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The statements about jewry’s plans for world domination brought together in The Protocols of the Elders of Zion have had an enormous political impact of an educational nature about jewry. Through them, thousands and thousands of people have been made aware of the corrupting character of jewish thought and action. They then reach for other writings or watch their “citizens of the jewish faith” more carefully and find confirmed the basic points of the Protocols. Hardly any other book has so aroused the hatred of jewry, which attempts to destroy or defame the Protocols with all available methods.

Protocols CoverWorld jewry attempted to strike a decisive blow against this highly dangerous incriminating document before a court in Berne, Switzerland. The “Swiss-Israelite Federation” and the “Jewish Religious Society” brought suit in July 1933 against a Swiss bookseller who had sold the Protocols. The timing of the case alone proves that the jews were launching a political attack on National Socialist Germany. The same goal was served by a case World jewry brought before an international court in Cairo (the so-called Cairo trial), which like the battle about the Protocols of the Elders of Zion resulted in a major defeat for the jews in their battle against National Socialism outside of Germany. The trial about the Protocols ended before the Berne court on 14 May 1935 after becoming a huge case. Experts were called and jewish witnesses from around the world testified. Prominent witnesses for the defense, however, were not allowed to testify. The one-sided pro-jewish nature of the trial found clear expression in the verdict. After all the effort, the defendant Silvio Schnell had to pay a fine of 20 francs and fellow defendant Fischer was fined 50 francs for distributing an anti-Semitic book. Such small fines were in contrast to the costs of the trial, 27,000 francs, which after the first trial were charged to the two defendants. This grotesque difference between the absurdly small fines — when compared to the importance of the legal issue — and the size of the court costs charged to the defendants shows the uncertainty of the judge, and probably the fact that the judge was not convinced of the “falsity” of the Protocols or that it was immoral literature.

The jews wanted to conduct a propaganda campaign against anti-Semitism at the cost of several anti-Semites, and one particularly aimed at National Socialist Germany. They found a judge who — if perhaps somewhat hesitantly — followed their political desires. He ruled in 1935 that the Protocols of the Elders of Zion (Theodor Fritsch’s edition) was immoral literature and violated the 1916 “Law on Movie Theaters and Measures against Immoral Literature.” He banned it in Berne Canton.

We will go into more detail on the jewish conception of immoral literature later. Here we need only give the grounds for the acquittal after appeal to the Berne Supreme Court on 1 November 1937 to reveal the jews’ political maneuvering. Judge Peter issued a carefully worded but sharp ruling about the decision by the lower court. He ruled that the lower court judge had improperly handled the testimony about the genuineness of the Protocols. Since the parties involved selected the experts, confidence in their testimony was shaken. The so-called unbiased expert Loosli (who used every opportunity to support the jewish position) was not impartial. He had already written in a polemic, unscientific manner about the authenticity of the Protocols and one could only assume that the lower court judge was unaware of that. He was warned to be more careful about such testimony in the future. Furthermore, the expert testimony was entirely irrelevant. A possibly forged text was not necessarily immoral literature and an accurate text could nonetheless be immoral. The nature of the text was determined only by its content and form. Whether or not the Protocols was a forgery — as maintained by the plaintiffs — was therefore irrelevant. The only question was whether the Protocols was, as claimed, immoral literature. The law did not define the term precisely. One probably intended literature of no or limited value that met certain criteria contained in the law. Whether the material was distributed in the hope of making a profit was irrelevant.

Even if the Protocols was able to make its readers into opponents of the jews, it would be going too far to claim that the Protocols encouraged or led to criminal behavior. If there were in fact attacks on jews in Switzerland, it could not be proven that reading the Protocols caused them, nor that reading the Protocols was likely to encourage such behavior. The court believed that there were other causes. One could not, therefore, say that the Protocols endangered morality. The federal court stated that a text could not be banned “because it contained material unpleasant for the jews.”

One may conclude from the acquittal that the task of a court is not to determine whether the Protocols is genuine or a forgery. That, we can conclude from the judge’s ruling, is the task of historical scholarship.

World jewry’s political maneuver against National Socialist Germany thereby collapsed. Truth and justice triumphed. For the Jewish Religious Society in Berne, however, the decision brought back the question of paying for the witness and expert testimony. To persuade the judge of the lower court to turn his courtroom into a center of jewish propaganda, they had pledged to cover the costs. After the defendants were freed not only from their fines, but also from the court costs, Berne’s jews had to pay themselves for their political insanity of 1933.

