CHAPTER X

THE REVOLUTION OF 1917

The Great War—Rôle of British Socialists—Rôle of German Social Demo-
crats—The Russian Revolution—Bolshevism—Rôle of the Jews—
The Protocols of Nilus—German Organisation.

When the Great War broke out in 1914 it was on International Socialism that Germany counted to break the resistance of her enemies.

 Everywhere the ground had been carefully prepared. In England, from the founding of the First Internationale onwards, German intrigue had never ceased to play a leading part in the succeeding Socialist organizations, each of which in turn had been diverted from its original course in the direction of pan-German interests.

 Although the influence of Marx amongst the British working-men was practically nil during his lifetime, the Marxian tradition had been carried on by his colleague Engels and his British middle-class disciples who formed the Socialist associations in this country.

 Thus the Second Internationale, founded in 1882, became Germanized by 1893, and remained so until the outbreak of war, when it was suspended and did not reconstruct itself until the Geneva Congress of 1920. The Fabian Society, inaugurated in 1883, fell almost immediately under the control of Mr. G. Bernard Shaw, who has made no secret of his international sympathies. In the same year the Social Democratic Federation was founded by Mr. H. M. Hyndman, with Justice as its organ, and in the following year of 1884 produced an offshoot in the Socialist League founded by William Morris with the co-operation of Mr. Belfort Bax, an Austrian semi-Anarchist named
Andrea Scheu, several English Anarchists, and Dr. Aveling, the "husband" of Marx's daughter, as editor of its organ *The Commonweal*.

This ceased to exist in 1892. The original S.D.F. meanwhile continued its course, but in 1911 changed its name to the British Socialist party.

The alien influence in all these associations is thus plainly visible, but it was not sufficient to content Friedrich Engels, who therefore set to work on another enterprise, the "Independent Labour Party," which, with the collaboration of Mr. Keir Hardie, he afterwards boasted that he helped to create. Engels then instructed Dr. Aveling, who had formed a "free union" with Marx's daughter, to join the Executive Committee of the I.L.P., whilst Eleanor herself "was told off to work for the Gas Workers' and General Labourers' Union."

Engels now imagined that, with the aid of the Independent Labour Party, he would obliterate the Social Democratic Federation and the Fabians, as a punishment for not showing sufficient subservience to German leadership. He evidently believed that he was eminently successful in these efforts. On July 20, 1889, Engels wrote to Sorge: "I think that we are going to make great progress here." Then he goes on to explain that as the Anglo-Saxons are slow and dull of comprehension, it was quite natural that English workmen should be "bossed" (gebosselt) by Germans.

In a subsequent letter Engels boasts that the gas workers of London "were led by Tussy," the diminutive name of Marx's youngest daughter (Eleanor). Finally, in 1892, Engels repeats triumphantly:

We are making great progress here in England. Affairs advance splendidly. Next year there will be seen marching behind Germany, not only Austria and France, but also England.2

These hopes found their fulfilment on the declaration of war in 1914. What part did the Socialists play? The true meaning of Internationalism was then revealed. Although the war on the part of Germany was one of pure aggression, and on the part of England one of urgent national defence, *the whole German Social Democratic Party in a*

---

1 How admirably Marx was fitted to direct the affairs of the human race is shown by the way he managed his own family. Eleanor Marx, her "husband," Dr. Aveling, and her sister all committed suicide.

body went over to the German war-party, whilst all the Socialist organizations in this country—the Independent Labour Party, the British Socialist Party, and the Socialist Labour Party—opposed England's participation in the war.

Not content with this Pacifist attitude before the outbreak of hostilities, certain Socialists—notably the members of the I.L.P.—continued, after the war had begun, to give active encouragement to the enemy. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, who had published a violent indictment of the British Government on August 13, 1914, was mentioned on several occasions with the warmest approbation in the German press. At a congress of the I.L.P. in Norwich in April 1915, a resolution was passed by a huge majority opposing recruiting. Worse still, industrial troubles were stirred up amongst the workers, delaying the supply of war materials to the troops, so that the *Referee* declared that "German Socialists and their English allies were responsible for the death of thousands of Englishmen on the battle-front."

It is only just to add that the question of the war brought about a split in the British Socialist Party, and though the name was retained by the anti-war party—a party largely composed from 1916 onwards of Russian-Jews and foreign Anarchists, with *The Call* for their organ—a group of British Socialists, under the leadership of Mr. Hyndman, stood out for national defence, and in 1916 reorganized themselves under the name of the "National Socialist Party." In 1920 this society resumed the original name of the Social Democratic Federation, whilst at the same date the British Socialist Party, now affiliated to the Third (Moscow) Internationale, became the British Communist Party and changed the name of its organ from *The Call* to *The Communist*. The fact then remains that at the outbreak of war British Socialism was represented by no national and patriotic party. The work of Germany had been well and truly done.

---

1 On this point see Laskine's admirable pamphlet, *Les Socialistes du Kaiser, la fin d'un mensonge* (Floury, 1915).
2 *The Two Internationals*, by R. Palme Dutt (Labour Research Department, 34 Eccleston Square), 1920, p. 3.
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Unless these preliminaries are clearly recognized, the attitude of the Socialists must appear only as the most extraordinary paradox. Why should the so-called champions of democracy have accorded their sympathy to Imperial Germany, the most monarchic and the most autocratic country in the world, rather than to Republican France, the home of the revolutionary tradition? It is true that the Government of Germany under Wilhelm II. was probably the best in Europe from the point of view of the working-classes, but this was precisely because it repudiated the Socialist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and owed its success to the fact that it treated the people like children, cared for them like children, punished them like children, and never allowed them to dictate.

The pro-German sympathies of British Socialists are therefore incomprehensible unless we realize that all their ideas had been instilled into their minds by German agents. "I am anti-French, but I am none the less anti-English," Marx, their prophet, had declared,¹ and the "anti-Allies" attitude of "International" Socialists in this country was the natural result of these influences.

In France German propaganda had been less successful. Although there were a few notorious pro-Germans in the Socialist and Radical camps the French Socialist party stood solidly for national defence. Even Jaurès, whose illusions on Germany had excited suspicions of complicity with the enemy, warned his countrymen that they must "beware of the Illuminati, who seek to organize the proletariat on a non-national basis."² Anti-patriotism is a sentiment not easily aroused in France, and inspires little admiration there when professed by foreigners. In this connection it is amusing to observe the attitude of Georges Sorel—Syndicalist, and therefore International, as he might profess to be—towards our British pacifists.

"Arbitration," he remarks, "always gives results disastrous to England; but these good people (the English Liberals) prefer

¹ Briefwechsel zwischen Marx und Engels, iv. 335, date of September 12, 1870.
² Quoted in speech of M. Brunet, Socialist deputy for Charleroi, August 2, 1920.
to pay or even to compromise the future of their country rather than affront the horrors of war. ... Many Englishmen think that by humiliating their country they will become more sympathiques—this is not clearly proved." ¹

But it was by pacifism that the great conspiracy gained its end in Russia. This is not the place to recount the story of the Russian Revolution, which is still too fresh in the minds of the public to need repeating; all that concerns us here is to trace the course of the World Revolution throughout the movement and to controvert the pubblind declarations of certain leading politicians in this country, who persisted in regarding the Russian upheaval as something quite new in the history of the world. Thus in the House of Lords on February 10, 1920, Lord Curzon observed:

When we look at Russia, who can regard that spectacle without consternation and dismay?—a country at this moment prey to a revolution of a character unprecedented in history. Because, although every one is always drawing analogies with what happened in France 140 or 150 (sic!) years ago, there is no analogy whatever. Everybody knows that the circumstances of what is happening in Russia at the present time are wholly without parallel in the history of the world, and you can imagine how in what are called the inner circles of statecraft at every moment we are confronted with this appalling spectacle outside our door, upsetting us, perplexing our resolution, and confounding our calculations at every turn.

What wonder that our foreign policy is frequently at fault and that our statesmen find themselves perplexed and confounded at every turn if this is the extent of their historical knowledge? Not only is there an exact analogy between the revolutions of France and Russia, but as every one who has studied the latter movement knows, the Russian Revolution from November 1917 onwards was a direct continuation of the French. This was admitted by the Bolsheviks themselves, who repeatedly declared that the first French Revolution must be copied in every detail, and who from the outset took Marat and Robespierre as their models. ²

¹ Réflexions sur la violence, p. 89.
² Sir Paul Dukes informed me that at a meeting of the Bolsheviks he attended in Russia at the beginning of the Revolution, Marat was held up as the great example to be followed. In June 1919 an article in the
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It has been objected that in two important points the Russian Revolution differs from the French, firstly, that whilst the French Revolution was National, the Russian was International; secondly, that the French Revolution was directed against the aristocracy, but the Russian Revolution aimed particularly at the destruction of the bourgeoisie. Both these statements are inaccurate. The French Revolution, like the Russian Revolution, contained both National and International elements. In its declaration "all men are brothers" the French Constituent Assembly gave expression to the purest Internationalism, and Clootz, the apostle of this doctrine, received, as we have seen, the loudest acclamations from the Convention. It was only when the Jacobins' declaration of world anarchy met with opposition from foreign countries and also ran counter to the innate patriotism of the French people that the Convention found itself forced into an attitude of Nationalism it had never intended to assume, and under the domination of Robespierre, the greatest opponent of Internationalism, Clootz and the "parti de l'étranger" were condemned to death. In Russia, on the other hand, the Revolution did not bear at the outset an entirely International character, amongst the Social Revolutionaries who brought about the rising of March 1917 were several national groups; the Mensheviks likewise comprised a national party, led by Plechanov. It was not until the Bolsheviks seized the reins of power that the Revolution became frankly International, and this was facilitated by the fact that the Russian people were less patriotic than the French, and also that whilst the Jacobins of France could count on no support from abroad the Bolsheviks depended almost entirely on foreign co-operation and founded all their hopes on the prospect of a world revolution.

