeking to rule the world via a conspiracy against gentiles. How then can we assert a line of *'inspiration'* from

Goedesche when there are so many other likelier candidates for such '*inspiration*' available: most notably the work of the renegade jew Jacob Brafmann which was published in Wilno in 1868 (the same year as Goedesche's '*Biarritz*') and was an instant best-seller in Russian anti-jewish circles. (141)

In fact Goedesche's name only seems to have come up as a candidate for being the textual origin of the Protocols, because of this early misidentification by both Stanjek and Friedrich of '*Biarritz*' being the Rosetta stone of the Protocols based on Mueller von Hausen's introduction to the Protocols, which included '*The Rabbi's Speech*'.

Thus we can again see that what has happened here is the accumulation of mistake upon mistake in the anti-Protocols camp, which has now reached the point of absurdly trying to single out Goedesche's text; from a large and well-attested pack of contemporary works just like it, because of this early theory and not because it is; per se, an origin for the alleged '*plagiarised*' passages in the Protocols.

References

- (110) Cohn, Op. Cit., pp. 49-50; although concerns have been raised to the viability of this analysis per Taguieff, Op. Cit., Vol. 2, pp. 781-782
- (111) Eisner, Op. Cit., p. vi
- (112) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 55
- (113) Ibid, p. 8
- (114) Bernstein, '*The History of a Lie*', Op. Cit., p. 59
- (115) Wolf, Op. Cit., p. 19
- (116) Bronner, Op. Cit., p. 81; de Michelis, Op. Cit., pp. 46-47
- (117) Ibid, p. 48
- (118) I should remark that only two anti-Protocols authors (de Michelis and Taguieff) mention this although it is very well-known and often discussed among pro-Protocols authors such as Jouin, Fritsch, Fry and Begunov.
- (119) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 8
- (120) John Allegro, 1964, '*The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reappraisal*', 2nd Edition, Penguin: London, p. 173
- (121) A. Chabry, 1897, '*L'Accaparement monétaire et l'indépendance économique*', 1st Edition, C. Poussielgue: Paris, p. 20
- (122) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 52
- (123) <http://www.jfklibrary.org/Research/Ready-Reference/JFK-Speeches/Address-Before-the-General-Assembly-of-the-United-Nations-September-25-1961.aspx>
- (124) <http://mailstar.net/toolkit.html>
- (125) Philip Graves, 1921, '*The Truth about "The Protocols": A Literary Forgery*', 1st Edition, Printing House: London, pp. 19-21
- (126) Bernstein, '*The History of a Lie*', Op. Cit., p. 71
- (127) Segel, Op. Cit., p. 66

- (128) Bronner, Op. Cit., pp. 82-83
(129) Ibid, p. 82
(130) Herman Bernstein, 1971, *'The Truth about "The Protocols of Zion": A Complete Exposure'*, 2nd Edition, Ktav: New York, pp. 22-23
(131) de Michelis, Op. Cit., pp. 49-50
(132) Poliakov, Op. Cit., Vol. 4, pp. 36-40
(133) Segel, Op. Cit., pp. 65-66
(134) Wolf, Op. Cit., pp. 21-22
(135) Segel, Op. Cit., pp. 97-99
(136) Bronner, Op. Cit., p. 83
(137) Bernstein, *'The History of a Lie'*, Op. Cit., p. 59
(138) Ben-Itto, Op. Cit., p. 50
(139) Rollin, Op. Cit., p. 558
(140) Poliakov, Op. Cit., Vol. 4, pp. 34-36; Segel, Op. Cit., p. 54; Wolf, Op. Cit., pp. 6-8
(141) Poliakov, Op. Cit., Vol. 4, p. 37; Jacob Brafmann, Siegfried Passarge (Trans.), 1928, *'Das Buch vom Kahal'*, Vol. 1, 1st Edition, Hammer-Verlag: Leipzig, pp. V-viii

The Protocols of Zion: The Facts, The Myths and The Lies (Part VI)

Having dealt and disposed with the problem of the alleged quotations from Goedesche: we can move on to the sine qua non of the anti-Protocols case: the alleged plagiarism of Maurice Joly's *'Dialogue'*. In order to understand this claim we need to understand the context in which the claim came to light as well as what we know about Maurice Joly.

Maurice Joly was a left-wing French Republican lawyer and writer who was stridently against Napoleon III of France: so much so that in 1864 he published the *'Dialogue'* in Geneva and Brussels. The work was then unsuccessfully smuggled into France by friends and associates: who were promptly arrested and interrogated. Joly's left-wing friends predictably gave him up to save their own skins and the man himself was arrested (not before he had written published another political attack on Napoleon III published as his 1865 *'Caesar'*). Hauled before a judge Joly then received the sentence of 15 months in prison for his subversive pamphlet on the 25th April 1865.

After he got out of prison Joly continued to write and publish an autobiography in 1870 (as well as joining the *'French resistance'* against Napoleon III) and with the downfall of that monarch in 1871 as a direct result of the loss of the Franco-Prussian war. Joly began to publish openly on political subjects again with a book on French Republican politics in 1872. However Joly had begun to grow disillusioned, was fighting a legal battle against a one-time friend; Monsieur Grevy, and on July 14th 1878 he was found dead in his apartment: the cause of death being attributed to suicide. (142)

All well and good you might say, but even in Joly's life we have two issues that we need to consider before we move on.

Firstly we have the allegation; made by Lord Alfred Douglas in *'Plain English'* in 1921, that Maurice Joly was; in fact, a Jew who was born with the name: *'Moses Joel'*. (143) Douglas cited various unnamed sources for his assertion, but never told or wrote to anyone; to my knowledge, about who or what these were. A similar claim was made at the Bern Trial by one of the German luminaries on the Protocols; Colonel Ulrich Fleischhauer (of *'Weltdienst'* fame), who asserted that Maurice Joly was originally called *'Joseph Levy'* but once again produced no actual evidence of this claim. (144)

That said however the prosecution in the Bern Trial did in fact do the defense a rather large favour when they sought to disprove Fleischhauer by producing Joly's baptismal certificate which was dated 1829, which didn't match with Joly's claim of having been born in 1833 in his autobiography. (145) This could have been used to argue; although it wasn't at the time, that Joly's recollection of events was doubtful and would have thus enabled the defense to throw a large amount of doubt on the prosecution's case.

Unfortunately we also have to contend with the fact that in his autobiography; published in 1870, Joly actually states that he had a French father and an Italian mother: not mentioning any change of name, anything to do with Judaism and/or gave any indication of being anything other than what he claimed to be. (146) We also have to bear in mind that the discrepancy is the wrong way for a Jew converting to Christianity (i.e. the baptism is earlier than the claimed birth year rather than the baptism being several years later) and as such we have to dismiss this evidence as not being suggestive; in any way, of a Jewish origin for Joly.

Now because of the fact that we have no actual evidence that Joly was anything other than what he professed to be: we have to dismiss this notion of Joly being a Jew.

Secondly we have the allegation that Joly plagiarised a lot of his material from a work; *'Macchiavel, Montesquieu, Rousseau'* (*'Macchiavel'* is a transliteration of *'Machiavelli'*) by one Jakob Venedy (actually Jacob Venedey) who is claimed to have been a Jew, a Freemason, a Communist and a friend of Karl Marx. (147)

With these I am going to work slightly backward in that we do know that Venedey was a left-winger; as opposed to a patriotic, socialist who fought on; but not at the side as Marx and Engels in the revolutionary year of 1848 in Germany. As to him being a Communist; i.e. a follower of Karl Marx, this is very unlikely in so far as Venedey died in 1871 (the year of the Paris Commune) and although Marx had published the first volume of his *'Das Kapital'* in 1867: it was not till after he died that he came to be regarded; through the industry and agency of Engels, a *'great'* socialist thinker. (148)

It is thus rather doubtful that Venedey was a Communist as now normally understood, but it is possible that he could have been a supporter of the Communards given that he spent a large amount

of time in Paris (this time a centre of revolutionary thought) as well as France in general and was politically left-wing. We can thus reasonably speculate that Venedey was at the very least familiar with the doctrines and ideas of the philosophers of the communards; like Babeuf, Saint Just and Proudhon, and would have likely been; as an ideological fellow traveler, supportive of their revolutionary ideas and general program.

As such then it is possible that Venedey knew Marx, but I know of no instances or examples of correspondence to or mention of Venedey in any published or archive collection of Marx's voluminous correspondence. As Marx was a serial letter writer and used any connection; however obscure, to try to elicit money to pay for his various habits in addition to having an aristocratic wife, several young children and a servant to feed and clothe. (149) We can say that although it is possible that Venedey knew Marx it is highly unlikely this was the case as Marx left no paper trail of it and nor do he or Engels mention Venedey as far as I am aware, which would have been the case had Marx and Venedey known each other and especially so if the two were friends as is alleged.

That Venedey was a Freemason I have been able to find no evidence for other than the much later assertion that he was associated with a Paris lodge named '*Bauhütte*' (lit. '*Masonic/Workers Hut*'). (150) Other than the fact that the Bauhütte claim could easily refer to the German craft guilds that had existed since the medieval epoch: the term '*Bauhütte*' does not come into existence till 1816 when Goethe innovated it in his book of that year: '*Kunst und Alterthum am Rhein und Mayn*'. (151) I cannot find any contemporary or detailed reference to such an organisation existing in Paris at the time (Fry refers to a periodical of the same name which I have not been able to locate a copy of) and not least to Venedey having been a Freemason himself.

Further; and perhaps most alarmingly, there does not appear to be any actual evidence; other than later blind assertion and rumour, that Venedey was himself Jewish. It seems we have a case here; as Peter Myers has observed, (152) of an individual being labelled as a Jew who seems to have not been and then claimed as being a '*Learned Elder*'. (153)

This hasty claim seems to also be at the root of the claim that Venedey's book '*Macchiavel, Montesquieu, Rousseau*' was plagiarised by Maurice Joly. Although I have not; as yet, made a detailed comparison between the '*Dialogue*' and '*Macchiavel, Montesquieu, Rousseau*' some key points stand out to me as suggesting this was a hasty improvisation in the pro-Protocols camp.

Firstly is the difference of language in that in spite of its title '*Macchiavel, Montesquieu, Rousseau*' was only to my knowledge published in German (in 1850 by Franz Duncker in Berlin) as opposed to Joly's '*Dialogue*' which was published in French in Geneva and Brussels. Now it is of course possible to plagiarise from different language works, but it is very difficult; due to the linguistic difficulties of translation, to do so accurately. That suggests that even if the Vishnu quote from the Protocols that has been traced to Joly is in Venedey's work (154) then it wouldn't likely read the same way due to the translation and would thus be very difficult to track back and prove as a '*plagiarism*'.

That said you could style this as a clever piece of plagiarism on Joly's part (as we know he did actually plagiarise whole pages of work from Eugene Sue for example) (155) but the problem with that is that we do not know if Joly could read or speak German; let alone fluently, and as such it is difficult at best to imagine him plagiarising a German language work for reasons unknown to us.

Secondly the originator of the Venedey plagiarism claim seems to have superficially connected the title of the first volume (there are two) of Venedey's book, which is *'Macchiavel und Montesquieu'*, and assumed that this is a dialogue. In fact as the title of the second volume; *'Rousseau'*, makes clear: it is actually just a left-wing philosophical reflection on three important authors in the then contemporary philosophical canon. The work itself is not a dialogue in the vein of the Protocols and could not have served as a model for Joly's *'Dialogue'* as de Michelis rightly points out. (156)

Thirdly Venedey arrives late on the scene; in 1931 no less, (157) as a defense of the Protocols by including Joly as plagiarist of an alleged freemasonic jewish communist then it serves to neutralise the superficially powerful Joly *'plagiarism'* claims and indeed enlist them into the arsenal of the pro-Protocols camp.

Thus we can say in summary that Venedey wasn't a communist, didn't know Karl Marx, doesn't seem to have been jewish or a freemason either. We also can be fairly sure that Venedey's *'Macchiavel, Montesquieu, Rousseau'* did not serve as a template or inspiration for Joly's *'Dialogue'*.