So much for the trial that brought the Protocols to the attention of the world once again, in part because of jewish propaganda itself. Its outcome not only reduced the suspicion that the Protocols was a forged and immoral document, but also made clear that the origin of the Protocols was not a matter to be determined by a court, but rather by historical scholarship. This is a matter worth great effort, but it must be said that outside of Germany only a few scholars have the necessary intellectual and physical resources. The majority of scholars are unable to study the matter because for most countries the jewish question is raised only rarely because of jewish power over the press and scholarship. Furthermore, in countries outside Germany the physical requirements are lacking, since studying the history of the Protocols is a scholarly task of international scope for which thorough and detailed investigation has to be conducted throughout the world, or at least in Europe and America. And above all, this scholarly work must be conducted in the archives of a country in which jewry has absolute control, Soviet Russia.

Why Russia? The history and spread of the Protocols up to this edition proves why. The oldest reliable evidence of the Protocols is contained in the Russian magazine Snamja, published in 1903. In 1905, or at the latest 1906, a text by Georg Butmi titled The Roots of Our Troubles appeared in St. Petersburg. By 1907 the third edition was titled The Enemies of Humanity (St. Petersburg, 1907). Besides Butmi, the text was also published in 1905 by the Russian Sergei Alexandrovitsch Nilus as an appendix to the second edition of his book The Great in the Small: The Antichrist as a Coming Political Possibility. Further editions of this book appeared in 1911, 1912, and 1917. There is a copy of the 1905 edition at the British Museum in London. The third printing of Nilus’s 1911 edition was translated into German and published by Colonel Müller von Hanson under the pen name Gottfried zur Beck with his Auf Vorposten publishing firm. The rights were transferred to the Zentralverlag der NSDAP, Franz Eher, in Munich in 1929.

Since any reasonable person will grant the impossibility of researching the origin of The Protocols of the Elders of Zion in jewdified Soviet Russia, we will have to limit ourselves in this introduction to examining the accuracy of the Protocols on the basis of evidence provided by the jews within Germany.

 We want to choose several of the many individual paragraphs and sections from the Protocols for which there is frightening evidence from jewish literature, particularly from the post-war period, that shows how they have been followed and realized.

They differ from the statements in the Protocols only in form and in changes in the language from the turn of the century to the post-war period. The unbiased reader will recognize from these citations that jewry has worked with even greater force in corrupting the German part of European culture than is evidenced in the Protocols. During the post-war period the jews had unlimited freedom in Germany, and it seemed to them to be the beginning of jewish domination of the German people such that they displayed openly and plainly their drive for power.

 Whenever the jew speaks or acts as a jew, his statements or acts will be shown to be consistent with the theses of the Protocols.

Since the betrayal of the German soldiers at the front and the resulting beginning of parliamentary domination is at the opening of the post-war period, we will begin with the section of the Protocols titled “universal suffrage”:

 “To secure this we must have everybody vote without distinction of classes and qualifications in order to establish an absolute majority, which cannot be gotten from the educated classes alone.” [Protocol 10]

The history of the World War and the post-war period in Germany alone provides an impressive collection of evidence such that one can speak of strict adherence to and systemic realization of a carefully thought-through plan. We have to limit ourselves here to a few convincing examples. The overwhelming role played by “German” jews in treason and agitation against Germany during the war can be seen in a book by “a French journalist” titled Behind the Scenes of French Journalism (Berlin, 1925). In it a jewish puppeteer, the “American” financial jew Otto Kahn, reveals this dishonorable and filthy business:

 “The Freie Zeitung was established in Berne, a newspaper of the worst sort. It employed journalists with rather broad consciences such as Grelling (the author of J’accuse and similar writings; [jew, the editor]), Röselmaier, Fernau [a jew, the editor], Edward Stilgebauer (author of the novel The Ship of Death, which portrayed the torpedoing and sinking of a huge ship in gruesome detail). They were under the direction of the Maison de las Presse (in Paris) and twisted the facts intentionally, subtly selecting documents and discovering bloodthirsty German atrocities. The Swiss government was powerless. It should not be forgotten that the well-known American banker Otto Kahn [a jew, the editor] contributed $50,000 to establish the Freie Zeitung.”

That is how jewry worked against a strong Germany that was determined to resist. in Germany itself, the jews Alfred H. Fried, Alfred Einstein, Eduard Bernstein, privy councilor Witting-Witkowski, Wulfsohn, Siegfried Balder, Magnus Hirschfield, Dr. Oskar Cohn, Hugo Haase, Kurt Eisner, among whom Maximilian Harden (Wikowski) particularly stands out. Even before the war they worked hard to bring down the monarchy. Their racial comrade Max Reinhardt said:

 “If one could trace the important events of this period to their origin, one would have to admit that all the threads led to a single man in Grunewald. Whatever the results of the great upheavals of the present may be, later observers will have to conclude that he was their cause.” (Maximilian Harden on 20 October).