*Daily Herald* described the closing down by the Bolshevik authorities of a play entitled *The Death of Danton*, for fear it might be offensive to the memory of Robespierre. A Russian who had been imprisoned under the Bolsheviks wrote to me after reading my *French Revolution*: "Your book... seems to be the diary of our own revolution, so thoroughly well have our apes learnt their roles... everybody in Russia knew by heart that bloody era, though many of the actors hardly knew how to sign their names!"
In the matter of the class war the Bolsheviks of Russia pursued precisely the same course as the revolutionaries of France. In both countries the monarchy and aristocracy were the first to suffer; in both the turn of the bourgeoisie came next. In the summer of 1793, as we have seen, war on the bourgeoisie was declared by the Convention, and the battle-cries of that period have been adopted verbatim by the Bolsheviks. Let us follow the same process, as carried out by Lenin, in his own words:

What is the first stage? It is the transfer of power to the capitalist class (bourgeoisie). Up to the March revolution of 1917 power in Russia was in the hands of one ancient class, namely the feudalist-aristocratic-landowning class, headed by Nicholas Romanov. After that revolution power has been in the hands of a different, a new class, namely the capitalist class (the bourgeoisie). The shifting of power from one class to another is the first, the main, fundamental symptom of a revolution, both in the strictly scientific and the practical political sense of the word. To this extent, the capitalist or bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia is at an end.¹

In Russia as in France war on the bourgeoisie was only the second stage of the movement, and in both the complete subjection of the people formed the next point on the programme.

The Bolshevik revolution was, from the very beginning, avowedly anti-democratic and in no sense the outcome of the Russian revolutionary movement. Until the end of the last century the subversive forces in Russia had been mainly anarchic, resulting from the doctrines of Bakunin and Kropotkine; but with the formation of the Russian Social Democratic Party a definite Marxian school was inaugurated and found further support in the Jewish Bund of Social Democrats. It was at a congress of the Russian Social Democratic Party in London in 1903 that the split took place, resulting in division into the two groups of Bolsheviks under Lenin and Mensheviks under Martov, the former signifying the majority, the latter the minority, but since then the terms have come to denote the extreme and the less extreme party.

¹ The Soviets at Work, p. 8.
At the outbreak of the March revolution of 1917 the Bolsheviks were, however, completely in the minority amongst the various revolutionary groups—a fact frankly admitted by the Bolsheviks themselves—and it was only by a course of systematic deception, and finally by force of arms, that the party which might be described in Bakunin’s words, “the German-Jew Company,” the “red bureaucracy,” succeeded in establishing its domination. Such popularity as it had achieved had been won by the old method of the conspiracy—promising one thing and doing precisely the opposite. Thus according to the word of command of the Secret Societies—“Constitution”—the Bolsheviks had clamoured for a Constituent Assembly, and their first act was to dissolve the assembly elected by universal suffrage; exploiting the war-weariness of the troops they had promised the people immediate peace, and having by these means created disaffection first in the navy, then in the First army, and finally throughout all the troops, they inaugurated a régime that could only exist on warfare and of which the whole policy is aggressive militarism; they had promised the peasants the land they coveted, and then denied them the right to own the crops they grew on it.

From the outset, however, the Bolsheviks had never succeeded in obtaining a following amongst the peasants, of which the revolutionary elements looked to the Social Revolutionaries for salvation, and it was on the workmen of the towns that they counted for support. But here again their promises proved delusive, and the workers who imagined that they were to run the industries in which they were engaged found themselves bitterly disillusioned. Great efforts have been made by the Bolsheviks to persuade Syndicalists that their plans are identical, as we see in the overture made by Zinovieff in the name of the Third Internationale to the I.W.W. of America (date of January 1920), where soothing assurances are given on the subject of the

---

1 “At the beginning of the Revolution, the Socialist Revolutionary Party became by far the strongest in the whole political field. The peasants, soldiers, and even the masses of the workers voted for the Socialist Revolutionaries” (Trotzky, *The History of the Russian Revolution to Brest-Litovsh* (Allen and Unwin), p. 62). A report in the White Paper on Bolshevism asserts that 90 per cent of the population were in favour of the monarchy (date of October 14, 1918).
State. "Our aim is the same as yours—a commonwealth without State, without Government, without classes, in which the workers shall administer the means of production and distribution for the common benefit of all." But the appeal goes on to explain that this cannot be done all at once, and the old process of the "withering away of the State," originating with Louis Blanc, is to take place. In the face of Lenin's views on control by the workers the hypocrisy of this protestation is, however, apparent.

"Socialism," Lenin wrote in May 1918, "can only be reached by the development of State Capitalism, the careful organization of finance, control, and discipline amongst the workers. Without this there is no Socialism. . . . To every deputation of workers which has come to me complaining that a factory was stopping work, I have said: 'If you desire the confiscation of your factory, the decree forms are ready, and I can sign a decree at once. But tell me: can you take over the management of the concern? Have you calculated what you can produce? Do you know the relations of your works with Russian and foreign markets?' Then it has appeared that they are inexperienced in these matters; that there is nothing about them in the Bolshevik literature, nor in the Menshevik either. The workers who base their activities on State Socialism are the most successful." 1

Bolshevism then is not Syndicalism, it is State Socialism, it is Marxism, it is Communism, in a word it is Babouvisme.

It is therefore no figure of speech to describe it as the most reactionary school of thought now in existence, for it does not even carry on the traditions of 1848 or 1871, but goes right back to the century before last—the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 began where the French Revolution left off in 1797. Is it possible to conceive anything more retrogressive?

Let us now follow the programme of Bolshevism as set forth by its own advocates in order to realize its exact resemblance to that of Babeuf. We shall find it most clearly propounded in the pamphlet of Bukharin, the right hand of Lenin, from which the following passages are taken:

1 The Chief Task of our Times, by Vladimir Oulianoff (Lenin), published by the Workers' Socialist Federation, p. 12.
We already know that the root of the evil of all plundering wars, of oppression of the working-classes and of all the atrocities of capitalism, is that the wealth of the world has been enslaved by a few State-organized capitalist bands, who own all the wealth of the earth as their private property. . . . To deprive the rich of their power by depriving them of their wealth by force, that is the paramount duty of the working-class, of the Labour Party, the party of Communists. . . . In a Communist order all the wealth belongs not to individuals or classes, but to society as a whole; no one man is master over it. All are equal comrades. . . . The work is carried out jointly, according to a pre-arranged labour plan. A central bureau of statistics calculates how much it is required to manufacture in a year: such and such a number of boots, trousers, sausages, blacking, wheat, cloth, and so on. It will also calculate that for this purpose such and such a number of men must work on the fields and in the sausage work respectively, and such and such a number in the large communal tailoring workshops, etc., and working-hands will be distributed accordingly. The whole of production is conducted on a strictly calculated and adjusted plan, on the basis of an exact estimate of all the machines, apparatus, all raw material, and all the labour power in the community.¹

Compare this with Babeuf: "A simple affair of numbering things and people, a simple operation of calculations and combinations."²

All this, Bukharin goes on to inform us, "can be attained only by working to a single plan and by organizing the whole community into one vast labour commune."³

This process, which is to begin with the bourgeoisie, is to be carried out by means of introducing labour record books and labour service. Every one of the above-named class should receive a special book in which an account is kept of his work, that is to say of his compulsory service. Fixed entries in his book entitle him to buy or to receive certain food products, bread in the first place. . . . If such an individual refuses to work there is no corresponding entry in his book. He goes to the store but is told, "There is nothing for you. Please to show an entry confirming your work."⁴

This may be very pleasing to the proletarian who sees

² P. 63 of this book.
³ *Programme of the World Revolution*, p. 17.
⁴ Ibid. p. 55.
in imagination the "idle rich" being forced to shoulder spade or pickaxe in order to secure a meal, but the proletarian smile fades away as the end of the page is reached and these ominous words appear: "Of course labour service for the rich should only be a transitory stage towards general labour service."