By contrast to the legend of Joly's plagiarism of Venedey: the pro-Protocols camp are on much stronger ground when we come to the origins of the Joly plagiarism claim. This is typified in the fact that the argument originates from Philip Graves who claims to have met a White Russian landowner (*'Mr. X'*) who had had connections to the Okhrana in Constantinople in 1921 who then told him that he knew it was plagiarism from a rare old French book; Joly's *'Dialogue'*, and provided Graves with a copy to check the passages himself. (158)

Now there are several things that are very wrong with the picture that Graves provides; although nearly every author on the Protocols has unquestioningly believed him, one of which is found in the lack of an actual identity to give to this mysterious *'White Russian landowner'* per the pseudonym of *'Mr. X'*. This faceless man has been tentatively identified; using Graves' description, as one Mihail Raslovlev who was in Constantinople at about this time. (159)

Now the obvious question that needs to be asked; but which to my knowledge hasn't, is why did Graves cover up the identity of his informant given that there was no authority that would go after *'Mr. X'* any more as the Okhrana had ceased to exist and the anti-jewish governments of the 1930s were yet to come into power. So the question remains: why cover up the identity of the informant?

You could argue that this was to protect *'Mr. X's'* reputation in the right-wing White Russian circles, which would view such an activity as akin to treason especially for the money that Graves promised. However this assumes that *'Mr. X'* had much to lose by being known as an informer to White Russian émigrés in Constantinople. The logical question to this dilemma is again: why?

We could suggest; not unreasonably, that it was to avoid losing his friends and social connections, but then by betraying an alleged '*secret*' then '*Mr. X*' had already shown he had no real interest in loyalty to those he pretended to agree with on a social and political level. So why was he so interested in keeping in with his social and political circle, while willingly betraying an alleged '*secret*'?

Well the obvious; if controversial, answer is that '*Mr. X*' was actually a White Russian émigré who worked for the Cheka in an international capacity to keep an eye on what the White Russian émigrés were planning, which we know of numerous former monarchist émigrés doing. (160) However; like the sudden remembrances of du Chayla, I think we are dealing here with a Bolshevik method of trying to discredit their White Russian enemies whom used the Protocols of Zion; with the massive controversy that was raging around them in Europe in addition to their popularity, as a highly-effective propaganda weapon against the newly created Soviet Union. (161)

Now as the Cheka could not attack the Protocols directly by planting stories via sympathisers and fellow travelers without the risk of it being attacked as a Soviet plot to discredit the Protocols: they hit upon a simple and highly effective alternative. Invite a reporter for the paper that was respectable institution (i.e. believable) but also one that believed in the Protocols (i.e. no reason to suspect a Soviet source); for which '*The Times*' of London was easily the best candidate, and then give them the alleged '*plagiarism*' information plus a copy of the book in question (so they could see for themselves and were thus likely to print the claim).

This sounds somewhat fantastic: doesn't it?

However there is one strange detail of the meeting with '*Mr. X*' that is very difficult to explain if we simply assume he was motivated by money: he left after giving the information to Graves without taking the money that Graves had there for him and didn't actually ask for it at the time. (162) Now if '*Mr. X*' had been motivated by financial difficulties: would he not upon Graves' crediting the alleged '*plagiarism*' immediately ask for the money that was the ostensible reason for his coming forward?

That '*Mr. X*' left suggests to us that the money was not the principle reason for '*Mr. X*'s' revelation and that leaves us with two explanations to consider: that '*Mr. X*' was estranged from his former acquaintances and friends in the White Russian émigré movement or that '*Mr. X*' was involved in this event at the behest of a strongly anti-Protocols third party. That '*Mr. X*' was not estranged from his friends and acquaintances in the White Russian émigré movement we can see from the use of the pseudonym as '*Mr. X*' to protect his identity when there were no physical threats to his life by coming forward.

That then leaves us with other possibility: that '*Mr. X*' was working at the behest of a strongly anti-Protocols third party. The most obvious candidate for this is the Soviet Union who were strongly involved in opposing anti-Semitism at this time and also; as we have seen, were actively involved in trying to eliminate the Protocols as late as 1934-1935 at the Bern Trial. In addition to this we have a huge over-representation of jews in the Russian Communist party apparatus at this time, which

again serves to suggest that what we are dealing with here is a very successful Soviet information dissemination operation. (163)

If we understand this then it leads us nicely onto the second issue with *'Mr. X's'* story and one that has also not been sufficiently explored by the Protocols literature on both sides of the debate: why *'Mr. X'* knew about the alleged *'plagiarism'*. The problem with that of course is: we simply don't know as Graves doesn't tell us, but implies that it is something to do with the Okhrana by pointing out that *'Mr. X'* claimed to have received the information from an ex-officer in that organisation. (164)

This fits nicely with Cohn's theory of the origin of the Protocols being the Paris Okhrana: in that it is conceivable that it could have come through organisational gossip and so forth. However; as we have seen, Cohn's speculative theory is untenable because there is no actual evidence for it and quite a lot against it.

So then how did *'Mr. X'* know about the similarities to Joly's *'Dialogue'*?

The answer actually brings us onto the third issue with *'Mr. X's'* testimony. To wit: that *'Mr. X'* claimed that Joly's *'Dialogue'* was an *'obscure French book'* (165) when in fact in its Russian translation it was actually quite well-known: far more so than in the original French. (166) Now if *'Mr. X'* was the man he claimed to be: then he would understand that the book itself was common in Russian right-wing circles at the time, but if *'Mr. X'* was not from that milieu originally then it is precisely the sort of obscure detail that he wouldn't know.

That then suggests that; as I have said, *'Mr. X'* was likely from the Russian left-wing not the Russian right-wing (assuming of course that Graves would have realised if *'Mr. X'* was not actually Russian): i.e. he was an agent of the Cheka. However the information that *'Mr. X'* gave could have very easily been spotted in the Nilus edition, because two to three Protocols are very close to the text of the *'Dialogue'*. (167)

This then suggests that someone familiar with the *'Dialogue'* in its Russian translation; note not the original French, noticed one or more similarities between the texts when they read the Protocols, which would have then caused that individual to compare them. This information then found its way; probably through a monarchist turn-coat, to the Soviet secret police; the Cheka, who then sought to use it; via the delivery method I have elucidated, to eliminate a powerful weapon that the White Russian émigrés were using against the Soviet Union as well as enabling them to combat local anti-Semitism more effectively (i.e. citing the testimony of a respected external anti-Communist source).

If we understand this then it shows that while it doesn't necessarily impact the existence of alleged *'plagiarisms'* in the Protocols from Joly's *'Dialogue'*: it does give us a very different picture of the battles that were going on around the Protocols at this time. It wasn't a time of battles between *'truth'* and *'fantasy'*, but rather a brutal geopolitical battle between jews and their critics. The decisive factor in this phase of the struggle was the Soviet Union's intervention to help an

increasingly desperate Jewish community and because of the way that they aided them: it has been unrecognised till now.

Having thus dealt with the two areas which provide context to the Joly '*plagiarism*' claim: we can begin survey the claim itself. Before we do this however we should remind ourselves of two pertinent facts:

A) That the amount of '*plagiarism*' from Joly's '*Dialogue*' differs substantially from the Krushevan edition of 1903 and the Nilus edition of 1905.

B) That there is a limited range of expression in any language, which can easily give rise to convergences on metaphors and examples especially if written at a similar time and in a similar (or the same) cultural context. And we should bear in mind that the principle method used by the anti-Protocols camp is to look at the metaphors and examples used for comparison.

We should also state that; as Peter Myers has pointed out, the traditional calculation (by Bernstein and Cohn) of the amount of text the Protocols take from Joly is unrepresentative in that it is not; as Cohn states, two-fifths but rather one-sixth of the text. (168) Or put another way: the Joly passages comprise 16.45 percent of the Protocols, but again we should remember as above that a large quantity of this material is itself a later edition to the Protocols by Nilus. (169)

De Michelis calculates the percentage of '*plagiarism*' from Joly as 4 percent of the text across Protocols 1 to 11 and across 12-22 as 8 percent. (170) This compares to Cohn's claim of 40 percent and Bernstein's claim of 16.45 percent. This discrepancy can be explained by the authors examining different texts as Cohn looked at the Nilus edition as did Bernstein, but they came to two very different conclusions and I would suggest that Cohn is actually trying to maximise the percentage of the text that can be attributed to Joly's '*Dialogue*' (to fit his thesis of an anti-Semitic conspiracy in Paris using Joly's book) while Bernstein is; ironically (as he was a more outspoken opponent of anti-Semitism than Cohn), the more accurate.

De Michelis' notice of the difference can actually be explained simply; as he himself acknowledges, by looking at the fact that the Protocols were originally explicitly divided into two parts in the Krushevan edition. The first section (Protocols 1-11) was stated to have no '*cuts*' from the text by the editor (Krushevan) while the second section (Protocols 12-22) was stated to have '*cuts*' from the original text. (171) This suggests that whatever original document that Krushevan had: he had inserted and removed some parts of the text, which may suggest; as we know Krushevan had commented on Joly's '*Dialogue*' in '*The Bessarabian*' in 1903, that Krushevan may have unintentionally dressed up a small part of the Protocols with a book he had recently read and commented on.

This is quite a common practice; as Myers correctly observes, as one frequently uses earlier articles and what one has recently read to style one's thought. (172) Thus the lack of other styles in Krushevan's 1903 edition other than work from Herzl and Joly actually points to the Protocols originally being an authentic document as the inclusion of Joly we can explain by the cuts, but the

inclusion of near direct quotes from Herzl is very difficult to explain other than to suggest that Krushevan had read it recently (which has already been removed from contention above).

Even de Michelis has pointed out that the Joly *'plagiarism'* argument is at best indirect evidence precisely because the text is not used consistently throughout the Protocols and while Protocol 8 is almost word for word: Protocol 14 barely has anything reminiscent of Joly in it at all. (173) That suggests to us that the Joly plagiarism claim is not nearly as solid as many anti-Protocols scholars assume it is.

For the sake of simplicity I will take the three examples cited by the Wikipedia article (174) (the author of which has simply copied these parallel passages and references without attribution from Graves assuming incorrectly a consistency of argument over nearly a century of debate), (175) which is many people's first point of reference on this subject. To wit:

From Joly's 12th Dialogue:

'Like the god Vishnu, my press will have a hundred arms, and these arms will give their hands to all the different shades of opinion throughout the country.'

Is compared to Protocol 12:

'These newspapers, like the Indian god Vishnu, will be possessed of hundreds of hands, each of which will be feeling the pulse of varying public opinion.'

And

From Joly's 17th Dialogue:

'Now I understand the figure of the god Vishnu; you have a hundred arms like the Indian idol, and each of your fingers touches a spring.'

Is compared to Protocol 17:

'Our Government will be an apologia of the Hindu god Vishnu. Each of our hundred hands will hold one spring of the social machinery of the State.'

It is logical to stop here and examine this claim of similarity, which is based singly on the use of the image of Vishnu to explain a point. This is usually considered to be damning, but I disagree on the simple grounds that if one is going to explain the organisation of a massive conspiracy with lots of different elements working at apparent odds with each other. Then there are few neutral; let alone positive, methods of explanation while there are several negative ones. We should notice here that the author of the Protocols does not use the common anti-jewish motif of the many-armed octopus; ironically used as artwork on the cover of many editions of the Protocols, which would have been more in-line with a *'satirical'* origin of the Protocols and also anti-jewish thought in general.

Vishnu as such is actually a very good motif to use as it explains the policy without attaching negative characteristics to it, but as such it is one of the few such metaphors that could have been used. If I am honest I myself find it difficult to think of any way of explaining the policy of either the Protocols or Joly's pseudo-Machiavelli metaphorically without using either an octopus or Vishnu.

We may further observe that in Dialogue 12 and Protocol 12 the metaphor actually means something different in so far as Joly's pseudo-Machiavelli is saying that his press will fight each other at the explicit direction of the central power. While in Protocol 12 the meaning is quite different in that the Learned Elders are not actively directing the press, but rather using their control in a more passive way and only intervene; through their agents, when as they say the '*pulse quickens*' to prevent threats to their own power and program.

It is true there is a strong similarity between parts of the passages and the context in which they are presented, but the text is not nearly as close as is usually portrayed: particularly as Joly's pseudo-Machiavelli is talking about assigning one '*dedicated organ*' (i.e. a single newspaper) only to each position where-as the Protocols speak directly of newspapers and publishing in general placing no limit on the scale of their media system or suggesting that there is need for control of these newspapers to be active or centralized in any way.