After the war and in the midst of Germany’s greatest poverty, Harden celebrated his triumph in an unsurpassable hate-filled way:

 “It [Germany, the editor] may regain its rights only when it has the courageous dignity, even before tramps, to admit its injustice.” (Zukunft, 1919, I, p. 328).

No worse an infernal monstrosity of jewish thinking can be found in the Protocols. It corresponds to the practical proposals in the conclusion of the London Plan to impose war debts on Germany through trusts and later the Dawes Plan:

 “Germany’s first task in the consortium [the trust, the editor], as debtor to its creditors, as the defeated to the victors, is to provide all necessary means for building up Russia, experts, technicians, skilled labor, tools and finished products, which will help it, along with the industry in Northern France and English and American commerce, to recover.” (Zukunft, Nr. 23, 4.3.1922).

These facts and evidences give a picture of wide-spread jewish efforts against Germany’s will to resist wherever it was to be found. It was the preliminary work for the Weimar Constitution, created by the jew Hugo Preuß.

 It followed the Protocols’ call to establish “the absolute power of the majority” down to the smallest detail.

The importance to the jews of “creating” new constitutions that affirm the absolute power of the majority is proven by the surprising fact that nearly all German “democratic” and “republican” constitutions have jewish paternity. The creators of the first Reich constitution were the jew Gabriel Riesler and Johann Jacoby. The former was “Reorganizer” of the Democratic Party of Prussia and spokesman for international democracy, the latter one of the most prominent attorneys in the “German Citizens of the Mosaic Faith.” They along with their baptized racial comrade Eduard von Simson created the first German Reich constitution. That same revolutionary year 1848, the jewish demagogue Adolf Fischhof prepared a “representative constitution” in Vienna. It demanded complete freedom of the press, which means the unrestrained incitement of public opinion, the abolition of the death penalty, and “absolute majority rule.” It was followed exactly in the republican federal constitution of German-Austria, which was the work of the jew Kelsen. And the Weimar Constitution of the German Republic not only agreed with the demands of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, but was prepared by an exclusively jewish committee. The jew Paul Nathan published the following details about the history of this constitution in the newspaper Vorwärts, edited by his racial comrade Stampfer (who himself wrote on 20.10.1918, Nr. 289: “As socialists, our firm will for Germany is that it should lower its war flag forever without having brought it home the last time in victory.”):

 “Late that fall Hugo Preuß, who usually did pay visits, surprised me by coming to my home and said:

 ‘Ebert has asked me to draft the German Reich constitution. Should I do it? And I instantly replied: ‘Naturally, if you are guaranteed a free hand.’ An hour later we were with…

 …Theodor Wolff of the Berliner Tageblatt. Soon we were joined by…

 …Witting, Maximilian Harden’s brother….

 …and all of us whom Preuß had brought together…

 were agreed that Preuß — as long as his independence was assured — should agree to Ebert’s request and had to do it. Thus Preuß moved from Jerusalem-Strasse to Wilhelm-Strasse.” ( Vorwärts, 9. 10. 1925).

From Jerusalem-Straße to Wilhelm-Straße! With that began the rule of the jewish spirit over Germany in the preparation of the Reich constitution, the law under which all Germans were to live.

Knowing these facts, one can understand why the jews were so happy after the successful “German revolution,” as they called the November revolt of 1918. In the “serious” jewish magazine Der Jude we find an article not from the pen of a favorite author, but rather from the editors of this magazine itself. It represented a broad circle of the jews in Germany, and displayed a spirit absolutely identical with the Protocols:

 “The German revolution is the first powerful phase of the beginning of the liquidation of war, and this phase shows the scale and effects the individual phases of this liquidation will have. For us jews the concluding phase of the war will be of enormous significance, determining the future perhaps even more than the years of the war itself.”

This statement was stressed once again in an unmistakable sentence:

 “We were not deeply involved in the war.”

Then followed a genuinely jewish interpretation of the November revolt and a prophesy about the post-war period that, as we learned, turned out to be all too true:

 “We will feel bound to it [the age, the editor] and the ideas guiding it, and with the goals for which it is striving. It will set spirit against force, justice against power, peace between the peoples against war between the peoples, and we will know that jewish ethos and jewish pathos are at work. An age of the breakthrough of the jewish spirit in the world comes once more, an age in which humanity moves forward to save itself. How could we stand aside when other peoples are transforming their lives? We will also experience this age in a positive and affirming way, fully aware that we are the children of the prophets.”

Hidden behind these general phrases is the claim that after the work before and during the war, the future will be a jewish age. In the following passage this is said openly, in a way that to us leads back to the theses of the Protocols:

 “The collapse of these three powers [Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia, the editor] in their old form means that jewish policy is much easier to conduct. The fact that the same war that inaugurated a jewish national policy recognized world-wide also led to the collapse of three great powers hostile to the jews is a unique combination of events that may give one cause to think.” (Der Jude, v. 3, 1918/1919, p. 449 and following).