If we turn to The Russian Code of Labour Laws (published by the People's Russian Information Bureau in 1920) we shall find that "all citizens of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic over 16 and under 50 years of age"—with certain exemptions in case of illness—"are subject to compulsory labour" of eight hours a day.¹

In fact a great part of Lenin's writings are devoted to the problem of enforcing this system, to "the higher discipline of the toilers," ² "iron discipline during work with absolute submission to the will of one person," ³ for which purpose "a merciless dictatorship⁴ must be exercised." Moreover, we find that after all "wage-slavery" still exists, for a whole section of the Russian Code relates to the "transfer and discharge of wage-earners." But in time the wages though not the slavery are to disappear, for Bukharin explains that sale and purchase will by degrees give way to barter:

An "exchange" of goods must then begin between town and country, without the agency of money; municipal industrial organizations send out textile, iron, and other goods into the country, while the village district organizations send bread to the towns in exchange... when production and distribution are thoroughly organized money will play no part whatever, and as a matter of course no kind of money dues will be demanded from any one. Money will have generally become unnecessary. Finance will become extinct.⁵

In order to attain this ideal of condition of things the working-class must engage in a "bloody, painful, heroic struggle."

We have only to turn back to pages 58 and 59 of this book to see that this is identically and in every detail the plan of the Babouvistes; the Third International in its "New

¹ Pp. 6 and 16. ² The Soviets at Work, p. 25. ³ Ibid. p. 35. ⁴ Ibid. p. 40. ⁵ Programme of the World Revolution, p. 69.
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Communist Manifesto" in fact admits its direct descent from Babeuf. How are we to explain the continuity of idea? Simply by the fact that both systems are founded on the same doctrines—those of Illuminism, and that the plan now at work in Russia has been handed down through the secret societies to the present day.

The Bolshevik revolution has in fact followed out the code of Weishaupt in every point—the abolition of monarchy, abolition of patriotism, abolition of private property and of inheritance, abolition of marriage and morality, and abolition of all religion.

On the last two points queries will be raised. Has the Bolshevik Government officially abolished marriage? No; simply because it has not dared to do so, but its intentions in this respect are made quite clear in the pamphlet of Madame Kolontay, the friend of Lenin, Communism and the Family,\(^1\) in which it is explained that the old form of "indissoluble marriage" is to give place to "the free and honest union of men and women who are lovers and comrades"—that is to say simply to "free love." Does this imply then "the community of women"? Much discussion has been devoted to this question, heated controversies have taken place as to whether the mandate of -Ekaterinodar ordering the "socialization" of women was a part of the Bolshevik programme or merely the act of an individual commissar. Yet all the time the answer is quite simple. Bolshevism is avowedly Marxism; to follow the precepts of Marx in every detail is the supreme aim of the leaders. And the "official and open community of women" is laid down in Marx's Communist Manifesto.\(^2\) If, therefore, the Bolshevists have not established it in Russia it is because public opinion was evidently too strong for them. The mandate of Ekaterinodar, never intended for publication in Western Europe, gave away the plan and prevented its execution. But Madame Kolontay's pamphlet leaves no doubt as to the ultimate design. For "free love" must inevitably lead to the same conclusion—the removal of all protection from

---

\(^1\) Published by "The Workers' Socialist Federation," 152 Fleet Street.

women. The hypocritical pretension put forward by Marx and the Bolsheviks of wishing to abolish prostitution can deceive no one—Communism would simply replace voluntary prostitution by forcible rape.

In this matter the Bolsheviks go much further than Babeuf, who does not touch on the community of women, although he is no less insistent on the necessity for the break-up of the family by taking away the children from their parents; and his further stipulation that they should not be allowed to bear their father’s name “unless he had distinguished himself by great virtues,” certainly seems to indicate abolition of the present marriage system. But in their plan of the communal education of children the Bolsheviks have followed Babeuf to the letter. The English Communist, Mr. Bertrand Russell, has described the idea formulated by Madame Kolontay more or less vaguely—so as not to alarm Western mothers—as he saw it in operation during his stay in Russia, and it is curious to notice that Babeuf’s plan of teaching the children dancing has been carefully followed—an irony which even Mr. Russell could not fail to perceive, since the education of these “Eurhythmic” dancers contrasted pathetically with “the long hours of painful toil” to which they were “soon to be subject in the workshop or factory.”¹ The exact resemblance between the Bolshevik system with that of Babeuf is further shown by this passage from Mr. Russell’s book:

It is necessary first to admit that children should be delivered up almost entirely to the State. Nominally, the mother still comes to see her child in these schools, but in actual fact, the drafting of children to the country must intervene, and the whole temper of the authorities seemed to be directed towards breaking the link between mother and child.²

In the matter of religion the Bolsheviks seem to have been unable to carry out their programme entirely, for, although churches have been desecrated and destroyed, ikons torn down and spat upon, and countless priests

murdered, religious worship has not been officially prohibited as under the French Terror. But the intentions of the Soviet Government on this question admit of no misunderstanding. Turning again to Bukharin we find the following principles laid down:

One of the agencies in achieving this object (dulling the minds of the people) was the belief in God and the Devil. A great number of people have grown accustomed to believe in all this, whilst if we analyse these ideas and try to understand the origin of religion and why it is so strongly supported by the bourgeois, it will become clear that the real significance of religion is that it is a poison which is still being instilled into the people. It will also become clear why the party of the Communists is a strong antagonist of religion.¹

Adopting the aphorism of Marx that "religion is opium to the people," Bukharin goes on to show the mental degeneracy that results from any religious beliefs, and emphasizes his conclusions with these words in large black lettering: "Religion must be fought, if not by violence, at all events by argument."²

All religions, moreover, fall under the ban, for after describing the follies of fasting and penance, Bukharin adds:

Equally foolish things are done by the religious Jew, the Moslem Turk, the Buddhist Chinese, in a word, by every one who believes in God... Religion... not only leaves people in a state of barbarism, but helps to leave them in a state of slavery.³

In these words we seem to hear again the voice of Anarchism Cloots, "the personal enemy of Jesus Christ," uttering his declamations on "the nullity of all religions."

What is all this indeed but Illuminism, of which the anti-religious fury had blazed out successively in Weishaupt, Cloots, the chiefs of the Alta Vendita, in Proudhon, and in Bakunin? Indeed the final aim of the Illuminati, the destruction of Christian civilization, has been frankly admitted by the Bolsheviks of Russia. "Wherever I went in Russia," the Rev. Courtier Forster said on his return from that unhappy country, "the Bolsheviks assured me that 'civilization was all wrong' and must be done away

¹ Programme of the World Revolution, p. 73.
² Ibid. p. 77.
³ Ibid. p. 76.
with. An important follower of Lenin observed: 'We have now been at work for two years and you see what we have already done, but it will take us twelve years to destroy the civilization of the world.' And Mr. Lansbury, that obedient pupil of Lenin's, after his visit to Russia echoed the same sentiment in the columns of the *Daily Herald*: "We believe that man has been on the wrong road ever since the dawn of that thing we call civilization."¹ The very words employed by Robert Owen under the influence of Illuminism nearly 100 years earlier!

Yet another witness to the persistence of this theory is Mr. H. G. Wells, whose visions of the future expounded in the concluding chapters of his *Outlines of History* and articles on Russia are simply a compound of Rousseau, Weishaupt, Clootz, and Babeuf. Thus at the end of the former work we find Mr. Wells anticipating a partial return to the "nomadic life"—the identical expression employed by Barruel in describing Weishaupt's theory,—whilst the same writer's views on Internationalism are pure Clootz. What else is the "World State" now being advocated by Mr. Wells in the *Sunday Times* but Clootz's "Universal Republic," or his idea of union between all peoples regardless of nationality but Clootz's "solidarity of the human race"? The following genealogy of an extraordinary remark by Mr. Wells on the subject of cities will show how curiously he has been impregnated with "illuminated" thought, and incidentally illustrates the method by which one can acquire the reputation of being an "advanced thinker" to-day:

Barruel explained that the plan of Weishaupt had been to do away with fixed abodes so that man should return to the nomadic life,² and that this had been the influence at work behind the French Jacobins when they set out to destroy the manufacturing towns of France.³ "Be free and equal," he quotes from the original writings of Weishaupt, "and you will be Cosmopolitans and citizens of the world.

¹ *Daily Herald* for June 30, 1920.
Know how to appreciate equality and liberty and you will not fear to see Rome, Vienna, Paris, London, Constantinople burning. . . .” ¹ This plan, as we have seen, was put into execution during the Commune of 1871, and still forms an important part of the programme of World Revolution.

In 1796 Babeuf, Illuminatus, expressed the hope that in time all the large towns of France would disappear, as it was in towns that wage slavery flourished and that Capitalists were able to surround themselves with luxury and display.²

Seventy years later the Nihilists under the influence of German Illuminism declared: “We must burn down the towns. . . . What is the good of these towns? They only serve to engender servitude!”³

And in 1920 Mr. H. G. Wells excuses the ruin of the towns of Russia under Bolshevism by saying: “It was not Communism which built up these great impossible cities, but Capitalism.”⁴

Now this is an argument too silly to have been invented by any one of Mr. Wells’s intelligence, and we can only conclude that in putting it forward he is simply repeating a phrase that he has heard from his Russian friends, to whom the idea of the necessity for doing away with towns has descended direct from Weishaupt through the Secret Societies.