As such then we can see that the Joly and Protocols comparison on this quote is actually not as close as Graves, Bernstein and Cohn think: as the quote differs substantially in what the object of such control is and how it is to be achieved. The only thing that is similar in part is the phrasing, which conforms to de Michelis' view of an indirect origin for these paraphrases.

With Dialogue 17 and Protocol 17 we have a similar situation with the metaphor of Vishnu again being used however this time the Dialogue and the Protocol do match each other far more closely than in Dialogue 12 and Protocol 12. In particular the use of word '*apologue*' (lit. '*account*') in the original text of Joly's '*Dialogue*', which has been changed into '*apologia*' (lit. '*speaking in defense*') in the Protocols. This occurs before the Vishnu metaphor, which cannot be coincidence precisely because it is so unusual an expression to use and combined with the commentary on the use of the police after both the Dialogue and the Protocols suggests that one comes the other.

That said there are some discrepancies: the Protocols actually divorces itself from the use of the '*official police*' preferring to use a network of informers (possibly a reference to the Jews in the Pale of Settlement) that will comprise one third of the population to spy on the other two thirds, while the Dialogue states that pseudo-Machiavelli would increase the network of police to about half the population as a '*vast institution*' so that no one in the other half of the population would be able to move without central government's knowledge.

Thus we can see that once again there is a similarity; although this time it is clear that the Protocols is a paraphrase of Joly, but that the meaning is quite different. This is reinforced by the '*apologue*' and '*apologia*' discrepancy in so far as whoever wrote the Protocols did not understand the subtle

difference in meaning: a fact that seems to my mind to strengthen the case for a Jewish origin precisely because the Jews of Russia would not have been very familiar with Greek work; whereas Christians such as Krushevan would have been, and would easily have transliterated the meaning from a term they had not heard of 'apologue' and replaced it into a term they had 'apologia' (hence the absurdity of 'apologia for the Hindu god Vishnu' which makes no logical sense whatsoever).

Thus we can see that in spite of the literary paraphrase of Joly the point of the argument made by the Protocols is neither debunked as part of an actual program or demonstrated that it comes from anti-Semites. Indeed as stated we can even see in the mistakes in the paraphrasing potential evidence for Jewish involvement.

The last of the examples cited by Wikipedia is from Joly's 20th Dialogue and proceeds thus:

'How are loans made? By the issue of bonds entailing on the Government the obligation to pay interest proportionate to the capital it has been paid. Thus, if a loan is at 5 percent, the State, after 20 years, has paid out a sum equal to the borrowed capital. When 40 years have expired it has paid double, after 60 years triple: yet it remains debtor for the entire capital sum.'

Is compared to Protocol 20:

'A loan is an issue of Government paper which entails an obligation to pay interest amounting to a percentage of the total sum of the borrowed money. If a loan is at 5 percent, then in 20 years the Government would have unnecessarily paid out a sum equal to that of the loan in order to cover the percentage. In 40 years it will have paid twice; and in 60 thrice that amount, but the loan will still remain as an unpaid debt.'

Now here we have a very clear case of a good and simple example being used by the Protocols from the Joly text in the figures used for the calculation of the loan. However this is as far it goes in as is demonstrated by actually quoting the context of both statements.

Joly's 20th Dialogue:

'It is here that I wanted to lead you. It is certain that few governments do not have the necessity of resorting to loans; but it is also certain that they are obligated to use them with discretion; they do not know how -- without involving immorality and danger -- to burden the generations to come with loads that are exorbitant and disproportionate to probable resources. How are loans made? By the issuance of securities that contain obligations on the part of the government to pay sums proportionate to the capital that is deposited with it. If the loan is at 5 percent, for example, the State -- at the end of 20 years -- must pay a sum equal to the loaned capital; at the end of 40 years, a double sum; at the end of 60 years, a triple sum, and yet it still remains a debtor for the totality of that capital. One can add that, if the State indefinitely

increases its debts, without doing anything to diminish them, it will be brought to the impossibility of borrowing any more capital or bankruptcy. Such results are easy to grasp: there is no country in which every person would not understand them. The modern States have also wanted to set necessary limitations on the growth of taxes. To this purpose, they have imagined what one has called the system of amortization, which is an arrangement truly admirable for the simplicity and the practical method of its execution. One creates a special fund, of which the capitalized resources are intended for the permanent redemption of the public debt through successive fractions, with the result that, every time the State borrows, it must endow the amortization fund with a certain amount of capital intended to wipe out the new debts in a given period of time. You will see that this method of limitation is indirect and that this is its power. By means of the amortization, the nation says to its government: "You will borrow if you are forced to, but you must still preoccupy yourself with meeting the new obligations that you incur in my name. When one is ceaselessly obligated to amortize, one will look twice before borrowing. If you regularly amortize, I will allow your loans to pass."

In comparison to Protocol 20:

'Every kind of loan proves infirmity in the State and a want of understanding of the rights of the State. Loans hang like a sword of Damocles over the heads of rulers, who, instead of taking from their subject by a temporary tax, come begging with outstretched palm of our bankers. Foreign loans are leeches which there is no possibility of removing from the body of the State until they fall of themselves or the State flings them off. But the gory States do not tear them off: they go on in persisting in putting more onto themselves so that they must inevitably perish, drained by voluntary blood-letting.

What also indeed is, in substance, a loan, especially a foreign loan? A loan is – an issue of government bills of exchange containing a percentage obligation commensurate to the sum of the loan capital. If the loan bears a charge of 5 percent, then in 20 years the State vainly pays away in interest a sum equal to the loan borrowed, in 40 years it is paying a double sum, in sixty thrice, and all the while the debt remains a debt unpaid.

From this calculation it is obvious that with any form of taxation per head the State is bailing out the last coppers of the poor taxpayers in order to settle accounts with wealthy foreigners, from whom it has borrowed money instead of collecting these coppers for its own needs without the additional interest.'

We can see from putting the two sections side-by-side that the parallel is actually quite minimal and is limited to talking about a similar subject and the use of the simple example given by the Dialogue in the Protocols. So while it is clear that the Protocols have used the Dialogue as an aid in

composition: they are not *'plagiarising'* or even paraphrasing it. They are merely taking an example as a benchmark in good expression.

I should add that one sees such example-based bench-marking throughout the Dialogue and Protocol comparisons such as in Dialogue 13's use of the expression *'tigers have souls of sheep, heads full of wind'* and Protocol 15's *'tigers in appearance have the souls of sheep and the wind blows through their heads'*. There isn't a parallel in either passages in terms of meaning, but rather the same metaphor or example is used to explain a point.

Sharp-eyed readers will also have noticed the expression *'sword of Damocles'* that was covered earlier; which is alleged to come from Chabry, and offers further evidence of the absurdity of the *'plagiarism'* argument leveled at the Protocols in that we are supposed to believe that the author or authors of the Protocols decided to combine two different *'plagiarisms'* from two very different works together and to have done it consistently.

This underlies my point about the simple lack of common sense in the anti-Protocols camp and how their seeing *'plagiarism'* everywhere has actually undermined their own central *'plagiarism'* argument by dragging it into absurdity.

Thus we can see that the claim that the Protocol's is a *'plagiarism'* of Joly is actually something of a toothless tiger itself as its central argument is based on the idea that the Protocols is merely a repeat of Joly's Dialogue and offers nothing substantial to it. However as we can see from working through Wikipedia's three examples: not only is this not the case, but when subjected to point for point comparison the Dialogue and the Protocols are substantially different if sometimes convergent on examples and metaphors.

If we bear in mind that all three of these examples are from the second section of Krushevan's 1903 edition (the most *'plagiarised'* part with 8 percent of the text allegedly coming from Joly's *'Dialogue'*) then we can see just how weak the anti-Protocols case is in that they are ignoring nearly all the text to focus their attention on selective examples of convergence.

I would add that while this does not remove the fact that Joly's *'Dialogue'* has been used it is not a case of *'plagiarism'* but rather as a simple benchmark aid to the composition, which proves very little other than that the author must have been aware of Joly's work. For which we can; as before stated, remove Krushevan from contention for being the author of the Protocols because of the Ukrainianisms in the original text which he did not write with.

References

(142) Eisner, Op. Cit., pp. 10-19 gives the simplest summary of these events.

(143) de Michelis, Op. Cit., pp. 53; 60

(144) Bolton, Op. Cit., p. 34

(145) Ibid.

(146) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 53

- (147) Bolton, Op. Cit., p. 34
- (148) See Simon Rigby, 2007, *'Engels and the Formation of Marxism'*, 1st Edition, Manchester University Press: Manchester.
- (149) See Heinz Frederick Peters, 1986, *'Red Jenny: A Life with Karl Marx'*, 1st Edition, Allen and Unwin: London.
- (150) Bolton, Op. Cit., p. 34
- (151) Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, 1971, [1816], *'Kunst und Alterthum am Rhein und Mayn'*, 1st Edition, Peter Lang: New York, p. 575
- (152) <http://mailstar.net/toolkit.html>
- (153) Bolton, Op. Cit., p. 34
- (154) <http://mailstar.net/toolkit.html>
- (155) Umberto Eco, 1994, *'Six Walks in the Fictional Woods'*, 1st Edition, Harvard University Press: Cambridge, pp. 135; 172
- (156) Ibid, p. 60
- (157) L. Fry, 1953, *'Waters Flowing Eastwards'*, 4th Edition, Britons: London, pp. 96-101
- (158) Graves, Op. Cit., pp. 4-5
- (159) Taguieff, Op. Cit., Vol. 2, p. 196
- (160) An excellent example of just this is Nikolai Skoblin who pretended to be an anti-Communist White Russian émigré, but was actually an agent for the Cheka.
- (161) Michael Kellogg, 2005, *'The Russian Roots of Nazism: White Émigrés and the Making of National Socialism 1917-1945'*, 1st Edition, Cambridge University Press: New York, pp. 63-70
- (162) Eisner, Op. Cit., p. 90
- (163) For a detailed discussion of this see Lionel Kochan (Ed.), 1971, *'The Jews in Russia since 1917'*, 1st Edition, Oxford University Press: New York.
- (164) Graves, Op. Cit., pp. 5-6
- (165) Ibid, p. 6
- (166) de Michelis, Op. Cit., pp. 52-53
- (167) Ibid, p. 54
- (168) <http://mailstar.net/toolkit.html>
- (169) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 55
- (170) Ibid, p. 8
- (171) Ibid.
- (172) <http://mailstar.net/toolkit.html>
- (173) de Michelis, Op. Cit., pp. 54-55
- (174) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Protocols_of_the_Elders_of_Zion#Maurice_Joly
- (175) Graves, Op. Cit., pp. 9; 13-14

The Protocols of Zion: The Facts, The Myths and The Lies (Part VII)

The third and final issue around the alleged '*plagiarism*' of the Protocols is one that I have mentioned several times previously: the use of near-direct quotes from Herzl's '*Der Judenstaat*' in the Protocols. Thus Herzl talks of his view that:

'Only repression reawakens in us the sense of belonging to our lineage, the antisemites also work for us. They only have to continue along their path, and the desire of the Jews to emigrate will awaken where it is yet to be, and will be reinforced where it is already present.' (176)

That statement is then condensed by the Protocols to something of exactly the same meaning, but said in much fewer words in the Krushevan edition of 1903. To wit that: '*antisemitism is necessary to guide our younger brothers.*' (177)

The sting is taken out of this statement by Nilus who modifies it to:

'Throughout all Europe, and by means of relations with Europe, in other continents also, we must create ferments, discords and hostility.' (178)

It is clear from these words that the Protocols is expressing a central Zionist idea in so far as an increase in anti-jewish sentiment that judges who is jewish by biology; not only by religious confession, (i.e. anti-Semitism as opposed to anti-Judaism) is presumed to create jews who do not want to assimilate with gentiles (in-line with the more traditional forms of Judaism). This then serves the purpose of the Learned Elders by separating the jews from the gentiles and preventing intermarriage, which was and is a perpetual worry and perceived bane for Zionists everywhere.