In truth these facts, but also the points of the Protocols we have mentioned agree, and after this and similar statements yet another point of the Protocol is relevant, the policy of hampering the resistance of non-jews through war and a universal world war. It says:

 “We must be in a position to respond to every act of opposition by war with the neighbors of that country which dares to oppose us: but if those neighbors should also venture to stand collectively against us, then we must offer resistance by a universal war.” [Protocol 8]

Those three states about whose defeat the jewish magazine rejoices already had anti-Semitic groups in public life before the war that “resisted” the jews. And after the war these three countries were the first to suffer, and suffer most terribly, as hostages of jewish communism.

Before we go into further points from the Protocols from the same standpoint to see whether they were realized in post-war Germany, we must consider the accuracy of the statement in Der Jude that the coming age, the years after 1918, would be jewish. The jew Lucien Wolf, a leader of the “English” jews, had unsurpassed insight into the political activities of his racial comrades. With cynical openness, he provided an eloquent, if not exhaustive, insight into the role of the jews in international politics after the war, particularly those who devised the Peace Dictate [the Treaty of Versailles]. In his essay in the Jüdische Preß-Zentrale Zürich he wrote:

 “The great progress of the second decade of the twentieth century and its democratic consequences offers the possibility for a significant increase in diplomatic activity on the part of the jews. During the war, two jews who followed the example of those of their faith in the 16th and 17th centuries helped to defend against new attacks on Europe’s freedom and on the balance of power. Lord Reading … and Baron Sonnio brought about the Treaty of London in 1915 that dissolved the three-party pact and led to Italy’s entrance into the war.

 Other than these two men, we jews had no leading diplomatic representatives during the war. However, numerous jews were quickly employed in the newly-established intelligence and propaganda agencies that were part of all the foreign ministries, since they possessed the traditional broad cosmopolitan vision and could speak other languages. A significant but not widely known fact is that none of the warring nations knew how to properly use the jews. The foreign ministries in London, Paris, and Berlin organized special jewish departments that concentrated on the analysis of jewish matters. The history of the competition between these departments with regards to Palestine, which Zionist leaders used so effectively, must still be written. From the beginning the Zionist leanings of London’s Foreign Office was clear. The head of the new Jewish Department, although not a jew himself, shared the name of a cousin who was a famous diplomat, journalist, and writer, and who was a pioneer of the Zionist idea. The Jewish Departments in Paris and Berlin were headed by famous jewish professors who were, however, lukewarm about Zionism. One was Professor Sylvain Levi, the eminent Sanskrit scholar and current president of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, the other Professor M. Sobernheim, also an eminent Orientalist. The British and French departments have been eliminated, but the Jewish Department on Wilhelmstraße is still functioning and remains under the leadership of Professor Sobernheim. In recognition of Professor Sylvain Levi’s services to the Quai d’Orsay, his son Daniel Levi was accepted into the distinguished circle of French diplomacy. He is currently consul in Bombay.”

 “Many jews in the background at the conference (Versailles, where Oskar Strauß represented Taft), ephemeral representatives of a future state that hoped for recognition from the great powers. Lithuania was represented by the Kowno attorney Rosenbaum who was an assistant to the foreign minister. The Ukraine delegated two jews, the Kiev attorney Arnold Morgolin and Samuel Sarachi, a physician who had had a practice on London’s Whitechapel Road. We find the signatures of a small group of other outstanding jews on the final act of the peace conference. Baron Sonnino signed the Treaty of Versailles for Italy, Edwin Montagu for India, Louis Klotz on behalf St. Germain for France, Auguste Isaac for Trianon (also for France). Several of these representatives were also signatories to the treaties with Poland, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia. The treaty with Poland was signed by no fewer than three jews, Sonnino, Klotz, and Montagu, while the other two main treaties were signed by Klotz.”

 “Diplomatic activity by jews after the treaty can be discussed briefly. Europe (!) had a jewish foreign minister in the person of the deceased Walter Rathenau… Working closely with him was a jewish ambassador, the very capable Dr. Lujo Hartmann, a historian who represented Austria in Berlin. In London, Mr. Henry Rabbinowitsch was chancellor of the new and fully recognized Lithuania. Until recently, the outstanding “Russian”-jewish historian served in the same capacity in the legation of the Ukraine. Another outstanding historian, Professor Szymon Askenasi, is the chief of the Polish delegation to the League of Nations in Geneva. Both the Soviet government and the ephemeral military government that fought the Bolshevist usurpation had a number of jewish diplomats. The most prominent among the bolshevists was Litvinov, the former ambassador to Great Britain and current assistant to Foreign Minister Kameneff, as was his successor in London, Radek, who was also the first Soviet ambassador in Berlin. Salkind and Rothstein served as Soviet ambassadors to Teheran. On the other side, the old Russian attorney and senator Vinaver severed as foreign minister in the government of General Denikin, while the well-known international jurist Mandelstamm represented the same government in Paris.”