It is obvious that ideas such as these in no way correspond to the desires of the “people” in any country. Even the peasants of Russia do not want a return to savagery, whilst to the proletariats of Western Europe nothing would be more abhorrent than the destruction of cities. They love the busy life of towns and all the amenities of civilization; they ask for better homes, a higher standard of living, for modern conveniences that will lighten the burden of the working-woman, for the devices of science, for cinemas and music to beguile their hours of leisure. They do not wish to solve the housing question by becoming nomads.

¹ Mémoires sur le Jacobinisme, iii. 197.
² Buonarotti, Conspiration pour l’égalité dite de Babeuf, i. 221.
exploitation—is not less civilization but more. The "people" understand this very well, and thus the programme of the revolutionary leaders is still, as it has been throughout, in direct opposition to the wishes of the people.

If any doubt on this point still remains, if the history of the World Revolution related in this book does not prove that the revolutionary movement for the last 140 years has been the work of a conspiracy whose aims are entirely unconnected with the interests and demands of the people, how are we to account for the following undeniable facts?

1. That although the grievances of the people throughout this period have varied according to the changing conditions of our civilization, the programme of the social revolution has never varied. For if the succeeding outbreaks had been made by the people each would have been distinguished by different war-cries, different aims arising from the exigencies of the moment; instead of this each outbreak has been carried on to the same slogans, has repeated the same catchwords, and each has been directly copied from the earliest—and until 1917 the most successful—attempt, the first French Revolution.

2. That the leaders of the movement have never, in a single instance, been men of the people, but always members of the upper or middle classes who could not by any possibility be regarded as victims of oppression. And if it is objected that these men were disinterested fanatics fighting in a cause that was not their own, then—

3. That, with rare exceptions such as Louis Blanc, they invariably displayed complete unconcern for the sufferings of the people and a total disregard for human life. No instance has ever been recorded of pity or sympathy displayed by the Terrorists of France towards any individual members of the working-classes; on the contrary, they turned a deaf ear to all complaints. The Marxists and Bakuninists mutually accused each other of regarding the people as "cannon fodder."

4. That each outbreak has occurred not when the cause of the people was hopeless but on the eve of great reforms.

5. That each has been followed not by reform but by a period of reaction. For twenty years after the first French
Revolution the very word "reform" could hardly be breathed even in England.

6. That in spite of the fact that each outbreak has thus thrown back the cause of the people, each has been represented to the people as a step forward and further revolutions have been advocated.

The revolutionary movement of 1776 to the present day is therefore the work of a continuous conspiracy working for its own ends and against the interests of the people.

But now we come to the further question—who are the modern Illuminati, the authors of the plot? What is their ultimate object in wishing to destroy civilization? What do they hope to gain by it? It is this apparent absence of motive, this seemingly aimless campaign of destruction carried on by the Bolsheviks of Russia, that has led many people to believe in the theory of a Jewish conspiracy to destroy Christianity. And indeed, if one examines the present régime of Russia apart from the revolutionary movement of the last 140 years, this provides a very conclusive solution to the problem. To the unprejudiced observer Bolshevism in Russia may well appear to be a wholly Jewish movement.

For many years before the present revolution the Jews had played a leading part in the forces of disruption in that country. The correspondent of The Times at Odessa in 1905 described the riots that took place there at the end of October when "excited Jewish factory girls donned red blouses and ribbons and openly flaunted them in the faces of the Cossacks." Out of a population of 430,000 inhabitants over one-third were Jews, and about 15,000 took part in the rioting. "The main part of these demonstrators were students and Jews; . . . excited Jews unblushingly exhibited Republican emblems," red flags were unfurled, the Russian national flag was dishonoured by having all colour except the strip of red torn from it, the Emperor's portrait was mutilated. In the fight that ensued over 400 Jews and 500 Christians were killed. The writer of this article further showed the demonstration to have been organized at headquarters; "amongst other Socialistic fraternities the Central
Jewish organization located in Switzerland sent emissaries from its branches in Warsaw and Poland to Odessa.”

Mr. Wickham Steed, in his book *The Hapsburg Monarchy*, quotes a letter written in this same year of 1905 by a semi-Jew on the question of the Jews in Hungary, in which this remarkable passage occurs:

> There is a Jewish question and this terrible race means not only to master one of the grandest warrior nations in the world, but it means, and is consciously striving, to enter the lists against the other great race of the north (the Russians), the only one that has hitherto stood between it and its goal of world-power. Am I wrong? Tell me. For already England and France are, if not actually dominated by Jews, very nearly so, while the United States, by the hands of those whose grip they are ignorant of, are slowly but surely yielding to that international and insidious hegemony. Remember that I am half a Jew by blood, but that in all I have power to be I am not.

Twelve years later this prophecy was terribly fulfilled. For, whatever the Jewish Press may say to the contrary, the preponderance of Jews amongst the Bolsheviks of both Hungary and Russia has been too evident to need further proof. The Executive of the Communist Government established in Hungary in March 1919 consisted in a Directorate of Five which included four Jews—Bela Kun, Bela Vago, Sigmund Kunfi, and Joseph Pogany. The Secretary was another Jew—Alpari. Szamuelly, also a Jew, was the head of the Terrorist troops. In Russia Jews have again predominated. An article in *The Times* for March 29, 1919, stated that:

> Of the twenty or thirty commissaries or leaders who provide the central machinery of the Bolshevik movement not less than 75 per cent are Jews. . . . If Lenin is the brains of the move-

---

1 *The Times* for November 22, 1905, article entitled “The Reign of Terror at Odessa.” The Chief Rabbi Gaster wrote in *The Times* of November 25 to contradict these statements, but brought forward no proofs to the contrary.

2 *The Hapsburg Monarchy* (1913), p. 169. “In Austria-Hungary,” the author observes on p. 155, “the spread of Socialism has been largely the result of Jewish propaganda. Dr. Victor Adler, the founder and leader of the Austrian party, is a Jew, as are many of his followers. In Hungary the party was also founded and inspired by the Jews.”

3 See the pamphlet, *In the Grip of the Terror*, by Lumen, printed by Jordan Gaskell. Agents, W. H. Smith & Son, 186 Strand.
ment, the Jews provide the executive officers. Of the leading commissaries, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kameneff, Stekloff, Sverdloff, Uritsky, Joffe, Rakovsky, Radek, Menjinsky, Larin, Bronski, Zaalkind, Volodarsky, Petroff, Litvinoff, Smirdovitch, and Vovrowsky are all of the Jewish race, while among the minor Soviet officials the number is legion.\(^1\)

In fact the Jewish Press has on occasions admitted this influence in Bolshevism. Thus in *The Communist*, a newspaper published in Kharkoff (number for April 12, 1919), we find Mr. M. Cohan boasting that,

... without exaggeration, it may be said that the great Russian social revolution was indeed accomplished by the hands of the Jews. ... It is true that there are no Jews in the ranks of the Red Army as far as privates are concerned, but in the committees and in Soviet organizations, as Commissars, the Jews are gallantly leading the masses of the Russian proletariat to victory. ... The symbol of Jewry, which for centuries has struggled against capitalism, has become also the symbol of the Russian proletariat, which can be seen even in the fact of the adoption of the Red five-pointed star, which in former times, as it is well known, was the symbol of Zionism and Jewry.\(^2\)

This star from the beginning of the Bolshevik revolution has decorated the caps of Lenin's guards.

Even in England the activities of Jews are clearly evident in the Bolshevik camp; the audiences at “red flag meetings” have been observed to contain a very large Jewish element, Jewish interrupters have been sent to shout down speakers at patriotic meetings, Jewish agitators have taken part in every riot and urged young British hooligans to violence, and, according to the admission of the *Daily Herald*, a very large number of its readers are Jews.\(^3\) The *Jewish Chronicle* has in fact frankly declared that “there is much in the fact of Bolshevism itself, in the fact that so many Jews are Bolsheviks, in the fact that the ideals of Bolshevism

---

\(^1\) A prominent member of the Jewish Bund in 1907 and Bolshevik "ambassador" to England.

\(^2\) On this point see the remarkable pamphlet, *Who rules Russia?* published by the Association Unity of Russia, 121 East 7th Street, New York (1920), where the exact names and number of Jews in the different departments of the present Russian Government are given.

\(^3\) Quoted in American edition of *The Protocols*, p. 88.