In addition to this we have a short quote from the prophet Nehemiah with a short commentary used in the original Krushevan 1903 edition of the Protocols to support this claim: "*You have given them kingdoms and peoples*": *not in Canaan alone, but in the whole world.*' (179)

This is clearly a Zionist theme in so far as it echoes the importance of Palestine to the jews (hence the Yom Kippur invocation '*Next Year in Jerusalem*') and also Herzl's own distinguishing demand that it be Palestine or nothing, which is stated as follows:

'Palestine is our ever-memorable historic home. The very name of Palestine would attract our people with a force of marvelous potency.' (180)

Thus we have a focus on regaining Palestine, which we should remember that Jews had attached no real name to as of yet and Canaan was as good as Zion, Israel and Judah which were inevitably being discussed and bandied around. This is then followed by Herzl's startling assertions that:

'If His Majesty the Sultan were to give us Palestine, we could in return undertake to regulate the whole finances of Turkey. We should there form a portion of a rampart of Europe against Asia, an outpost of civilization as opposed to barbarism. We should as a neutral State remain in contact with all Europe, which would have to guarantee our existence.' (181)

What Herzl is in effect could be read as stating here is that if the Jews were to be allowed to create a Jewish state in Palestine then the Jews will run the state and administration of Turkey (i.e. implied by the phrase *'undertake to regulate the whole finances of Turkey'*), which can be compared to Protocol 4 in Nilus:

'Thus, all the nations will be swallowed up in the pursuit of gold and in the race for it will not take note of their common foe.'

This passage also could be linked to the idea of the centrality of Jews to the world in Herzl's *'Der Judenstaat'* in so far as Herzl places Jews as a *'neutral'* country between East and West who are tacitly assumed to be in eternal conflict with each other (hence Herzl's statement about an *'outpost of civilization as opposed to barbarism'*). That which *'guarantees'* the existence of the Jews could also be read not as geography, but also as the Jewish commercial, social and religious networks which for so long have indisputably existed in Europe. (182)

Herzl's next statement that:

'The sanctuaries of Christendom would be safeguarded by assigning to them an extra-territorial status such as is well-known to the law of nations. We should form a guard of honour about these sanctuaries, answering for the fulfillment of this duty with our existence. This guard of honour would be the great symbol of the solution of the Jewish question after eighteen centuries of Jewish suffering.' (183)

Could similarly be interpreted in the light of Protocol 17 in Nilus:

'The King of the Jews will be the real Pope of the Universe, the patriarch of an international Church.'

'But, in the meantime, while we are re-educating youth in new traditional religions and afterwards in ours, we shall not overtly lay a finger on existing churches, but we shall fight them by criticism calculated to produce schism.'

This could be suggested to be policy derived from what Herzl has said in *'Der Judenstaat'* in particular because the comments have been prefigured by a discussion of how the Jews would step in acting like the defenders and mediators between warring nations, which closely parallels Herzl's

own qualifier to this statement about Christianity that the Jews would act as a neutral broker between East and West.

Now in effect what Herzl could be read as saying is that with the control of the '*sanctuaries of Christianity*' then Jews will gain control of a powerful bargaining chip with countries that are actually or nominally Christian in so far as the '*sanctuaries*' mean nothing to the Jews, but do mean something to their enemies so access to them can be held to ransom for certain ideological changes in Christian belief in addition to nations behaving to an extent.

As such then we can see that even so quick a comparison of Herzl's '*Der Judenstaat*' to the Protocols in either the Krushevan or Nilus edition throws up some remarkable concordances and even; as stated some near-direct quotations, between them. Some much so; in fact, that one anti-Protocols scholar has felt the need to address this in detail. (184)

Thus we can see that of the works that are claimed to have been used to create the Protocols: only two have any solid basis to them. These two are Joly's '*Dialogue*' and Herzl's '*Der Judenstaat*'. The '*Dialogue*' acts as source for good expressions and to a point some of the structure of the Protocols, but not nearly to the extent normally claimed. While Herzl's '*Der Judenstaat*' in contrast contributes a number of near-direct quotations in addition to a significant part of the general and specific thrust of the political philosophy and policies put forward in the Protocols.

It is then beholden onto to us to conclude that the Protocols; in spite of huge amount of the odium that has been heaped on them, do actually have a more solid basis in fact than is claimed by the anti-Protocols camp.

Ain't it Dead Yet?

One of the more memorable questions that frequently rears its head in discussions about the Protocols is the problem of why the Protocols have persisted in their career after apparently so many '*authoritative debunks*'. Eco offers a representative sample of such thinking when he charges that such beliefs are limited only to those who want to believe and those who are irrational (i.e. those who will not be swayed by on point rational argument). (185)

The issue with that kind of thinking is that it assumes that the theory of the moment on a given subject is the only rational one, while any and all others that disagree with that (outside of a narrow spectrum) are ipso facto irrational. This is; of course, rather intellectually incestuous in so far as it permits only a few interpretations and doesn't account for the possibility that there may be external factors at play (such as intellectual and cultural fashions or political/social norms and forms) which can and do influence the '*rational conclusions*' that researchers and scholars hold forth.

Nor does it account for the fact that the anti-Protocols camp's '*rational arguments*' are as much conspiracy theories as the pro-Protocols camp's '*irrational arguments*' with the former actually having less evidence than the latter. Indeed it would not be going too far to assert that the only

reason that the anti-Protocols camp's arguments are considered more '*rational*' is because they don't blame the jews (the proverbial saints) but rather blame the anti-Semites (the proverbial sinners). Thus fitting into the current intellectual philo-Semitic intellectual cosmos as opposed to standing four-square against it.

Unfortunately for the anti-Protocols camps: the only criterion for the rationality of a given argument is derived from whether it is supported by the totality of the evidence and as we have seen very few anti-Protocols (or pro-Protocols ones for that matter) take into account the totality of the evidence in the case of the Protocols. As my own work here is only a beginning of a much larger project: I cannot and will not claim to have done what my fellows are in the main yet to do. However I can hope to produce something to rival de Michelis' work on the pro-Protocols side of the fence in spite of my continuing to be an agnostic on the authenticity of the Protocols.

So to paraphrase Grobman's words on this subject: the Protocols ain't dead yet.

References

(176) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 48; a different and less anti-gentile translation is available at the following address: <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Zionism/herzl2d.html>. I shall use this later source going forward to allow the reader to quickly judge for themselves.

(177) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 48

(178) Protocols of Zion, Historical Review Press Edition, Op. Cit., p. 41

(179) de Michelis, Op. Cit., p. 49

(180) <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Zionism/herzl2b.html>

(181) Ibid.

(182) Michael Toch, 1994, '*Jewish Migration from Germany*', pp. 646-648 in Michael Toch (Ed.), 2003, '*Peasants and Jews in Medieval Germany*', 1st Edition, Ashgate: Burlington

(183) <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Zionism/herzl2b.html>

(184) Taguieff, Op. Cit., Vol. 1, pp. 161-176

(185) Eisner, Op. Cit., pp. vi-vii

The Marx, Darwin and Nietzsche Passage in the Protocols of Zion

It has come to my attention recently that I may not have covered a particular issue to do with the infamous Protocols of Zion specifically enough as people who have cited my work on the Protocols have never-the-less missed one of the side points I made in my original article.

That issue is very simple: in Protocol 2 (in the Nilus edition of the Protocols) there appears a passage which claims that Darwin, Marx and Nietzsche were jewish and/or Masonic agents.

For completeness I quote the passage from the normal Protocols text:

'Do not suppose for a moment that these statements are empty words: think carefully of the successes we arranged for Darwinism, Marxism and Nietzscheism. To us Jews, at any rate, it should be plain to see what a disintegrating importance these directives have had upon the minds of the goyim.' (1)

This is an passage that is massively problematic for proponents of the Protocols of Zion being at least a semi-truthful narrative of jewish ideas and intentions and/or as an intellectual methodology for understanding the jewish history and behavioural trends in the future. Conversely it is also one of the most common and rhetorically most powerful anti-Protocols arguments and it is frequently used to put proponents of the Protocols in a Catch 22.

Either they suggest with the Protocols Darwin, Marx and Nietzsche were jewish/Masonic agents (Marx is possible, but Darwin and Nietzsche are not) or the Protocols are textually incorrect: thus placing them at the intellectual mercy of the anti-Protocols debunker.

The problem for the anti-Protocols debunkers using this passage however is rather fundamental and actually informs us that they; ironically enough, tend to be ignorant of the scholarly literature around the Protocols (i.e. that they likely have an external reason to simple scholarship and intellectual reasoning to be arguing the anti-Protocols case).

That problem is fairly simple.

This passage doesn't form part of the original Protocols and is one of many additions to the text by the Christian mystic: Sergei Nilus. Where the Darwin, Marx and Nietzsche assertion comes from is obvious if we quote the original text of Pavlov Krushevan's serialised first edition of the Protocols.

To wit:

'The intellectuals [the "goyim"] are proud of their knowledge without logical verification, and put into practice all the notions dealing with science, written by our agents with the intention of

forming the minds in ways that will prove useful (the translator remembers the successes of Darwinism, of Marxism, of Nietzscheanism and the other unproven doctrines).' (2)

From this original text it is clear that the Darwin, Marx and Nietzsche quotation is nothing to do with the Protocols text itself: rather simply being an addition by Krushevan to illustrate the point being made by the original text, which Nilus has then worked into the text of the Protocols.

This then makes sense of what we call '*the translators note*' and explains why this quotation has been often used to; in my opinion incorrectly, situate the origin of the Protocols in a non-jewish Russian nationalist context as that is precisely where the translators note comes from!

However because this is not actually part of the Protocols and only Krushevan's interjection of his suggestion as to who and what the text is talking about: we can see that it cannot be used as part of the Protocols itself.

Thus necessarily the Darwin, Marx and Nietzsche statement cannot be used to '*debunk*' the Protocols, because it simply isn't part of the original Protocols!

References

(1) Protocols of Zion, 2002/2003 Historical Review Press Edition, p. 28

(2) Cesare de Michelis, 2004, '*The Non-Existent Manuscript: A Study of the Sages of Zion*', 1st Edition, University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln, p. 88

Theodor Fritsch's Foreword to his last Edition of the Protocols of Zion

Theodor Fritsch was in many ways the greatest and most prolific of any anti-Semite who has ever lived and has not been unjustly labelled the '*godfather*' of German anti-Semitism. However his large corpus of work; that spanned some fifty years worth of writing, research and correspondence, has unfortunately remained untranslated into English and since 1945 has received little attention in spite of Fritsch's massive importance to the intellectual acceptance of anti-Semitism in the German-speaking world as well as being a major inspiration to the fledgling NSDAP of which he quickly became a member. Indeed one may remember that it was Fritsch who largely inspired Goebbels' anti-Semitism when the two met at the very beginning of Goebbels' and very end of Fritsch's respective careers as significant historical figures.

Fritsch's best-known contribution to the anti-Semitic corpus however is his central involvement in the transmission and propagation of the Protocols of Zion in Germany and Austria. Without Fritsch's campaign on behalf of the Protocols; a subject on which he and those associated with him

wrote a great deal, it is unlikely that the Protocols would have been able to have had the influence they did, because it was Fritsch's *'Hammer Verlag'* that kept them alive and fought back against the time of Jewish abuse that was hurled against them.

Many of his arguments are now dated, but I think it is still important to lay before the world what Fritsch actually said and to this end I have translated his foreword to the 1933 edition of the *'Zionist Protocols'*. (1)

To wit:

'Foreword to the 12th to 14th Edition

In the past few years: the policy of the *"Elders of Zion"* has been revealed for many unbelievers with awful clarity. The mask is falling! The Jew looks back at us from all around betraying themselves. In forging their strategic plans Judah has forgotten that; due to the nature of those plans, there will be a reaction and a resistance from the oppressed people: who have now openly joined in battle with them. This moment of natural reaction against Judah is now and the fighting has broken out across the world.

This resistance is now beginning to apply the new racial aspect of all the weapons at its disposal: the most powerful of these are education and enlightenment about the true reasons for the problems we face today. Part of this educational work is to be found in the dissemination of the *"Zionist Protocols"*.

In 1931 the controversy was still unsettled: could the Protocols be true? This was discussed in the Introduction and Afterword of that edition. Today we have confirmation of their authenticity.