 “In addition to those named above, others who should be mentioned include, among others: Judge Abram Elkus of New York, former American ambassador to Constantinople; Mark Hyman of New York, general consul of the U.S. Shipping Board; Max D. Kirjassof, American consul in Manchuria and the American consuls Samuel Sale and Samuel Sokobin in Kalgan (China). Furthermore, there was Jacques Georges Nunberg, first secretary of the Polish embassy in Berne, and Milan Schwarz, Southern Slavish consul in Zürich. There were also several prominent jews among the delegates to the League of Nations.”

After this overview of the jewdification of diplomacy from a professional jewish pen, there can be no doubt that during this period “jewish ethos and jewish pathos” were at work and that the leadership of world affairs was almost entirely in the hands of the the “children of the prophets.”

During the post-war period Germany experienced the realization of another point of the program: “The constitution as a school of party discord”:

 “Liberalism replaced self-government by constitutional states, which the Jews saw as their goal. [This is a misquotation, as the text has “Gentiles” rather than “jews.’] A constitution, as you well know, is nothing but a school of discords, misunderstandings, quarrels, disagreements, fruitless party agitation, party whims — in a word, a school of everything that serves to destroy the personality of state activity.” [Protocol 10]

This development could already be seen at the turn of the century. The jews had a leading role in founding all political parties. Of the parties that they founded or helped to found and controlled down to the smallest detail, we will name only the National Liberal Party, one of whose founders was the jew Eduard Lasker, the Freethinker’s Party, one of whose founders was the jew Ludwig Bamberger, the “Right Center” at the National Assembly in Frankfurt, founded and led by the baptized jew Eduard von Simson, and finally the Democratic Party in Prussia, which was “reorganized” by the Königsberg jew Johann Jacoby. At the same time in Vienna, we find Adolf Fischhoff, spiritus rector of the Democratic Party, who for a time during the Revolution of 1848 had the fate of Vienna in his hands as president of the security service. The Conservative Party of the pre-war period was founded by the jew Friedrich Julius Stahl, who let himself be baptized. He built the intellectual foundation of Christian (!)-Conservative political thought. He was also the leader of the conservative faction in the upper house and had a central role as member of the Evangelical Church Council (!).

The strongest centers of jewry’s corrupting power are the two Marxist parties. In the history of The General German Workers’ Union led by the jew Ferdinand Lassale’s (Lasal) one can note that the Social Democrats and the Communist Party have the same father, Karl Marx-Mordochai, whose jewish nature in both his works and person was accurately characterized by a jew in this way:

 “His spirit found a direction that forever overcame all supernatural forces because he showed how they were bound to the physical world; without realizing it himself he became in his deepest self a jew in tradition of the prophets.” (Neue Jüdische Monatshefte, 25.4.1918).

Not only was the theoretician and founder of Marxism a jew, but jews are also the best-known Marxist practitioners whose deeds will forever be among the most terrible atrocities in history. We do not need to search for the names, but only refer to an essay by the jew Georg Hermann in which he celebrates the atrocities as a revelation of jewish nature, as a jewish contribution to the history of humanity. He says:

 “I hear jews say nervously: ‘They hurt us, that is not good, it leads to bad blood.’ To the contrary: Let us be proud that a Marx, a Lassalle, a Singer, a Rosa Luxemburg, an Eisner, even a Haase, etc., are jews. They represent the ancient human soul of our tribe better than any religious renewal is able to do. Let us cheerfully admit that also in Russia, in Hungary, many of those —whether they are correct or not I do not dare to say — many of those who seeking to bring the oppressed, miserable masses to new, better, humane forms of life, a Trotsky, a Bela Kuhn, are jews. They only prove that human thought is best advanced by the jews.” (Neue Jüdische Monatshefte, v. 3. Nr. 19/20).

Georg Hermann, the author of the well-known novel Jettchen Gebert, was fully aware of the significance of his words that he directed to his racial comrades in a jewish magazine. In another work from the same time directed to the broader public of the German people, his Randbemerkungen (Berlin, 1919), he presented himself as a “opponent of nationality” and in a statement directed to the Germans wrote:

 “We must finally learn to put humanity above nationality.”

At the same time as he glorifies jewish-Communist murderers like Trotsky and Bela Kuhn in a jewish magazine as real leaders of modern jewry, he tries in another work to take away from the German readership its faith in its great men:

 “Humanity would be better had it never known its great statesmen, generals, and rulers — without great men and without great ages it would have been much better off. Socially and culturally, it would be 5,000 years ahead.” (Randbemerkungen, p. 90).