\(^4\) Letter to the *Morning Post* from George P. Mudge, Aug. 31, 1920.
at many points are consonant with the finest ideals of Judaism." ¹

In the face of all this overwhelming evidence on the rôle of the Jews in the revolutionary movement, what wonder that the amazing Protocols of the Elders of Zion, first published in Russian by Sergye Nilus in 1902 ² and in English under the title of The Jewish Peril in 1920, came as a revelation and appeared to provide the clue to the otherwise insoluble problem of Bolshevism? Here was the whole explanation—a conspiracy of the Jewish race that began perhaps at Golgotha, that hid itself behind the ritual of Freemasonry, that provided the driving force behind the succeeding revolutionary upheavals, that inspired the sombre hatred of Marx, the malignant fury of Trotsky, and all this with the fixed and unalterable purpose of destroying that Christianity which is hateful to it. Is this theory true? Possibly. But in the opinion of the present writer it has not been proved—it does not provide the whole key to the mystery.

The only way in which the truth can be reached is by scientific investigation. And the first step in the process of establishing the authenticity or non-authenticity of the famous Protocols is to endeavour to trace their origin. Now to any one familiar with the language of Secret Societies the ideas set forth in the Protocols are not new; on the contrary, many passages have a strange ring of familiarity. To the present writer the thought that recurred at every page was: "Where have I read that before?" and by degrees the conviction grew: "But this is simply Illuminism!" So striking, indeed, are certain analogies not only between the code of Weishaupt and the Protocols, but between the Protocols and later Secret Societies, continuations of the Illuminati, that a continuity of idea throughout the movement becomes apparent. The following parallels may prove of interest as evidence of the theory that the Protocols are founded on much earlier models:

¹ Article entitled "Peace, War, and Bolshevism," April 4, 1919.
² The copy in the British Museum is dated 1905, but there is said to have been an earlier edition in 1902.
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PROTOCOLS

He who wants to rule must have recourse to cunning and hypocrisy (p. 3).
We must not stop short before bribery, deceit, and treachery, if these are to serve the achievement of our cause (p. 6).

The end justifies the means. In making our plans we must pay attention not so much to what is good and moral, as to what is necessary and profitable (p. 4).

With the Press we will deal in the following manner. . . . We will harness it and will guide it with firm reins; we will also have to gain control of all other publishing firms . . . (p. 40).
All news is received by a few agencies, in which it is centralized from all parts of the world. When we attain power these agencies will belong to us entirely and will only publish such news as we allow . . . (p. 40).

No one desirous of attacking us with his pen would find a publisher . . . (p. 42).

Our programme will induce a third part of the populace to watch the remainder from a pure sense of duty and from the principle of voluntary government service. Then it will not be considered dishonourable to be a spy; on the contrary, it will be regarded as praiseworthy (p. 65).

We will transform the universities and reconstruct them according to our own plans. The

ILLUMINISM
(Weishaupt, 1776–1786)

Apply yourselves to the art of counterfeit, to hiding and masking yourselves in observing others (Barruel, iii. 27, Originalschriften, p. 40).

The end sanctifies the means. The good of the Order justifies calumnies, poisonings, murders, perjuries, treasons, rebellions; briefly, all that the prejudices of men call crimes (Barruel, iv. 182, 189, quoting evidence of Cossandey, Utzschneider, and Grünberger).

We must take care that our writers be well puffed and that the reviewers do not depreciate them; therefore we must endeavour by every means to gain over the reviewers and journalists; and we must also try to gain the booksellers, who in time will see it is their interest to side with us (Robison, p. 191).

If a writer publishes anything that attracts notice, and is in itself just, but does not accord with our plan, we must endeavour to win him over or decry him (Robison, p. 194).

Every person shall be made a spy on another and on all around him (Spartacus to Cato; Robison, p. 135).

We must acquire the direction of education—of church management—of the professorial chair
heads of the universities and their professors will be specially prepared by means of elaborate secret programmes of action. . . . They will be very carefully nominated, etc. (p. 60).

We intend to appear as though we were the liberators of the labouring man. . . . We shall suggest to him to join the ranks of our armies of Socialists, Anarchists, and Communists. The latter we always patronize, pretending to help them out of fraternal principle and the general interest of humanity evoked by our socialistic masonry (p. 12).

In the so-called leading countries we have circulated an insane, dirty, and disgusting literature (p. 49).

Our Sovereign must be irreproachable (p. 86).

In the place of existing governments we will place a monster, which will be called the Administration of the Super-government. Its hands will be outstretched like far-reaching pincers, and it will have such an organization at its disposal that it will not possibly be able to fail in subduing all countries (p. 22).

Our International Super-government (p. 28).

and of the pulpit . . . (Robison, p. 191).

We must preach the warmest concern for humanity and make people indifferent to all other relations (Robison, p. 191).

We must win the common people in every corner (Robison, p. 194).

We must try to obtain an influence . . . in the printing-houses, booksellers’ shops. . . . Painting and engraving are highly worth our care (Robison, p. 196. Note adds: “They were strongly suspected of having published some scandalous caricatures and some very immoral prints. They scrupled at no means, however base, for corrupting the nation”).

An Illuminated Regent shall be one of the most perfect of men. He shall be prudent, foreseeing, astute, irreproachable (Instruction B. for the grade of Regent).

It is necessary to establish a universal régime of domination, a form of government that will spread out over the whole world . . . (Barruel, iii. 97).
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We will destroy the family life of the Gentiles . . . (p. 31).
We will also distract them by various kinds of amusement, games, pastimes, passions, public houses, etc. (p. 47).

The essential thing is to isolate a man from his family, to make him lose his morals . . . He loves the long conversations of the cafés and the idleness of shows . . . After having shown him how painful are his duties you will excite in him the idea of another existence (Piccolo Tigre to the Vente Piemontaise; Crétineau-Joly, ii. 120).

The people of the Christians, bewildered by alcohol, their youths turned crazy by classics and early debauchery, to which they have been instigated by our agents, . . . by our women in places of amusement—to the latter I add the so-called "society women"—their voluntary followers in corruption and luxury (p. 5).

Let us . . . never cease to corrupt . . . but let us popularize vice amongst the multitude. Let us cause them to draw it in by their five senses, to drink it in, to be saturated with it . . . It is corruption en masse that we have undertaken . . . (Vindex to Nubius; Crétineau-Joly, ii. 147).

The masonic lodge throughout the world unconsciously acts as a mask for our purpose (p. 10).

It is upon the lodges that we count to double our ranks. They form, without knowing it, our preparatory novitiate (Piccolo Tigre to the Vente Supreme; Crétineau-Joly, ii. 120).

Most people who enter secret societies are adventurers, who want somehow to make their way in life, and who are not seriously minded. With such people it will be easy for us to pursue our object, and we will make them set our machinery in motion (p. 52).

This vanity of the citizen or of the bourgeois for being enrolled in Freemasonry is something so banal and so universal that I am always full of admiration for human stupidity . . . . (The lodges) launch amidst their feastings thundering anathemas against intolerance and persecution. This is positively more than we require to make adepts (Piccolo Tigre to Nubius).

We employ in our service people of all opinions and all parties; men desiring to re-

Princes of a sovereign house and those who have not the legitimate hope of being kings
Protocols

We have taken great care to discredit the clergy of the Gentiles in the eyes of the people, and thus have succeeded in injuring their mission, which could have been very much in our way. The influence of the clergy on the people is diminishing daily. Today freedom of religion prevails everywhere, but the time is only a few years off when Christianity will fall to pieces altogether (p. 64).

We must extract the very conception of God from the minds of the Christians... (p. 17).

We must destroy all professions of faith (p. 48).

Haute Vente Romaine

by the grace of God, all wish to be kings by the grace of a Revolution. The Duke of Orleans is a Freemason. A prince who has not a kingdom to expect is a good fortune for us (Piccolo Tigre to Nubius).

There is a certain portion of the clergy that nibbles at the bait of our doctrines with a marvellous vivacity... (Nubius to Volpe; Crétineau-Joly, ii. 130).

It is corruption en masse that we have undertaken: the corruption of the people by the clergy and the corruption of the clergy by themselves, the corruption that ought to enable us one day to put the Church in her tomb (Vindex to Nubius; Crétineau-Joly, ii. 147).

Our final end is... the destruction for ever of Catholicism and even of the Christian idea (Dillon, The War of Antichrist, etc., p. 64).

In order to kill the old world surely we have held that we must stifle the Catholic and Christian germ (Piccolo Tigre to Nubius; Crétineau-Joly, ii. 387).

Alliance Sociale Démocratique

(Bakunin's Secret Society, 1864-1869)

The fourth category of people to be employed thus described by Bakunin: "Various ambitious men in the service of the State and Liberals of different shades. With them one can conspire according to their own programme, pretending to follow them blindly."
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We will entrust these important posts (government posts) to people whose record and characters are so bad as to form a gulf between the nation and themselves, and to such people who, in case they disobey our orders, may expect judgement and imprisonment. And all this is with the object that they should defend our interests until the last breath has passed out of their bodies, (p. 26).

We will pre-arrange for the election of ... presidents whose past record is marked with so-called "Panama Scandal" or other shady hidden transaction (p. 34).