The Swedish newspaper *"Nation"* has reprinted the speech made by the Chief Rabbi Dr. Marcus Ehrenpreis on 1st May 1932 in the synagogue in Stockholm and which was originally published in the *"Judisk Tidsskrift"*. (2) We have reprinted the notorized translation from *"Nation"* below. (3)

It is important to say that the very honourable Chief Rabbi Dr. Marcus Ehrenpreis brings no dishonour to his name and does not tell his parishioners things that are not true. He has also given us the proof that is in your hands which establishes that the *"Protocols of the Elders of Zion"* are true: for he speaks of Herzl's work as the *"pre-established goal."* As according to his own statement the goal of the Jews from Biblical times down to the present is to rule the world and it should be recorded here. Some may still doubt the *"Protocols"*, but the words of the Chief Rabbi establish their authenticity without doubt to all reasonable people.

The defensive method of the Jews; to attack the Protocols as a forgery and a lie, no longer works. Now these claims only help us and harm the Jews themselves in the long run.

In this new edition of the “*Protocols*” no changes have been made and the Introduction and Afterword have remained unchanged due to their intrinsic value. For clarity only the individual Protocols have been divided thematically as they frequently treat several areas at the same time.

Theodor Fritsch,
Leipzig 1933,

“An Enlightening Statement from the Jewish Times:

The program for Jewish world conquest; which Theodor Herzl the Founder of Zionism, brought forth at the Zionist Congress of Basel in 1897, that was compiled as "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion" happened to come at a very appropriate time for the non-Jewish eyes of the world, which had come to a growing realisation of the importance of the Jewish Question.

For the plans; laid out in the program, have been shown to be extremely reflective of reality and to date practically all of the predictions they have made have come to pass. Of special interest to us Swedes is a statement regarding the decision by the Chief Rabbi of the Jewish community in Stockholm; Dr Marcus Ehrenpreis, who in-front of the Jewish Academic Club gave a speech destined to be reprinted in the Jewish Times. According to the aforementioned newspaper Dr Ehrenpreis said among other things: (4)

"We have during the past three to four decades become emancipated, but yet not fully free. They gave us liberty, but we did not have the courage to accept it in full. We should state that this applies for Eastern and Western Jews alike. Many could not stomach the freedom given to us and have to this day kept the fear of god's vengeance inside them. (5) There is unmotivated anxiety to be yourself and to use the freedom we've been given.

I participated along with Herzl in the First Zionist Congress in Basel in 1897. This congress is the most memorable of my all my life's experiences. Herzl held us together in a previously unfathomable way at this first Jewish World Conference. His work led to an agreed common goal.

As it was for the Prophets of Israel who saw the victory of the Persians before any others and decades before the events. So it is with Herzl that twenty years before we saw the first signs of the World War, (6) he warned us what would come. He had foreseen the destruction of Turkey as he had foreseen that England would take Palestine when Turkey fell. We stand in the presence of living history: as he said twenty years before the World War and saw how these events would open up new possibilities for the Jewish people. When he closed his eyes: he could die with knowledge that his work would live on.

Today; twenty-five years after his death, we can look at the consequences of his work. Fifty countries have given England the mission of sovereignty of Palestine and have admitted the historical connections of the Jewish people to that land. (7)

"This day we have removed the shame of Egypt from you".

And now the most important thing of all is now coming to pass. Now every faithful [Jewish] citizen can live and suffer in their homeland with our ancestors from whom we are descendants having the obvious right as well as the clear duty to participate in the work on behalf of Israel. (8) We now finally have clarity and it seems like a miracle. Happy is our generation who can experience this joyful event and whose consequences this moment alone can not encompass: the unification of the entire Jewish nation above religious and political differences.

In the book of our ancient history we are starting a new leaf."

That the above German text matches with the Swedish text here attached is hereby officially certified.

Gothenburg, 22 December 1932

Signed Adolf Salzmänn

Translator Publicus.

Siegel + stamp (Translator Publicus * Gothenburg *)'

References

- (1) I have frequently altered Fritsch's literal text in order to preserve his meaning for an English speaking audience as I feel this is the best way to read him and also prevent the reader becoming hung up on oddities of expression.
- (2) Best translated as '*Jewish Times*'.
- (3) Rather than translate the German translation of the original Swedish: Hans Blackthorne has translated the original Swedish text of the report into English.
- (4) Compare to the not dissimilar reflections of the Baseler Rav who was instrumental to the conference in Arthur Cohn, 1972, '*Of Israel's Teachings and Destiny: Sermons, Studies and Essays*', 1st Edition, Ahron Press: New York, pp. 111-119
- (5) Ehrenpreis is talking about the fear of becoming too '*goyische*' (like gentiles and therefore unjewish) by leaving the segregated life of many jewish communities and possibly destroying the jews by too much integration.
- (6) World War One.
- (7) This is a reference to the Treaty of Versailles and the agreements on the division of territory that were agreed before it and then ratified in large part by it.
- (8) Ehrenpreis here does not mean '*Israel*' as in the state, but '*Israel*' in terms of Judaism or put more simply: the jewish nation. So he is basically calling his listeners to arms as members of the jewish nation to work for the creation of a jewish state in Palestine.

Theodor Fritsch's Afterword to his last Edition of the Protocols of Zion

Theodor Fritsch was in many ways the greatest and most prolific of any anti-Semite who has ever lived and has not been unjustly labelled the 'godfather' of German anti-Semitism. However his large corpus of work; that spanned some fifty years worth of writing, research and correspondence, has unfortunately remained almost totally untranslated into English and since 1945 has received little attention in spite of Fritsch's massive importance to the intellectual acceptance of anti-Semitism in the German-speaking world as well as being a major inspiration to the fledgling NSDAP of which he quickly became a member. Indeed one may remember that it was Fritsch who largely inspired Goebbels' particularly virulent anti-Semitism when the two met at the very beginning of Goebbels' and very end of Fritsch's respective careers as significant historical figures.

Fritsch's best-known contribution to the anti-Semitic corpus however is his central involvement in the transmission and propagation of the Protocols of Zion in Germany and Austria. Without Fritsch's campaign on behalf of the Protocols; a subject on which he and those associated with him wrote a great deal, it is unlikely that the Protocols would have been able to have had the influence they did, because it was Fritsch's 'Hammer Verlag' that kept them alive and fought back against the time of Jewish abuse that was hurled against them.

Many of his arguments are now dated, but I think it is still important to lay before the world what Fritsch actually said and to this end I have translated his afterword to the 1933 edition of the 'Zionist Protocols'. (1) (2)

To wit:

'Afterword

To many people the 'Protocols' will appear as a psychological mystery. Blinded by the glare of the unusual light in which they are shown here many will be unable to distinguish much of their message in their everyday lives. Like a bad dream: it will pass many a mind by.

It is necessary to repeatedly read the text to discover that it is indeed an embarrassingly elaborate program aimed at the establishment of Jewish world domination and to discover in many aspects of public the existence of Jewish supremacy and the acts of those Jews which conform to the conspiracy.

As far as anyone can attentively recognize these 'Protocols' inform us that: within honourable peoples [of Europe] lives a hostile element, which seeks by every nefarious trick and vile deception

to disturb the peaceful prosperity of the societies in which it resides. This activity is informed by the delusion of Jewish racial superiority. This delusion in turn relies on the imagination: a display of spirit and ability over all other nations by an exalted race that was destined by God to rule over the whole earth.

Selfless, honourable people who understand the nature of their manifest gifts put these innate qualities at in the service of the national community, work hard to excel in their chosen field(s) and win the trust of others allowing them to rise to positions of influence and thus straightforwardly and honestly achieve a dominant position in society. They would then find plenty of opportunity to manifest their community-orientated spirit, to express their creative abilities and show their truly charitable disposition. By such a medium are important people developed and are enabled to further enrich the national community with their innate gifts.

This way was not that of the Jews. Not open to fair competition with other equally or more qualified people: they sought to give effect to dominate by the underhanded and dishonourable methods of trickery and cunning. Keeping their plans secret they formed among themselves a conspiratorial organisations, which initially excluded all non-Jews from their community and nurtured an unmistakable hostility against all gentiles. This hostility was however carefully concealed and disguised by a seemingly harmless and pious nature. An open expression of the hostile attitude would have complicated and potentially compromised their objectives.

It wasn't by hard work and manifest courage that the Jew wanted to conquer the world, but rather by the use of devious cunning. In this no means; fair or foul, was considered beneath him. In order to paralyse the strength of the honourable man: the Jew undermined the economic, social and moral order. He deliberately fostered all evil desires and inclinations among non-Jews: hatred, jealousy, rebellion, licentiousness, debauchery and vices of every description. The ruling classes the Jew wore down by preying on their weaknesses and mistakes. However we need not further enumerate the many villainies by which the state and our society have been undermined and which have described in the 'Protocols' with such cynicism.

To understand this system of ruthless deception it is necessary to delve a little deeper into the Jewish nature. Eagle-eyed researchers have; for more than fifty years, uncovering important information about Judaism, but the mass of the population - and even the majority of well-educated people - have remained steadfastly ignorant these valuable revelations. The Jews are still for the majority of people still; as Heinrich Heine described them, 'a real mystery.'

Therefore, it seems necessary for me to give another short sketch of the character of the Jewish nature especially in relation to their strange sense of morality and philosophy of life.

The Jews consider themselves; as every child knows from reading the Bible, the 'chosen people' and by that title the special favorites of God. God has; they think, granted special privileges in the world and promised them even more that is to come. Their conception of God are certainly of a peculiar kind for the Jewish God has eyes only for this peculiar people and he showers on them all his love and favours. Yes: he has even allowed the Jews to commit all kinds of injustice against

other nations and the concomitant morality that he teaches them can be summarized in the words: Everything that is of benefit to the Jews is allowed and indeed sanctified. The Jewish God even helps his people in the fraud and the destruction of non-Jews. When helping the Jews escape from Egypt: Yahweh-Jehovah councils them to steal all the silver and golden vessels from Egyptians.

The Jewish God has a special hatred for and revengeful thirst against all non-Jews and he recommends exterminating them and stealing all their wealth.

It is evident that this strange misanthropic, and fire-breathing 'God' is nothing in common with the 'Heavenly Father' of Christianity, which is full of gentleness and kindness toward all people.

In the reasoning behind of these strange ideas about God and the chosen nature of the Jews: the Rabbis come to some very strange conclusions in their Talmudic writings. They teach that the Jews are the only real humans and that God created the world only for them. The non-Jews are regarded as being equivalent to the animals and their only reason for existence is to serve the Jews. Yahweh gave the Jews the right to all the treasures of the world; which the non-Jews have unjustly accumulated, because everything actually belongs to them as the 'chosen nation' of Yahweh. The Jew shall have the right to bring all that is owned by foreigners [non-Jews] into his hands. He commits no wrong in doing so, because he only takes back what already belongs to him as Jew. The Rabbis however advise the Jew to proceed with caution and care to ensure that non-Jews do not notice what he is doing and make sure that the good reputation of the Jews will not be in any way tarnished.

Through this reasoning the Rabbis allow any fraud and crime against the non-Jews (Goyim or Akum) while preserving their sage-like appearance and good reputation.

The Shulchan Aruch says: 'The possession of non-Jews (Akum) is as unclaimed property, and who comes first has the advantage.' And clarifies itself with the sentence: 'The best of the Akum are those who are dead!'

The Jews have not only a differing view on human morality: they also differ in their legal and political principles. The Talmud is not only a work of religious law, but also a legal code and a political constitution. Are the Jews by virtue of their special law to this day a state within state despite their dispersion over many different lands? And is this Jewish law so tightly bound on the Jews that he can never truly be a sincere member of a non-Jewish state?

The Jew can recognize only a state with a Jewish government. So must the Jew be a revolutionary in non-Jewish state and seeks to turn it into a Jewish state with the help of non-Jewish revolutionaries: in essence he will not rest till the non-Jewish authorities are eliminated. Toleration is not enough for the Jew as what he demands is that the non-Jews give him the right to rule.

The Jews are well aware of the state and its hostility towards their actions hence they prescribe the death penalty to those who reveal their teachings to the Gentiles and especially those educated in

the ways of the Talmud. Thus we should appreciate the credibility of statements that are made by those who come forward about what the Talmud teaches.

These facts must be known in order to truly understand the horrors of the 'Zionist Protocols'.

One might ask how it is possible that non-Jews down the centuries have been so completely enthralled by the Jewish deception. This should not be taken as evidence for a lower mental capacity among non-Jews precisely because had they recognised that they had been cheated and tricked by the Jews then they would have been derided by others who were still en hoc to the Jews. It is little wonder then that the Jews see us as a 'flock of sheep' and speak of the 'animal mind of the goyim.'