That is only one brief example of many that provides a look at the “school of discord” that the Protocols proposes as means to the end. The Marxist jews promoted class struggle within the people, subverted national powers of resistance and public morality, while intellectual jews who pretended to be nonpartisan saw to it that jewish unity was preserved. This wicked double game that praised jewish-Marxist atrocities on one hand while subverting and weakening non-Aryan peoples by inciting one group against another through carefully prepared slogans is well-founded in the plan found in the Protocols. One can take the following passages and translate them from the language of the turn of the century into that of the post-war period:

 “They have never yet and they never will have the sense to reflect that this dream of equality is a manifest violation of the most important law of nature, which has established from the very creation of the world that one creature is unlike another and that personality plays a decisive role. If we have been able to blind them in this way, it is amazingly clear proof that their minds in no way measure up to ours. That is the guarantee of our success.” [Protocol 15]

And:

 “The word ‘freedom’ plunges human society into a battle against all powers, against the power of God and that of nature. When we sit on the throne we will erase this word from the human vocabulary because it is the very principle of brute force that turns the masses into bloodthirsty beasts of prey. These beasts, it is true, fall asleep after they have enjoyed their blood and can then easily be chained. If they are not given blood, however, they do not sleep, but rather fight.” [Protocol 3]

Or:

 “It is from us that all-engulfing terror proceeds.” [Protocol 10]

Could the theory and practice of the jewish rulers of Russia and the Komintern during the post-war period, and which they are doing today in Spain, be better expressed than they were at the turn of the century?

It would go beyond the bounds of this introduction were we to spend more time on the jewish policies of the Marxist parties or list the actions and statements of the jews that prove and justify the historical accuracy of these citations from the Protocols. Let us compare another thesis from the Protocols with historical facts. Regarding jewish domination of the press it says:

 “No news will reach the public without our approval. We have already practically reached this goal, since the news from the entire world flows through a few news agencies, where they are processed and only then sent on to the individual editorial boards, agencies, etc.” [Protocol 12]

The extent to which the source of the international press system was jewdified even during the pre-war period is proven by looking at the three leading world press agencies. All three were founded by jews and the two that survive today are still fully jewdified. The French Agence Havas was founded by the jew Charles Lois Havas, the English Reuters by Josaphat Beer, the son of a rabbi who later added the name “Reuter,” while the now defunct Wolff Telegraph Agency in Germany was the work of the jew Bernhard Wolff.

The extend to which jewry used the power of the press to serve jewish interests is clear from an editorial in the magazine Der Jude, which was published before (!) the end of the war. It threatened the German government with jewish world power:

 “We have a leading role in the international press, in international finance, and in economic life; we influence public opinion, we are an important factor in establishing international attitudes and — something very important — we are represented everywhere. We are truly a unique international people, spread over every land, active in every aspect of politics, and of immeasurable value to anyone who wishes to be our ally.” (v. 3, 1918/19, p. 194 and following).

Closely bound to the press was jewish influence on Germany’s intellectual and cultural life. Jewry had no limits here during the post-war period, able to fully realize the thesis in the Protocols about subversive activity in this field:

 “We have stupified, misled, and corrupted non-jewish youth. We based their education on false principles and doctrines, whose falsity we knew well, but which we nonetheless used.” [Protocol 9]

The reader cannot be spared the results of this, evidenced in the defense of immoral and obscene literature by writers whom the jews consider great and important members of their race. They fought the law against immoral and obscene literature, claiming that it was necessary to the intellectual life of the nation and particularly for the education of the youth. They praised it accordingly. The Berliner Tageblatt, at the time a purely jewish newspaper proclaimed by the jews to be Germany’s leading international newspaper, wrote the following about the battle over the law, which ultimately passed despite jewish influence:

 “Obscenity is absolutely necessary for the youth. Maiden aunts argue the fantasy that young boys and girls are corrupted by obscene literature. In reality, however, the fantasies of young people going through puberty are rather obscene, and these fantasies need obscene literature to redirect their arousal in harmless ways. If one takes obscene literature away from the youth, the number of youthful sex crimes would increase tremendously. The outlet would be closed, the inner pressure would have destructive effects. Obscene literature means as much, even more to the youth than dirty jokes to adults. What would become of all the fine citizens gentlemen and workers who exchange dirty jokes at pubs, bowling clubs, or gentlemen’s evenings if one closed off that outlet — what filthiness would they do if they could no longer talk about filthiness!” (B.Z. of 1.12.1926).