Out of governments we made arenas on which party wars are fought out. ... Insuppressible babblers transformed parli-amentary and administrative meetings into debating meetings. Audacious journalists and impudent pamphleteers are continually attacking the administrative powers (p. 11).

We will create a universal economical crisis. ...1 Simultaneously we will throw on to the streets huge crowds of workmen throughout Europe. These masses will then gladly throw themselves upon and shed the blood of those of whom, in their ignorance, they have been jealous

1 Marx was evidently in this secret. In Réflexions sur la violence (p. 183) Georges Sorel says: "Marx thought the great catastrophe would be preceded by an enormous economic crisis."

ALLIANCE Sociale Démocratique

The third category of Bakunin thus described: "A great number of highly placed animals who can be exploited in all possible ways. We must circumvent them, outwit them, and by getting hold of their dirty secrets make of them our slaves. By this means their power, their connections, their influence, and their riches will become an inexhaustible treasure, and a precious help in various enterprises. . . ."

In the same way with the fourth category: "We must take them in our hands, get hold of their secrets, compromise them completely in such a way that retreat will be impossible to them."

The fifth category of Bakunin consists of: "Doctrinaires, conspirators, revolutionaries, all those who babble at meetings and on paper. We must push them and draw them on unceasingly into practical and perilous manifestations which will have the result of making the majority of them disappear whilst making a few amongst them real revolutionaries."

The Association will employ all its means and all its power to increase and augment evils and misfortunes which must at last wear out the patience of the people and excite them to an insurrection en masse.
from childhood, and whose belongings they will then be able to plunder (p. 14).

We will make merciless use of executions with regard to all who may take up arms against the establishment of our power (p. 50).

We must take no account of the numerous victims who will have to be sacrificed in order to obtain future prosperity (p. 51).

The masonic lodge throughout the world unconsciously acts as a mask for our purpose (p. 16).

In the first place must be destroyed the men who are most pernicious to revolutionary organization and whose violence and sudden death may most frighten the government.

My friends, abandon that absurd idea that I have been won over to Freemasonry. But perhaps Freemasonry would serve as a mask or as a passport ... (Letter to Herzen and Ogareff, Correspondance de Bakounine, 209).

Through all these parallels the plan of World Revolution runs like a "complot suivi," and when we further compare them with the utterances of the modern Bolsheviks we see the plan carried right up to the present moment. Let us now consider how the Protocols of the Elders of Zion tally with the Bolshevist programme:

Protocols

It is expedient for the welfare of the country that the government of the same should be in the hands of one responsible person (p. 5).

The system of government must be the work of one head.

The despotism of capital which is entirely in our hands will hold out to it (the State) a straw, to which the State will be unavoidably compelled to cling . . . (p. 2).

On the ruins of natural and hereditary aristocracy we built

Bolshevism

How can we secure strict unity of will? By subjecting the will of thousands to the will of one (Lenin, The Soviets at Work, p. 35).

What is the first stage? It is the transfer of power to the capitalist class. Up to the March Revolution of 1917 power in Russia was in the hands of one ancient class, the feudal aristocratic-landowning class, headed by Nicholas Romanov.
Protocols

an aristocracy of our own on a plutocratic basis. We established this new aristocracy on wealth, of which we had control... (p. 8).

Soon we will start organizing great monopolies—reservoirs of colossal wealth... (p. 22).

Our government is in so exceeding strong a position in the sight of the law that we may almost describe it by the powerful expression of dictatorship (p. 27).

When we accomplish our coup d'Etat, we will say to the people: "Everything has been going very badly; all of you have suffered; now we are destroying the cause of your sufferings—that is to say, nationalities, frontiers, and national currencies. Certainly you will be free to condemn us, but can your judgement be fair if you pronounce it before you have had experience of what we can do for your good?" (p. 31).

Our laws will be short, clear, and concise, requiring no interpretation, so that everybody will be able to know them inside put. The main feature in them will be the obedience required towards authority, and this respect for authority will be carried to a very high pitch.

Then all kinds of abuse will cease, because everybody will

Bolshevism

After that revolution, power has been in the hands of a different, a new class, namely, the capitalist class (the bourgeoisie) (Lenin, Towards Soviets, p. 8).

We must improve and regulate the State monopolies... which we have already established, and thereby prepare for State monopolization of the foreign trade (Lenin, The Soviets at Work, p. 20).

We advocate a merciless dictatorship (Lenin, The Soviets at Work, p. 40).

We must study the peculiarities of the highly difficult and new road to Socialism without concealing our mistakes and weaknesses. We must try to overcome our deficiencies in time (The Soviets at Work, p. 18).

What we have already decreed is yet far from adequate realization, and the main problem of to-day consists precisely in concentrating all efforts upon the actual, practical realization of the reforms which have already become the law, but have not yet become a reality (ibid. p. 20).

Economic improvement depends on higher discipline of the toilers... To learn how to work—this problem the Soviet authority should present to the people in all its comprehensiveness (The Soviets at Work, p. 26).

The revolution... demands the absolute submission of the
be responsible before the one supreme power, namely, that of the sovereign (p. 56).

We will make it clear to every one that freedom does not consist in dissoluteness or in the right of doing whatever people please. . . . We will teach the world that true freedom consists only in the inviolability of a man’s person and of his property, who honestly adheres to all the laws of social life (p. 83).

In order to demonstrate our enslavement of the Gentile governments in Europe we will show our power to one of them by means of crimes of violence, that is to say, by a reign of terror (p. 25).

We must destroy all professions of faith (p. 48).

When the time comes for us to take special police measures by putting the present Russian system of the Okhrana in force . . . (p. 67).

masses to the single will of those who direct the labour process (The Soviets at Work, p. 35).

It must take some time before the ordinary representative of the masses will not only see . . . but come to feel that he must not just simply seize, grab, snatch—and that leads to greater disorganization (The Soviets at Work, p. 36).

We will turn our hearts into steel, which we will temper in the fire of suffering and the blood of the fighters for freedom. We will make our hearts cruel, hard, and immovable, so that no mercy will enter into them, and so that they will not quiver at the sight of a sea of enemy blood, etc. (Krasnaya Gazette, the official organ of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers, Red Army, and peasants’ deputies, presided over by Zinovieff, alias Apfelbaum, a Jew. Date of August 31, 1918).¹

Religion must be fought, if not by violence, at all events by argument (Bucharin, Programme of the World Revolution, p. 77).

A highly organized intelligence department, or rather the renewed Okhrana of the old autocracy, is a necessary part of . . . this régime. Lenin was perfectly right to emphasize this before the last Soviet conference in Moscow (Dec. 1919) (Miliukov in The New Russia for February 12, 1920).

¹ Quoted in American edition of the Protocols, p. 89. Nine years earlier M. Copin Albancelli, in his Conjuration juive contre le monde chrétien (p. 452), had written: “France has known—and she has forgotten!—the régime of the Masonic Terror. She will know, and the world will know with her, the régime of the Jewish Terror.”
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The foregoing parallels prove, therefore, a clear connection between the Protocols and former Secret Societies working for World Revolution, and also between the Protocols and Bolshevism. But they do not necessarily establish their authenticity. One possibility immediately suggests itself. Might they not be a forgery compounded by some one versed in the lore of Secret Societies? Supposing Nilus to have been a student of this subject and also, as he was known to be, a pronounced anti-Semite, it would not have been difficult for him to reconstruct the programme of World Revolution from earlier models, weaving into them at the same time the idea of a Jewish conspiracy. Why, then, was this very obvious explanation not put forward by the Jews? Why, on the contrary, when it was suggested by the present writer in a newspaper article, did it meet merely with resentment? Here was a loophole indeed! But instead of using it the advocates of Jewry contented themselves with angry expostulations, or fell back on absurd explanations, as that the Protocols were invented by the Russian police or by the "Tzarist reactionaries" in London, or that they were copied from a notorious forgery by Goedseh—why choose a forgery when such admirable authentic models were at hand?—or again, the attempt was made to draw a red herring across the track by dwelling on Nilus's personality and his own literary work, which had no bearing whatever on the question. The point was to prove whether the document which he purported to have discovered was genuine or not.

The truth is, then, that the Protocols have never been refuted, and the futility of the so-called refutations published, as also the fact of their temporary suppression, have done more to convince the public of their authenticity than all the anti-Semite writings on the subject put together.

The only line of defence, namely, that this document was the work of illuminized Freemasonry, and not of a purely Jewish association, has been rejected by the advocates of the Jews themselves, and the only conclusion that we can draw is either that the Protocols are genuine and what they pretend to be, or that these advocates put forward by the
Jews have some interest in concealing the activities of Secret Societies in the past.