We should also realise that this Jewish fraud has also been delicately woven. The Jew began where the human mind is at its deepest and most vulnerable: in religion. We learned from our youth look up to the Jews as a sublime and 'holy people.' The Bible's teaching aroused in us the idea that every other culture and religion had descended from the Jews. It introduced us to the idea of the Jews as agents of God, whom could alone bring salvation to the people. This was the most shameless fraud that was perpetrated on the honest masses and was committed under the guise of religion. This religious delusion prevented us from discerning the true nature of the Jew. From this curtailing of critical thought; and in some minds of all reason and morality, most people cannot make sense of what is truly occurring all around them.

The Bible's teachings had given them rose-tinted glasses, which prevent them; at least in respect to the nature of the Jews, from seeing things as they really were. Although the greatest minds of every age have raised their voices and warned of the treacherous enemies, but the fact that these warnings had been raised was carefully concealed from the mass of the people. The few far-sighted individuals of the last fifty years who watched the activities of the Jews and sounded warnings afresh were subjected to a large amount of public ridicule and scorn.

The press has since that time been mainly in the hands of the Hebrews and the non-educated masses were deceived and intoxicated with nonsensical ideas like freedom, progress, humanity and tolerance. So much so that every outspoken word against Judah was branded a 'throwback to the days of blackest reaction.' In 1860 one of the finest minds of Germany wrote; under the name H. Naudh (Heinrich Nordmann), a scholarly book entitled 'The Jews and the German Government', which elegantly and masterfully probed every side of the Jewish Question, but our ruling class: statesmen, politicians and scholars have done anything with that information.

Of course, the Hebrews even then had all the influential personalities surrounded by themselves and their agents that no honest man was able to get to or influence them in any way. All messages to those in influence had to pass through the checkpoints of this system of Jewish censorship. In this way all the rulers and the ruling classes were left in an appalling state of ignorance of the most important questions of the moment. The artificial creation of the different aspects of control was a stunning success and was performed in exactly the same manner which the 'Protocols' openly boast of.

When we come to the reign of Wilhelm II: the entire corps German government officials and diplomatic officials not a single good mind was present any longer. The few that showed talent were moved; by the Wise Men of Zion, from public office to better salaried places in the large corporations and banks.

Our future politicians and diplomats will have to go to these rogues from the Orient to be schooled in the doctrine; but in fact to learn the basics, of the art of government. And to provide this the 'Zionist Protocols' are an excellent teaching tool. The statesman must know above all the means by which revolutionaries use to undermine the national community and the state. Only then can he take the necessary countermeasures to prevent the success of the Jews. Otherwise: he will fall prey to their machinations.

Given these facts: the shameless man will be inclined to grant the Jews a real mental superiority. He forgets that the Hebrews emerged from a sect of thieves and even today seek to improve their condition by theft; though in a more refined form, with their very existence founded always on the ridicule and reversal of all morality. Their Talmudic teachings are simply put a mockery of morality. They are born fraudsters and it therefore common for less honourable people to make the most unsparing use of these Jewish insights: unaffected as they are by any scruples of conscience. The Jews have developed a pettifogging virtuosity which falsely links the material benefit of an something directly to whether it is moral or immoral. Their first principle is 'Anything that benefits the people of Judah is moral and holy', which is a doctrine that Friedrich Nietzsche confessed the greatest admiration for. He called it 'the grand style in morality.' Healthier people call it criminality.

In fact what our [Jewish] 'ruling class' understands of the art of manipulating the emotional wiles of the mob and directing the public mind is evident on the subject of the railways, which were beneficial to the prosperity of the whole.

Just read the relevant passages of the Protocols again and recall how unlikely it is that an Aryan mind could entertain such thoughts. As if heads with such insight were in important positions: they would have seen through Judaism much earlier and the Jews would never been able to sneak into their dominant position. The few individuals who suspected something of these events were publicly attacked in the press as 'fanatical Jew-haters'.

We should note that an enormous amount of wisdom lies hidden in this 'Zionist Protocols' but this wisdom is degraded by the purpose that it has been harnessed. If those minds which could contrive such things did not pursue anti-social special interests: then they would almost certainly be perceptive men with a great deal of psychological insight who would be leaders of a coup d'etat. In their sharp insights into the social and intellectual processes active in the body of the people: they have developed those talents which allow them to move aside and render innocuous the former ruling classes. The old ruling class believed they would prevail without making any mental effort to do so. They assumed that their right to rule was a matter of course, but it was just an outdated legacy and were not aware that the right to rule has to be constantly re-earned and defended. If you

become lazy and they abandoned the evolving technologies and institutions to the zealous corrupters of the people who took over where they had left off.

The old aristocrats didn't comprehend how they were being abused and fooled by these crafty fraudsters. To the eyes of the thief and the burglar: the clumsy accounting of the 'rulers' to the people was simply a farce directed by them to increase their own power in the long-term. The great and good of today should learn from the 'Protocols' about the nature of the shameful role that they played.

In any case: to anyone wishing to study political science the 'Protocols' must be the subject of serious study. Here we can learn how to set up an authoritarian regime based on the worthlessness and the destruction of the spirit of the people. In the Protocols you can learn about how the Jews are going to treat you if they what they envision is to come to pass.

When we see the phrase: 'True freedom consists in the inviolability of the person who honourably and strictly observes all the laws of social life.' Then we can see that the Protocols are absolutely right! Now, it is of the Hebrews, who rejects his Talmudic law by any honest community with others and thus was born the destroyer of community life.

The existence of the 'Zionist Protocols' as a work program for the secret society is a politically clear-sighted and unshakable fact. It is our duty to anticipate their aims and goals. The state must defend itself against this secretive clan, which in assumed disguise of harmlessness creeps into all positions of authority in order to use them to implement nefarious policies which directly against the best interests of the state. We must finally recognize the warning raised by sharp-eyed people as early as 1797: in that in Judaism we are dealing with a virtual state, which engages in constant warfare against all other states. We must also concede the truth of the warning written in 1886. 'The way the Jews on the Earth is a campaign for the world domination, under the cover of a false flag while in the midst of their enemies, but yet ready at any moment to assault and steal from them.'

Where have our princes and statesmen had their heads when they dismissed and ignored of all these warnings? We must now consider the practical application of the new information embodied in the 'Zionist Protocols'.

What use are all well-meaning declarations and treaties all with the goal of establishing world peace as long as the fires of discord between the nations are so obvious. Behind the nations and their governments is a hidden power that is tirelessly stoking the internal and external strife between the parties in conflict and which leads to new conflicts and wars. This is all betrayed in the 'Zionist Protocols'.

But the psychological aspect of this new information is the most important and valuable.

It is true that the Jews dominate today not only by virtue of their money power and all the clever machinations; which are portrayed in the 'Protocols', but also by the force of a relentless will in

contrast to the weak will-power of the non-Jewish peoples which is the cause of much of their current condition. The spirit of the Gentiles has been paralysed mostly due to the fact that they are not aware of the connections between today's events and the authors of them. Those who fumble around helplessly in the dark and are attacked by invisible enemies cannot develop courage and fight back successfully. The recognition of the enemy and his weapons is the first prerequisite for a successful defense. And this is the use to which we can put the 'Protocols' Their distribution in all social classes and religious groups of our nation is the first condition of our recovery and liberation from Jewish domination.

Whether the non-Jewish peoples have mental strength enough to hake off the Jewish vampire remains to be seen. Of course: the spiritual blood that the Jewish monster have been sucked out of the non-Jewish peoples becomes a part of their will and their life force meaning that as the Gentiles become weaker the Jews become stronger. Nevertheless: the clear recognition of our situation will forge new strength in us.

To once again raise the question of authenticity of the 'Zionist Protocols':

I cannot imagine an Aryan head capable of creating such a shamelessly consistent system of mischievous malice. It may be added that during the translation of the 'Protocols' into other languages: the occasionally quite convoluted phraseology on the part of the translator; perhaps unconsciously interpolated, has been subject to some intensification and exaggeration, but the authenticity of the basic ideas is not in doubt. So well do the 'Protocols' anticipate events that two decades ago the public had not yet realised; for example, the jewish origin of Freemasonry, but yet the 'Protocols' anticipates this fact which has now been established. You should also remember that throughout the Protocols numerous mentions of the 'World War' are made when the 'Protocols' were written in the 1897 or 1901!

And what reason could a non-Jew have had to take the trouble to prepare a detailed plan for the continuous plundering and subjugation of the non-Jewish peoples? If a non-Jewish mind was actually capable of concocting such wily and rascally plans then why do they not dominate international finance? The whole system of thought upon which these statements are based is to the Aryan mind so alien that it seems incomprehensible to many. It is only perverse minds trained in the study of the Talmud that could consciously entertain such thoughts. The English translator Marsden stated for example that he had to work only an hour a day on his translation of the 'Protocols', because their unnatural and dishonest reasoning made him feel quite ill.

It is difficult to imagine anyone with so sharp an eye for human frailties and abilities, with such a pragmatic and relentless appreciation and mastery of all elements of political power and influence who believes the Jews might perhaps be the appointed arm of the nation's destiny other than the Jews themselves. The Jew thinks that you should experiment and entrust the supreme authority to the Hebrews. The Jew would however once in official power not let go of his fateful dominance.

Care would be taken; as outlined in the 'Protocols', to brutally suppress of any public criticism of conditions in the Jewish State.

The requirement that everything is to be regarded as the property of the state and its Jewish king is hard to imagine to a non-Jewish mind. Likewise; the radical transformation of the financial system, as described in the Protocols, bears the distinct marks of Jewish resourcefulness and experience.

In the 'Protocols' the concealment of the Jewish hand in the proposals on the co-opting of the legal profession and the taxation of the rich are quite logical. What would cause a non-Jew; seeking to discredit the Hebrews, to impute such sensible measures to them?

No: the Zionist Protocols are quite true and whoever wants to see absolute truth in the psychological and political instinct or wishes to disclose that truth will find it in the 'Protocols'. The inexorable consequences, as they are outlined in the Protocols on the treatment of the judicial system are hardly likely to have sprung from non-Jewish heads. These include the Jewish ruthlessness and fanaticism. German thought is far too modest, too dominated by the concepts of equality and justice to be capable of the cruel consequences of such a plan. That this is the case shows clearly the devilish nature of the Jews.

Further would a non-Jewish brain have come up with the idea of giving Jewish activities such a bright halo as was done in the Protocols? Who would have it occurred to that the Jews would come up to whitewash their actions and plans in such a way?

Which non-Jew could so accurately predict the future Jewish sovereignty and glorify in such and sing the praises of a king from the House of David as the Protocols does?

No: the 'Protocols' are real! In every part they ooze a Talmudic character and outlook on life, which is the true stamp of genuine Jewish worthlessness.

The 'Protocols' should be regarded as fully authenticated evidence for danger that emanates from the Jews and which targets non-Jews.

Who after reading the 'Protocols' is still in serious doubt about their authenticity?

Even if we assume that the 'Protocols' had not emerged from Jewish hands: they are still a descriptive masterpiece of Jewish ideas and plans. If this was so they could only have been created by an ingenious mind, which had looked into the deepest chasms of the Jewish soul. Yes: the author could even be called a prophet, because he managed to predict numerous events decades before they occurred and identified them as the intentions and plans of world Jewry. This is amazing precisely because things have played out in the last twenty years exactly as the 'Protocols' described.

When asked Henry Ford what proofs he possessed for the authenticity of the Protocols, he said: 'Only one: they fit current events seamlessly.'

But has it now reached the point that where we; an age-old people, have to get lessons on how to set up a state that is rational and dominates? We need to learn from these Jewish fraudsters and create a government that ruthlessly suppresses its enemies.

Those men who want to take control of the future destiny of the people into their hands will have to remember to create a similarly clear program as given in the 'Protocols'. One could perhaps call it the 'Aryan Counter Protocols'. It would have to have the same relentless consistency, which in the case of 'Protocols' justified deceit and crime, to justify the protection of the honourable man and the defense of civilization and reason against their many enemies.

But one thing is undeniable from studying the 'Protocols' in that Judaism may no longer be tolerated among us! It is the honourable duty of civilized nations to eliminate this mangy cur which by its very presence permeates and pollutes everything and which poisons the spiritual and intellectual atmosphere in which we have to try breath.