The jews used every means to oppose this law. The jew Willi Haas’s Literarische Welt, which otherwise had no interest in Germandom across our borders saw Germans abroad as a way around the law. The jew Heinrich Eduard Jakob proposed the following plan:

 “The Index liborum prohibitorum this law will establish is valid only for the territory of the Reich. What is the sense of establishing censorship for sixty million German readers when there are 90 million of them? The law does not encompass the purely German population of Austria, Switzerland, or northern Bohemia. It does not encompass the Baltic Germans, those in Alsace or Luxemburg, Danzig or Upper Silesia. The law is so weak that, to give only a few examples, energetic action by three foreign German newspapers, the Neue Freie Presse in Vienna the Neue Züricher Zeitung,” and the Prager Tageblatt could render it lame. Will these newspapers do anything? Be assured, they will. They will do it because of their German past, because of their liberal tradition, and for another reason.” (Die literarische Welt, Nr. 51 of 17.12.1926).

Today we must grant that these German-language jewish newspapers abroad did their duty under Jakob’s plan in an exemplary way. So too did the jewish “‘writer” Franz Wersel, who wrote in the Literarische Welt of 26.11.1926 that he became a member of the Academy of Literature only so that he could use it “official authority” to “fight this dreadful law against obscenity and immorality ” with more force than he otherwise would have.

Clear evidence of the satanic battle opposing the protection of German youth from obscenity and trashy literature, from moral corruption and moral destruction, is clear from the behavior of the jews in Berne and all of their racial comrades in the battle against The Protocols of the Elders of Zion. They misused the “Law on Movie Theaters and Measures against Immoral Literature” against a publication that in no way injured moral sensibilities, even if it said something “painful” for the jews. This will make clear to any reasonable person the duplicity and dishonesty of jewry. They used every means to morally corrupt non-jewish youth during the post-war period by fighting the law against trashy and obscene literature. After jewish world power had been shaken by the National Socialist revolution, however, a similar law in the canton of Berne was good enough to prevent the unmasking of jewish world power.

We do not here need to discuss in detail the jewdification of theatrical life, particularly the jewdification of the Berlin stage. A report from one of the few newspapers from that time that dared to oppose the evil spirit of the almost entirely jewish theater directors had this to say about the theater calendar at the time. It gives us a picture of the jewish stamp on the holidays of the period, a mockery of everything German and Christian that had not been possible up to that time:

 “The Lessing Theater is producing Shaw (we think highly of Shaw — but for Christmas?). The donkeys at the Künstler-Theater dug up Sardou, the “Deutsche” Theater for Christmas is giving us Beer-Hoffman’s Zionist play Jakobs Traum. The Kammerspiele is doing Wedekind’s Fühlingswachen in the afternoon, in the evening ‘more Strindberg.’ Das kleine Theater is doing Das unberührte Weib by the kitschy Pole Zapolka. To improve the attendance the actresses are half naked. Das kleine Schauspielhaus is doing ‘Strindberg.’ Das Theater an der Königgrätzstraße is performing, of all things, Wedekind’s Schloß Wetterstein. The Residenz-Theater was at least honestly unashamed: it celebrated Christmas with the bordello drama Evchen Humrecht. Long live the theater director who earns money following the principles of the bordello’s madam! The Tribüne is not only presenting Wedekind’s Franziska,but more importantly has the theatrical whore ‘Wojan’ stark naked on stage behind a thin veil. Is it hateful for us to say in combating this Witch’s Sabbath during the Christmas season that jewish theater directors are responsible for these monstrosities?” (Deutsches Volkstum, 1920, Nr. 3).

In the revues, produced exclusively by jews during the post-war period, the destruction of family life, and above all marriage, reached its epitome. We content ourselves here by with an overview of the titles of some of these jewish products: Undress, On and Off, Beautiful and Chic, Damn — A Thousand Women, A Thousand Naked Women, Strictly Forbidden, The Sins of the World, Sinful and Sweet. And we add the text of the poster for the James Klein Revue Undress:

8:15 Komische Oper 8:15

 James Klein’s

Powerful New Revue Show

 Undress!

An Evening without Morality

 in 30 Scenes

With 60 Prize-Winning Nude Models

 The Hunt for Beautiful Women

Experience with a 15-Year-Old

 The Huge Heavenly Bed

The Woman with a Whip

 Sunshine and Naked Magic

 Living Bells and Living Flowers

and 20 more Scenes.

 Original Paris Revue Costumes

Parket: 4,50 Balcony 3,50

 Advance Sales after 10 a.m.

How much jewry not only tried to scuttle the law against immoral literature and obscenity, but was also actively involved in pornographic films of the worse sort is shown by the titles of a selection of films of jewish origin:

 How Pure and Beautiful Women Fall; The Right of Free Love; Lu, the Coquette; Sinful Blood; In the Clutches of Sin; The Daughter of the Prostitute; Those Who Sell Themselves (Those Who Live from Love); The Courage to Sin; Paragraph 175 — Different than the Others; Paragraph 218 — Abortion; Paragraph 182 — Under the Age of Consent; Lilli’s Path to Prostitution.