The question then arises: Were the Jews concerned in the organization of Illuminism and its subsequent developments? At present this is not clearly proved. It is true that Cagliostro was probably a Jew, that Kölmer who partly indoctrinated Weishaupt may have been a Jew, that a certain Simonini wrote to the Abbé Barruel in 1806 declaring that "the freemasons and the illuminés were founded by two Jews"—whose names the author has forgotten—that the Jewish financiers of Frankfurt may have contributed to the funds of the Illuminati or of the Duc d'Orléans, but all this rests so far on no contemporary documentary evidence. The "illumínés" referred to by Simonini may well have been the Martinistes founded, as it is known, by the Jew Paschalis and frequently referred to under this name. We should require more than such vague assertions to refute the evidence of men who, like Barruel and Robison, devoted exhaustive study to the subject and attributed the whole plan of the Illuminati and its fulfilment in the French Revolution to German brains. Neither Weishaupt, Knigge, nor any of the ostensible founders of Illuminism were Jews; moreover, as we have seen, Jews were excluded from the association except by special permission. None of the leading revolutionaries of France were Jews, nor were the members of the conspiracy of Babeuf.

The claim of the "Elders of Zion" to have inspired all revolutionary outbreaks since 1789 is not therefore at present substantiated by history, and it is not until the Alta Vendita from 1820 onwards that they can be proved to have taken an active part in the movement. Yet Monsignor Dillon, who clearly recognizes their importance as agents of this secret society, nevertheless attributes its

---

1 Deschamps, Les Sociétés secrètes, iii. 659.
2 Since these words were written, and at the moment of this book going to press, a number of La Vieille France has appeared (date of March 31-April 6, 1921) in which it is stated that five Jews were concerned in the organization and inspiration of the Illuminati—Wessely, Moses Mendelssohn, and the bankers Itzig, Friedlander, and Meyer. But the contemporary authority for this statement is not given.
efficient organization to "Italian genius." From this date onward their rôle is, however, more apparent. In Germany before 1848 Disraeli himself declared them to be taking the lead in the revolutionary movement, and with the First Internationale they come forward into a blaze of light. Henceforth along the line of State Socialism their influence is no longer doubtful.

But whilst the question of Jewish organization from the beginning of the World Revolution remains obscure, the workings of illuminized Freemasonry are clearly visible. It is strange that in the controversy that has raged over the Protocols so little attention has been paid to the fact that the so-called "Elders of Zion" were admittedly masons of the 33rd degree of the Grand Orient. Considered from this point of view, all their statements regarding the past history of the Revolution are substantiated by facts. For if by "we" is meant "illuminized Freemasons," then the assertion that "it is we who were the first to cry out to the people 'Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity'" is clearly accurate. Nothing can be truer than that since the French Revolution "the nations have been led from one disappointment to another," and that "the secrets of its preparatory organization were the work of our hands"—the hands of the Freemasons and Illuminati. If, then, the Protocols are genuine, they are the revised programme of illuminized Freemasonry formulated by a Jewish lodge of the Order.

But whilst the influence of the Jews cannot be proved throughout the early history of the society, German inspiration and organization is apparent from the very beginning. It was the German Weishaupt who founded the Illuminati with the aid of his German colleagues, it was the German Knigge who effected its alliance with French Freemasonry, German emissaries who introduced it to the lodges of the Grand Orient; it was this German Illuminism that inspired the campaign of universal corruption waged by the Alta Vendita and the anarchic fury of Bakunin; and again it was pan-Germanism, working by the methods of the Illuminati, that assured the success of Marx and Engels and secured control of all Socialist organizations up to the present day.
This revolutionary machine that threatens the peace of the world to-day, though manipulated in the past by men of all nationalities—French, Italian, Jewish, Russian, and in a few instances English—is primarily the work of German hands and is still mainly controlled by Germans with the aid of their Jewish allies. The German military authorities sent Lenin and the Jew Radek in a special train to Russia, German officers organized the Bolshevik armies, and German poison gas contributed to the final defeat of Wrangel.

It was also Germany who fanned the flames of civil war now raging in Ireland. Sinn Fein, which in its origins was largely a national and religious movement, is now being exploited by the International Atheist movement, whose "dark directory," as in 1884, "laughs at Ireland and her wrongs." For the plan of the conspiracy has always been to adopt a protégé and enlist its aid as an ally. Hitherto the two protégés invariably selected have been Ireland and Poland. But now that Poland has dared to assert its independence Poland has been thrown to the wolves, and when the day comes, as it must come if the World Revolution triumphs, for Ireland to resist the tide of Bolshevism, then Ireland with all her national and religious aspirations will be thrown to the wolves likewise. The organization of the revolutionary movement is even now less in the hands of Sinn Fein than of the Irish Republican Brotherhood, modelled like its predecessors, the Fenians and the United Irishmen, on the Illuminati of Weishaupt. The same organization is at work in India, and both are directed, not by Moscow, but by the invisible council which holds in its hands the threads of the whole conspiracy.

Bolshevist propaganda all over the world has been carried out by German organization and financed by German as well as by Jewish gold. "I affirm," wrote Bourtzeff, the Russian refugee, "that since August 1914, and in a relatively short lapse of time, the Germans handed over personally to Lenin more than 70,000,000 marks for the organization of Bolshevist agitation in the Allied Countries." Bernstein, a member of the German Social Democratic Party, has declared

---

1 For this reason Sinn Fein will not be found marked in the chart accompanying this book. It is not a part of the World Revolution.
in the official organ of the party, *Vorwärts*, that he knew as far back as December 1917 that Lenin was in the pay of Germany. More recently, Bernstein has learnt from "a responsible person" that the sum given to Lenin was more than 50,000,000 gold marks, or £2,500,000.¹ The Jewish Bolshevik emissaries to the recent Tours Congress, Abramovitch and Clara Zetkin, were discovered by the French authorities to have received money from Germany for the expenses of propaganda in France. The Jewish agitator is the tsetse fly carrying the poison germ of Bolshevism from the breeding-ground of Germany.

As long as England retains any belief in Carlyle's theory of "noble, patient, deep, pious, and solid Germany," the true cause of the evils now afflicting Europe will never be understood. Doubtless there are noble and pious elements in Germany, but let it not be forgotten that Germany holds within her a poison centre which has become a source of moral infection for the whole world. The campaign of militant atheism and moral corruption that is now being carried out systematically in our own country, in France, and in America, is of German devising. Weishaupt in his apology for Illuminism said that "Deism, Infidelity, and Atheism were more prevalent in Bavaria than in any country he was acquainted with."² Seventy years later, in 1846, Lord Shaftesbury, travelling in Germany, remarked: "Here is a peculiarity among the German *literati*; professorial chairs are held and public lectures given by men of open, acknowledged, and boastful Atheism"; and if we are reminded that Disraeli had declared most of these professorial chairs at this date to be monopolized by Jews, let us note that Lord Shaftesbury goes on to say: "Nor does opinion frown them down. We have bad people in England, but few dare to parade their make-beliefs with ostentation and joy."³ German Atheism and Jewish antagonism to Christianity have combined to form the

¹ Article by Mr. Adolphe Smith, "Lenin: Russian Traitor and German Agent," in the *National Review* for April 1921. The whole of this important article, from which the above quotations are taken, should be read carefully.
² Robison's *Proofs of a Conspiracy*, p. 102.
great anti-religious force that is making itself felt in the world to-day.

Again, Internationalism, the policy of national suicide advocated by the modern revolutionaries, has been frequently attributed to the Jews, and it is obvious that a race without a country of its own must see in the propagation of Internationalism much to commend it; but the originator of Internationalist doctrines as they are preached to-day was not a Jew but a German—Anacharsis Clootz. The so-called "International Jew" is not in reality International at all; he is first a Jew and then a German—sometimes indeed he is a German first.\1\ Internationalism, then, is simply another word for pan-Germanism, and it will always be noticed that advocates of Internationalism in this country betray a peculiar tdürresse for Germany. As Mr. Adolphe Smith has well expressed it: "The Socialist and revolutionary doctrines ... taught under the mantle of Marxism spread the idea that a Socialist has no country unless, of course, he has the good fortune to be a German." And again: "The doctrines of the older Socialists, the Socialists at whom Bismarck aimed by his anti-Socialist law, were now reserved for foreign exportation ... abroad they were just what was wanted to disintegrate communities, to weaken the sense of nationality, and lessen the desire for strong armies of defence. ... In all fields of action the German as an Internationalist needs to be studied with far greater care than as yet has been bestowed on him."\2\ The International doctrines of Weishaupt and of his disciple Clootz have served the cause of Germany well.

It will be urged, "But why should Germany encourage Illuminism, since she herself is now a victim of World Revolution?" True, the Spartacists of Germany to-day are undoubtedly the direct descendants of Spartacus

---

1 On March 29, 1913, an influential German-Jewish Association, the "Central Society of German Citizens of Jewish Faith," in a strongly anti-Zionist resolution, declared: "On the soil of the German Fatherland we wish, as Germans, to co-operate in German civilization and to remain true to a partnership that has been hallowed by religion and history" (Wickham Steed, The Hapsburg Monarchy, p. 177).