The Jew is a born forger, a spy and a traitor: he is the Wandering Jew of legend. Where freedom is granted to him: he spreads seemingly random confusion and destruction by his unfettered presence, but this made even worse by the conspiratorial practices that are described in the 'Protocols'.

It would be wrong to put all the blame for our plight to the Jews. We always want to admit that our own weaknesses and mistakes have contributed much to our decline: our indifference and indolence in spiritual terms as well as our lack of resolve and selectiveness in moral matters. Certainly we need to start to improve in the basic elements of our existence through strict discipline and order in all areas, by breaking away from materialism, by the establishing new ideals and by striving to be better in ourselves. All this is only possible if the immoral and materialistic influences; emanating today from the infection that is Judaism, are eliminated.

One cannot fight the plague unless one can move freely in the land of its victims. The 'Protocols' are useful thus to prove that this infection is not just random, but consciously cultivated. The Jews spread corruption and moral decadence, because they are tools to place the Jews in a position of unprecedented power. The Jew wants a dull, mixed and subservient human race so he can enslave it undisturbed. They seek to violate the roots of everything that makes up the self-sovereignty and dignity of man and which can lift it to purer heights: in other words to eliminate the divine spark in man. Under Jewish tyranny mankind would degenerate into a mindless herd of slaves whom pay; in their compulsory labour, for the decadent feasts of the Jewish tyrants. The mighty Soviet Jews have already provided the evidence about just how deadly serious they are about the destruction and enslavement of the goyim.

The Jew has a mission in the world: the mission of vermin in nature. It increases where there is dirt and laziness and drives us; by his animal tortures, into activity and cleanliness.

We must clean the world around us and there his place no more for the Jews among us!

With the elimination of Judaism many of the evils from which the civilised nations of the world suffers from would simply disappear.

The cleansing has to begin with the raising of our spirits. The Jews spread evil, confusion, greed and stupidity around us. The stupefied are all caught in their net and they; brutalized by the Jews, become a helpers. Let the people see; especially the poor workers and day labourers who the Jews have blinded, that a bridge can be built by which these evils can be remedied.

We have an inexhaustible arsenal of powerful spiritual weapons against the insidious enemy of mankind.

The great minds from across the ages are on our side. That this is withheld from the people is one of the most villainous tricks of Jewish propagandists.

Hurry to spread the truth, while the power of the great deceiver is still growing and before; as previously planned, all anti-jewish literature is suppressed and anti-jewish criticism is held to be a crime against humanity!

*Theodor Fritsch,
February 1924, Leipzig'*

References

(1) I have frequently altered Fritsch's literal text in order to preserve his meaning for an English speaking audience as I feel this is the best way to read him and also prevent the reader becoming hung up on oddities of expression. I have also eliminated some passages which are both difficult to translate; even figuratively, without losing the reader (as Fritsch was keen on nuance that would mean explaining aspects of German nationalist thought from the late 20th century in order to make any sense).

(2) My translation of the Preface can be found at the following address:

<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2012/08/theodor-fritschs-foreword-to-his-last.html>

Jacob Kovalio and the Protocols of Zion

You occasionally come across people in academia who really make you ponder as to whether they are actually sane or simply an ideological hack. Jacob Kovalio of Carleton University in Canada is one such individual.

I will cover Kovalio's argumentation and how it firmly plops itself down in the insane realms of modern jewish supremacism in a separate article. In this article however I wished to specifically

address Kovalio's claims in regards to the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion in his recent-ish work: *'The Russian Protocols of Zion in Japan'*. (1)

I must own that when I read the work I was rather surprised that Peter Lang, a respected academic publisher, would deign to put their imprint to a work filled with an awful lot of (bad) rhetoric and but a thin slither of scholarship. Kovalio seems to have an extremely bad habit of making misstatements of fact and misrepresenting the literature as well as simply not doing his research.

To be sure Kovalio does provide some original research in the body of the work – although his non-technical arguments are poor and he extensively uses the selective reproduction of source material to fit his (apparently pre-conceived) thesis – but it is heavily marred by absurd chapters claiming that everybody and their aunt is *'anti-Semitic'* (including Winston Churchill no less [contra Gilbert]), (2) that *'anti-Semitism has nothing to do with jews'*, (3) that jews who do not practice Judaism aren't jews (contra the relevant halakhah and rabbinic authors as well as contradicting himself on this later in said work) (4) and that he (Kovalio) understands the meaning of papal bulls and canon law better than the Pope in Rome. (5)

No more obvious is this Colonel Blimp-esque approach to academic writing than in Kovalio's comments on his erstwhile subject: the Protocols of Zion.

Since I am not an expert on the Japanese language or its literature; I won't comment on Kovalio's characterization of the intellectual and popular debates that surrounded the Protocols of Zion in Japan. I will confine my comments on the Protocols of Zion and not on how said text has been viewed in the land of the Rising Sun.

Now Kovalio – who claims to have read the literature on the Protocols of Zion (of which I have my doubts) – claims that the idea of a Parisian Okhrana origin for the document is the *'interpretative consensus'*. (6) His source for this is Norman Cohn who originated the thesis, but failed to address refutations of his positions by Russian scholars among others. Cesare de Michelis has also recently refuted Cohn's assumptions and the evidence on which he based them, which leaves Kovalio in a difficult intellectual position. (7)

To address this Kovalio claims - without citing a source - that de Michelis' work was badly translated into English (by a specialist academic publisher no less) and seeks to imply that de Michelis agrees with Cohn's thesis when he does not. (8)

In a similarly dishonest vein Kovalio asserts that Jacobs and Weitzman's work supports his position. (9) In fact these two authors simply wrote a non-scholarly book that *'refutes'* the Protocols text of Nilus translated into English by pseudo-Marsden, which is incidentally as nonsensical as refuting Homer by using the Homeric Hymns. Jacobs and Weitzman do not offer any detailed – let alone substantive - commentary or critique on the debate as to the origins of the Protocols of Zion. (10)

Kovalio's citation of Stephen Bronner's work is at least valid. (11) However he fails to inform the reader that Bronner's work is again not a detailed or substantive discussion of the 'origins debate'

(like Kovalio he doesn't cite or discuss most of the literature or the points of contention), but simply declares for Cohn's Paris Okhrana thesis. Bronner's work (*'A Rumor about the Jews'*) is nothing more than a scholarly (if at times irrational and pejorative) discussion of anti-Semitism and its links with the Protocols of Zion.

Another example of this... shall we say... cavalier attitude to interpreting the academic literature can be seen when Kovalio lists the *'experts'* who *'agree'* with his opinion that the Protocols were faked by the Russian Okhrana in Paris. (12) Most of whom, such as John Gwyer, I note are from the early twentieth century and are not even widely used or cited by scholars in the origins debate (unlike say Henri Rollin who Kovalio doesn't cite). Kovalio also fails to note the existence of major contributors in the debate around the origins of the Protocols of Zion who disagree with him such as Cesare de Michelis and Sergei Dudakov.

It is also worth noting that Kovalio happily cites the work of Michael Lepekhn as a scholarly authority in the 'Tsarist forgery' school of thought, but fails to mention other prominent Russian scholars on the Protocols who argue against this thesis (and that they are real) such as Begunov.

In the foregoing discussion I have already demonstrated the sloppy scholarship that characterizes Kovalio's work. However it only gets sloppier and more dishonest.

For example Kovalio is apparently (and hilariously) unaware that Leslie Fry was the pen name of Paquita Louise de Shishmareff (nee Louise Chandor), but yet deigns to comment on her work. (13)

Fry wrote *'Waters Flowing Eastwards'* which covers the early origins debate from the *'Protocols are genuine'* position. She was also a close associate of Monsignor Jouin, who published the *'Revue Internationale des Sociétés Secrètes'* (aka R.I.S.S.) as well as four major works on the origins of the Protocols, and as such is an oft-cited source in the origins debate. Yet Kovalio doesn't seem to know even basic biographical details about her (despite them being well known to modern scholars of the Protocols), but that doesn't stop him citing her work!

Another instance of dire (and dare I say deliberate) misrepresentation is when Kovalio cites Princess Catherine Radziwill – who is incidentally Cohn's only documentary evidence for his thesis – as evidence for the Paris Okhrana thesis. (14) Kovalio describes her as a *'leading antisemitic Polish aristocrat'* (15) when Radziwill was actually relatively philo-Semitic for the time as can be seen from actually reading her many publications.

Kovalio clearly intends these labels to lend authority to Radziwill's statements, but he forgets to inform the reader that Radziwill was also a convicted fraudster. (16) Oh and that her claims to have seen the Protocols in the possession of Tsarist officialdom amount to: *'I saw a piece of paper that had writing on it that I think might have been the Protocols about twenty years ago.'* (17)

Sounds really credible: doesn't it?

Then we've got Kovalio's assertion that the man Phillip Graves, a journalist writing for the Times, met in Constantinople and allegedly told him that the Protocols of Zion were plagiarized from the work of an obscure French author named Maurice Joly was a '*Tsarist emigre*' and '*former Okhrana agent*'. (18)

Kovalio however simply forgets to mention that Graves never revealed the identity of the man he referred to as 'Mr. X' and to this day we still do not know who said individual was. Therefore referring to an unknown source as a '*Tsarist emigre*' and '*former Okhrana agent*' is simply disingenuous and the use of appeal to authority.

Thus we can see that Kovalio isn't exactly hot on factual accuracy or scholarly caution, but on the contrary rather cavalier about such matters in regards to the origins debate around the Protocols of Zion. In my follow up article this I will further demonstrate that this habitual misrepresentation likely derives from Kovalio's extreme Zionism and Jewish nationalism as well as that it isn't just limited to the Protocols of Zion.

References

- (1) Jacob Kovalio, 2009, *The Russian Protocols of Zion in Japan: Yudayaka/Jewish Peril Propaganda and Debates in the 1920s*, 1st Edition, Peter Lang: New York
- (2) Ibid, pp. 5, 21, 38; 68
- (3) Ibid, pp. Xiv; 2-7
- (4) Ibid, pp. 32, 69; Kovalio contradicts himself when he claims the Christian convert Jacob Brafman was an '*apostate Jew*' in Ibid, p. 10.
- (5) Ibid, p. 77, n. 6
- (6) Ibid, pp. 7-8
- (7) Cesare de Michelis, 2004, *The Non-Existent Manuscript: A Study of the Protocols of the Sages of Zion*, 1st Edition, University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln, pp. 23-37
- (8) Kovalio, Op. Cit., p. 9
- (9) Ibid, p. 80, n. 5
- (10) As they themselves state in Steven Jacobs, Mark Weitzman, 2003, *Dismantling the Big Lie: The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, 1st Edition, Ktav: New York, pp. xii-xiv
- (11) Kovalio, Op. Cit, p. 80, n. 5
- (12) Ibid, p. 67
- (13) Ibid, p. 24
- (14) de Michelis, Op. Cit, p
- (15) Kovalio, Op. Cit., p. 30
- (16) Cf. Brian Roberts, 1969, *Cecil Rhodes and the Princess*, 1st Edition, Hamish Hamilton: London
- (17) de Michelis, Op. Cit., pp. 27-30
- (18) Kovalio, Op. Cit., p. 18

Analysing the Text of the 1952 Speech of Rabbi Emanuel Rabinovich

In a recent article I analysed the back story and the alleged origins of the text of the 1952 speech of one Rabbi Emanuel Rabinovich. (1) My conclusions based on the available facts was that the back story was itself rather incredible and lacked sufficient time between the speech being given and its publication via the (alleged) circumlocutions it went through to get from Rabinovich's giving it to Eustace Mullins' writing about it.

I did however point out one glaring textual inconsistency when compared to the back story: that the meeting (which was alleged to having been held on the 12th January 1952) was weirdly being held on a Saturday thus on the Jewish Sabbath (or Shabbos). This made the account unlikely, but not totally irreconcilable with an actual meeting. What made it irreconcilable was the fact that there are no references in the text to the fact that it was Shabbos. Had this meeting of rabbis been held on Shabbos then we would expect that this would be explicitly mentioned in the meeting: since performing work on Shabbos would only be viable if Jewish lives were at stake (in accordance with the basic halakhic rulings on the issue).

This then allowed us to conclude that the back story was in all likelihood fraudulent, but that doesn't itself mean the text itself is not of Jewish origin: as I have previously demonstrated in relation to the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion. (2) In order to understand the validity of the text we need to actually analyse it as otherwise we cannot say whether this is a fraudulent text with an equally fraudulent providence or an actual text with a problematic providence.