2 Adolphe Smith, The Pan-German International, pp. 4, 9, 12.
Weishaupt from whom they take their name; Liebknecht and Rosa Luxembourg were both leading members of the Order. Inevitably those who handle poison gas are liable at moments to inhale its fumes. But Germany has Spartacism well under control—meanwhile it can be used as a bogey to prevent her disarmament by the Allies. Between Berlin and Moscow the understanding is complete. Nicholas Lenin is not the controlling brain of the gigantic conspiracy. Great pains have been taken to represent the present dictator of Russia as a "Superman" of vast conceptions. Lenin's own writings refute this theory. Where in all his numerous pamphlets do we find a hint of genius or even of original thought? The writings of Robespierre bear at least the stamp of his personality. Babeuf, Illuminatus though he was, brought some native inspiration to bear on his diatribes, but from the days of Marx onwards revolutionary Socialism has always borne the same "machine-made" character, and Lenin's pamphlets resemble nothing so much as the instructions of a bogus company promoter directing other would-be bogus company promoters how to "do the trick." Mr. Wells has hastened to assure us that Lenin's writings are not representative of himself, that the great man must be seen to be appreciated; yet how is it that the many ardent pilgrims to the shrine of the deity at Moscow have never been able to bring back a single phrase uttered by the oracle that gives evidence of the slightest gleam of inspiration or of concern for the people of Russia? The one point that appears to occupy him is how to make the system work in spite of the opposition of the people.

Lenin, then, is neither a demagogue nor a superman, but the agent of the great German-Jewish company that hopes to rule the world.

How do the Germans and the Jews come to be allied in this design? Are not their aims mutually antagonistic? If we regard the Jewish plan as a racial conspiracy—yes. But there is no evidence to show that the whole Jewish race is concerned in it; on the contrary, many Jews in our

---

1 On this point see Welfsreimauerrei, Weltsrevolution, Weltsrepublik, by Dr. Wichtl (Munich, 1921), p. 262.
own country, as in France, have shown themselves fearless opponents both of Germany and Bolshevism. Nor does religious fanaticism appear to enter into the question. The insistence on the idea of a Jewish Messiah is the least convincing part of the Protocols. It is not religious Jews, even Talmudic Jews, but apostate Jews who have thrown themselves into the revolutionary movement. In the diatribe of Bucharin against religion quoted above the Jewish faith is derided equally with that of the Christian or the Buddhist. Yet if we examine the plan of Bolshevism we shall see the motive for a certain section of the Jews to take part in it. Now the avowed plan of the Bolsheviks is to do away with the right of private property and establish universal Communism. But the ruse of the conspiracy has always been to use words with a double meaning, and not only this, but with meanings diametrically opposed to each other. Thus when they proclaim the "dictatorship of the proletariat" their real intention is to bring about the complete enslavement of the proletariat; when they talk of the "equality of sexes" what they really mean is to reduce women to a position lower than the rank of squaws. The word "constitution," as we have seen, has been employed throughout as the signal for crushing an attempt to introduce constitutional government or for overthrowing it when it has been established. In the same way the word "Communism" has a double meaning.

To the simple proletarian Communism conveys a very alluring idea, namely, that of "having everything in common." Of the real theory of Communism he has no conception, but the propagandist who tries to win him over to Communism knows very well. He knows, moreover, that Communism is a system which has been tried and in every instance found wanting, and that, on the lines which he advocates, can never succeed.

For the only form of Communism which it has ever been possible to carry out successfully is that practised by religious communities. Monasteries and nunneries are, of course, Communist, but the fact which makes this possible is that they are composed of people who have renounced all interest in earthly things and centre all their thoughts and
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desires on the Kingdom of Heaven. Secular Communism, by its insistence on materialism, eliminates the only factor that makes the system feasible—belief in God and the Hereafter. It is inconceivable that leading Communists should be unaware of this fundamental error in their teaching, or of the failure that has attended every attempt to put it into practice in the past—above all, of its colossal failure in Russia.

If, then, Communism or State Socialism has been proved impracticable, if, moreover, it is a system that no one who understands it can possibly want, who is to profit by establishing it? Sorel answered the question long ago—“A few professors who imagine they invented Socialism and a few Dreyfusard financiers.” In other words, the Intellectuals who cherish the hope of being given official posts in the Socialist State which will give them an advantage over their fellow-men, and a few Jewish financiers. Werner Sombart, summing up the system of the latter, says: “Their aim was to seize upon all commerce and all production; they had an overpowering desire to expand in every direction.” The system of free trade was all part of this plan and can be traced back as far as Anacharsis Clootz, who was doubtless considering the interests of his friends the Jews when in his Universal Republic he advocated “all the peoples forming one nation, all the trades forming only one trade, all interests forming only one interest.” It is easy to see that State Socialism may be merely the prelude to this scheme, and here M. Sorel and M. Copin Albancelli are curiously in accord.

“One formula,” the latter wrote in 1909, “sums up the whole Collectivist propaganda: All for the State. All for the State! The people imagine that this means: All for All! and they march forward, intoxicated with hope, towards the conquest of this fallacious idea, not dreaming that the State being henceforth in the hands of the Jews ‘all for the State’... will be ‘all for the Jews!’... The dictatorship imposed by the Jewish race will be a financial, industrial, and commercial dictatorship.”

What could better describe the government of Russia

1 La Conjuration juive contre le monde chrétien, pp. 448, 450.
to-day? The plan of wresting all capital out of private hands and placing it in the hands of the State, as under Communism, or in the hands of industrial syndicates as under Syndicalism, may well be the prelude to State Capitalism or to gigantic trusts controlled by international financiers. In this case the so-called war on capitalism is simply a war in favour of capitalism, of ruining all small holders of wealth or property in order to enrich a ring of multi-millionaires. A passage in Mr. Wells's articles on Russia lends colour to this theory:

Big business is by no means antipathetic to Communism. The larger big business grows the more it approximates to Collectivism. It is the upper road of the few instead of the lower road of the masses to Collectivism.¹

Conversely, then, may not Communism be the lower road which the masses are being invited to follow leading to "big business," that is to say, to super-Capitalism? Once embarked on this road there can be no turning back. The present Capitalist system—that is to say, the system that aims at the distribution of capital amongst as large a number of hands as possible—having been destroyed by the workers' own folly in favour of concentration of capital in the hands of the State, they will be obliged to work or starve. Their new masters will have them completely at their mercy.

It will be urged: "But the workers will never stand this; they will rise against their tyrants and overthrow them! What government of this kind could maintain itself in power?"

But this is where the rôle of the German armies comes in. It is quite true that a group of international financiers could not of its own strength maintain itself in power against an enraged industrial proletariat, but if we imagine this financial power backed by a superb military system, if, in a word, we picture an alliance between Prussian militarism and international finance, the plan no longer appears impracticable.

It is this alliance that to-day menaces civilization, and

¹ *Sunday Express for November 28, 1920.*
it is an alliance of long standing, as we have seen in the earlier chapters of this book. The present campaign of anti-Semitism raging in Germany is largely a strategic manoeuvre with the object of reinstating Germany in the eyes of the world and throwing all the blame for both the war and the revolution on the Jews. Germany will not relinquish her Jews as long as they can help her towards the attainment of her dream of world-power. Nor will the International Jew forsake Germany as long as by her military strength she remains the horse to back.

Yet, formidable as this coalition may be, does it provide the whole force of Bolshevism? The organization—yes; but the force—no. In following the history of World Revolution one other factor, an immense factor, must be taken into consideration—the power of anarchy. All Bolsheviks are not Jews or Germans; all are not inspired by Jews or Germans. The importance of the constitutional destructionist cannot be over-estimated. It is essential to recognize that there are men and women in the world who will throw themselves into any subversive movement for sheer love of violence—it is idle to seek with them a motive. This has been so all through the revolutionary movement. For although down the line of State Socialism the influence of the Germans and the Jews is clearly evident, down the line of Anarchy, except for the original inspiration of Weishaupt and the agitations of Most and Hartmann, it is hardly to be found at all. Bakunin was the author of a polémique against the Jews; Sorel was an ardent anti-Dreyfusard; Lev Chorny, the Russian Anarchist, at the beginning of the present revolution warned the Russian people against the Jewish leaders of Bolshevism. If modern Communism, that is to say, Marxist Socialism, is German and Jewish, Syndicalism and Anarchy are peculiar to the Latin and Slavonic races. It was this fearful element that contributed largely to the ferocity of Bolshevism, and, exploiting the native tendency of the Russian people towards violence, could inaugurate an orgy of blood and terror.

Bolshevism uses Syndicalism, like Anarchy, to establish its power, it encourages the General Strike, which enters in no way into its own programme, but the spirit of Syndical-
ism exists apart from Bolshevism and is as much to be feared. If revolution breaks out in this country it will be a Syndicalist revolution—the General Strike with its fearful programme of sabotage and violence, its carnival of rioting and destruction. But it is not Syndicalism that will win the day. The lessons of history prove that: anarchy, ephemeral in its essence, must always give way before organization. And if this organization is not supplied by the forces of law and order, it will be the iron bureaucracy of the German armies and the international financiers which will establish its domination over a ruined country and a helpless people.