To assist the reader in following my argument I have reproduced the text of the speech below and bolded the particular sections that I feel are important. To wit:

*'A report from Europe carried the following speech of Rabbi Emmanuel Rabinovich **before a special meeting of the Emergency Council of European Rabbis in Budapest, Hungary, January 12, 1952:***

*"Greetings, my children; you have been called here **to recapitulate the principal steps of our new program.** As you know, we had hoped to have twenty years between wars to consolidate the great gains which we made from World War II, but our increasing numbers in certain vital areas is arousing opposition to us, and we must now work with every means at our disposal to precipitate World War III within five years.*

*The goal for which **we have striven so concertedly for three thousand years** is at last within our reach, and because its fulfilment is so apparent, it behoves us to increase our efforts and our caution tenfold. I can safely promise you that before ten years have passed, our race will take its rightful place in the world, with every Jew a king and every Gentile a slave (Applause from the gathering). You remember the success of our propaganda campaign during the 1930's, which aroused anti-American passions in Germany at the same time we were arousing anti-German*

passions in America, a campaign which culminated in the Second World War. A similar propaganda campaign is now being waged intensively throughout the world. A war fever is being worked up in Russia by an incessant anti-American barrage while a nation-wide anti-Communist scare is sweeping America.

This campaign is forcing all the smaller nations to choose between the partnership of Russia or an alliance with the United States. Our most pressing problem **at the moment is to inflame the lagging militaristic spirit of the Americans. The failure of the Universal Military Training Act was a great setback to our plans**, but we are assured that a suitable measure will be rushed through Congress immediately after the 1952 elections. The Russians, as well as the Asiatic peoples, are well under control and offer no objections to war, but we must wait to secure the Americans. This we hope to do with the issue of Anti-Semitism, which worked so well in uniting the Americans against Germany. We are counting heavily on reports of anti-Semitic outrages in Russia to whip up indignation in the United States and produce a front of solidarity against the Soviet power.

Simultaneously, to demonstrate to Americans the reality of anti-Semitism, we will advance through new sources large sums of money to outspokenly anti-Semitic elements in America to increase their effectiveness, and we shall stage Anti-Semitic outbreaks in several of their largest cities. This will serve the double purpose of exposing reactionary sectors in America, which then can be silenced, and of welding the United States into a devoted anti-Russian unit. Within five years, this program will achieve its objective, the Third World War, which will surpass in destruction all previous contests. Israel, of course, will remain neutral, and when both sides are devastated and exhausted, we will arbitrate, sending our Control Commissions into all wrecked countries. This war will end for all time our struggle against the Gentiles.

We will openly reveal our identity with the races of Asia and Africa. I can state with assurance that the last generation of white children is now being born. Our Control Commissions will, in the interests of peace and wiping out inter-racial tensions.

Forbid the Whites to mate with Whites. The White Women must cohabit with members of the dark races, the White Men with black women. Thus the White Race will disappear, for the mixing of the dark with the White means the end of the White Man, and our most dangerous enemy will become only a memory. We shall embark upon an **era of ten thousand years of peace and plenty, the Pax Judaica, and our race will rule undisputed over the world**. Our superior intelligence will easily enable us to retain mastery over a world of dark peoples.

Question from the gathering: Rabbi Rabinovich, what about the various religions after the Third World War?

Rabinovich: There will be no more religions. **Not only would the existence of a priest class remain a constant danger to our rule, but belief in an after-life would give spiritual strength to irreconcilable elements in many countries, and enable them to resist us. We will, however, retain the rituals and customs of Judaism as the mark of our hereditary ruling caste, strengthening our**

racial laws so that no Jew will be allowed to marry outside our race, nor will any stranger be accepted by us.

We may have to repeat the grim days of World War II, when we were forced to let the Hitlerite bandits sacrifice some of our people, in order that we may have adequate documentation and witnesses to legally justify our trial and execution of the leaders of America and Russia as war criminals, after we have dictated the peace. I am sure you will need little preparation for such a duty, for sacrifice has always been the watchword of our people, and the death of a few thousand lesser Jews in exchange for world leadership is indeed a small price to pay. To convince you of the certainty of that leadership, let me point out to you how we have turned all of the inventions of the White Man into weapons against him. His printing presses and Radios are the mouthpieces of our desires, and his heavy industry manufactures the instruments which he sends out to arm Asia and Africa against him.

Our interests in Washington are greatly extending the Point Four Program for developing industry in backward areas of the world, so that after the industrial plants and cities of Europe and America are destroyed by atomic warfare, the Whites can offer no resistance against the large masses of the dark races, who will maintain an unchallenged technological superiority. And so, with the vision of world victory before you, go back to your countries and intensify your good work, until that approaching day when Israel will reveal herself in all her glorious destiny as the Light of the World." (3)

If we take what I have previously pointed above as our starting point; i.e. the lack of mention of the fact that it was Shabbos and we are dealing with a group of rabbis who are performing work on the day on which they are religiously obligated to perform no work, we can make three other general textual observations.

The first is that this isn't what it claims to be: it isn't a speech as it is simply too short. The entire text can be read out loud in 2-3 minutes: where-as most speeches are at least 15 minutes long and are usually 45 minutes to an hour long in order to allow the speaker time to make a full presentation.

Also we should note on this point that the structure of the text is more akin to an announcement or possibly a rant given that there is little in the way of rhetorical flourishes and the argument that it is making is; at best, completely incoherent. It contains a lot of sweeping generalities, but only gets into specifics once or twice during the whole short text. When it does get specific it only deals with American current affairs and not the Soviet or European current affairs that would be more expected.

That in itself is suggestive that it is not an authentic text precisely because it displays outright ignorance of the anti-Zionist and anti-intellectual purges sweeping the Soviet Union; and more particularly Hungary, at this time as I covered in my previous article on the back story of this text. That it mentions the failure of the Universal Military Training (and Service) Act (although this was in fact passed in 1951) and the Point Four Program, but doesn't talk about the treason trials in the

USSR or events in the Far East (where the Korean War was raging) as anything other than an aside is suggestive that whoever is the author of the text. They weren't in Europe; let alone the Soviet bloc, at the time that they wrote it for the priority is the policies of the United States not the destabilization of the entire of Eastern Europe via the new grand purge sweeping Europe initiated by Stalin.

Had they been in either Europe or the Soviet Bloc then we would expect to see a greater priority given to the frightening events there (especially for rabbis) not issues of United States legislation in relation to the draft and foreign aid. This clearly suggests that whoever the author of text actually was: they were American and in North America when they wrote it.

Secondly the rabbi addresses his fellow rabbis as '*my children*': now while this is common phraseology for Christians; especially in Roman Catholicism, it is distinctly out of place in Judaism precisely because we here have a rabbi addressing rabbis. It is rather like a priest addressing their fellow priests of the same rank as '*my children*': it is just silly.

We cannot argue that Rabbi Rabinovich was a Tzaddik (i.e. an acknowledged pious and holy man who often lead a small jewish sect or cult), a Rebbe (i.e. a kind of jewish religious leader often associated with jewish mystical groups such as the modern Chasidim) or a Talmid Chacham (i.e. Torah Scholar: one who is deeply learned in halakhah [jewish religious law] as well as skilled in interpreting it correctly), because he doesn't describe himself or indicate that he is such. Thus he is an ordinary run-of-the-mill rabbi and referring to rabbis of the same rank as you as '*my children*'; especially among a group of people who pride themselves on their individual learning like the rabbinate, is going to cause not a few arguments to break out and people to leave the room in disgust.

This usage suggests that the author doesn't really know very much about Judaism, because they are making a very basic mistake in relation to intra-community relations and are doing so in spite of wanting to communicate appropriately and amicably to the rabbis in question.

That the author of this text knows little about Judaism; and probably wasn't jewish, is further indicated by the use of the '*3000 years*' timeline. The author is clearly thinking of the Gregorian calendar, which is used as standard in North America and Western Europe. However the jews have their own calendar, which we would expect rabbis to use amongst themselves as they do to this day. In the jewish calendar January 1952 would actually be Tevet 5712: in other words if a religious jew was among other religious jews then they wouldn't say that they have worked for this goal for '*3000 years*' but rather would say they have worked for this goal for '*5500 years*' or '*nearly 6000 years*' (if they said it at all).

Also the reference to a '*Pax Judaica*' is severely out of place since it is uses for a Romanism for a concept that the jews already have their own expression for: i.e. the '*inheritance of Israel*'. That the author has once again used a non-jewish term when there was; in fact, a jewish one available strongly suggests that the author is not jewish themselves, but rather is non-jewish with a smattering of knowledge about Judaism.

This is confirmed when we read the section of the text where Rabbi Rabinovich claims that Judaism is an irrelevant superstition and that its own value lies in its ability to keep the Jews together as a tribal-cum-racial unit. The sheer absurdity of this statement knows no bounds precisely because this is a rabbi addressing other rabbis: are we supposed to believe they aren't actually religious Jews but rather Jewish nihilists pretending to be rabbis?

This is another point where one half expects the room to simply empty of the audience given that Rabbi Rabinovich has now both insulted their intelligence and rabbinic standing (as we saw earlier) yet now he is claiming they don't believe in Yahweh either and that the point of Judaism is simply to aid '*the conspiracy*'.

As an aside we should also note that this passage also implicitly exonerates the Jews from blame, because it necessarily specifies that it isn't the Jews that are the problem but rather these nameless '*conspirators*' who are pretending to be Jews. This passage could have almost been lifted out of the writings of William Guy Carr who claimed just this in his work as I have explained elsewhere by quoting the relevant passages. (4)

Thirdly I would like to bring attention back to the structure of the text in that it is actually mostly a transcript and in spite of two attempts to style it a speech (the audience applause and the question from the floor): it is clearly meant to be read not said. It lacks ideological direction and is a brief ramble about a failure and then some pointless rhetoric about '*control*' and '*having it in hand*' as opposed to a coherent presentation of a plan (and the question from the floor is barely even relevant to Rabbi Rabinovich's presentation).

A good comparative to the speech is; ironically, the Protocols of Zion, which do actually make a lot of consistent sense as a plan and are quite logically conceived to be put into action. Compare that to the largely aimless warbling of this text and we can see that it is hardly a '*plan*' or even a '*speech*', but rather what someone would quickly throw together if they wanted to manufacture some evidence that would enrage people (and especially conservatives) in 1950s America (hence the otherwise pointless question about religions in the new world of the conspirators).

Compare the Protocols of Zion to the speech of Rabbi Rabinovich and you can quickly see which reads like a plan and which does not.

Now where do we end up?

We have ended up with the fact that the author; whoever it was, was an American (or resident in North America at the timing of writing) because of their use of specific information in relation to the United States as well as their use of Christian and Western terminology and phraseology. This latter point also suggests that they were not Jewish as they are not using Jewish concepts where they are available and indeed use no Jewish humour or make any reference to Torah (Written or Oral) parallels or parables to make their point (as we would normally expect).

Further the lack of length and the style of the text suggests that the 'speech' was never conceived as such, but rather was always meant as a textual document rather than a transcript of an oral presentation. This means that in effect it was a 'speech' that was always meant to be read and it was never meant to be anything other than 'evidence' of the jewish role in what the author was against not what the author was actually for.

Essentially then the 1952 speech of Rabbi Emanuel Rabinovich is almost certainly a fraud as it has nothing within the text to suggest it was written or said by a jew or in Europe (let alone by a rabbi in the Soviet Bloc) and a lot suggesting it was written by an American gentile.

Was that American gentile Eustace Mullins?

Very possibly, but it is unlikely that it could ever be proven with sufficient evidence.

References

- (1) This is available at the following address:
<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2014/02/eustace-mullins-and-story-of-1952.html>
- (2) This is available at the following address:
<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2012/05/protocols-of-zion-facts-myths-and-lies.html>
- (3) <http://www.rense.com/general45/full.htm>; cross-checked against William Guy Carr, n.d., [1954], 'Pawns in the Game', 1st Edition, GSG: San Pedro, pp. 116-117
- (4) This is available at the following address:
<http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2013/05/william-guy-carr-anti-semitism-and-jews.html>
and <http://semiticcontroversies.blogspot.com/2013/05/william-guy-carr-and-protocols-of-zion.html>