Closely bound to the propaganda for pimps and prostitution which was pressed by the jews on Germans with a persistence that makes it clear that it was no accident — closely bound to that is jewish propaganda for race-mixing, promoted to our people through fashion and the press. An essay by the jew Clare Goll illustrates the ways the jews sought to realize their slogan of the equality of all who have a human face. It concerned the niggerification of Europe, which an a way revealed the general staff plan of the jews, showing how they used fashion to advance their instinctual goal of corrupting their host people:

 “In New York the Negroes have their hair straightened, the Whites want curls, Negro hair. That goes well with dark colored skin, the new fashion of brown skin. When one gets to the point where the skin of Negroes can be whitened, racial differences will happily disappear. This will benefit and bless old-fashioned looking white humanity.” (Berliner Tageblatt, Nr. 489 of 16.10.1928).

Furthermore, and also an explanation as to why the debasement of the host people is the prerequisite for jewish rule, consider the opinion of the jew Kurt Münzer, taken from his book Der Weg nach Zion:

 “We jews are not the only ones debased and at the end of a worn out culture that has been sucked dry. All the races of Europe have corrupted their blood as we have — perhaps we infected their blood. Everything today is jewdified. Our essence is in everything living, our spirit rules the world. We are the masters; what has power today is our intellectual child. We can no longer be driven out, we have overcome the races, corrupted them, broken their strength, everything is worn out, rotten and decayed because of our culture. Our spirit can no longer be exterminated.” (Kurt Münzer, Der Weg nach Zion, 1910)

Such jewish subversive activity that is particularly directed toward the non-jewish youth proves clearly that the jews have acted consistently with the cited passage from the Protocols. Along these lines, we may not forget the propaganda for pacifism that jews such as Kurt Tucholsky (alias Peter Panter, Theobald Tiger, Ignaz Wrobel, and Casper Hauser) used throughout history to try to break the will of the people to defend itself. The following citations from Tucholsky’s pamphlets reveal the aggressive and combative tone that he used to attempt to win over the always active and battle-ready German youth to his pacifism. Although he never was at the front, he had these clear words to say about his conduct during the World War:

 “…I shirked the war for three-and-a-half years however I could — and I regret that I did not have the courage to say no and refuse military service, like the great Karl Liebknecht. I am ashamed of that. I did what many others did, using every way I could find to avoid being shot at and having to shoot.” (Mit 5 PS, p. 85).

He built his own treasonous ideology:

 “What judges call treason does not bother us, and what they call high treason is for us not dishonorable. We are left cold by what they call perjury, destruction of documents, and breach of peace.” (Deutschland, Deutschland über Alles, p. 167).

If that were not enough, he calls for direct acts of treason:

 “For us pacifists … if required to preserve the peace of Europe, if demanded by our consciences, and I am fully aware of what I am saying, there is no German military secret that I would not give to a foreign power if it seemed necessary to preserve peace….”

 “We are traitors. But we betray a state that we renounce in favor of a land that we love, for peace and for our real fatherland: Europe.” (Weltbühne, 27.3.1928, p. 473).

Hand in hand with that go filthy insults against German soldiers who fought at the front and the constantly repeated charge that Germany was the one guilty for the World War. Tucholsky wrote in Freiheit about Hindenburg in 1922:

 “We reject the head of the supreme command of the army, this German underestimation commission. We reject a completely unsuitable person who still today has not understood what happened under his orders — and we greet with regret and shame the Belgian widows and orphans whose husbands and fathers were murdered back then.” (cited by Deutsches Volkstum, 1922, Nr. 10, p. 342).

Tucholsky was not the only jew who thought that way, as is proven by an essay by the “Viennese” jew Alfred Polgar in the Berliner Tageblatt of 1922. He wrote this about the Germans of 1914:

 “Cattle are cattle … Animals about to be slaughtered have no idea what is coming. The proof of that was brought en masse when the war began. They cheered in the streets, heads high, those that would fall to the axe.” (cited by Deutsches Volkstum, 122, Nr. 3, p. 130).

For fifteen years the jews in Germany followed The Protocols of the Elders of Zion in a striking way, working to stifle the will of German youth to fight. They did this not only in magazines and pamphlets, but also in university lecture halls. On 1 April 1933 there was a total of 1,066 jewish professors at German universities. They spread the poison of pacifism and a contempt for German heroism of people like Gumbels, Lessings, and their comrades. The reader must realize that such treasonous statements in word and image were not prohibited because the governmental press office in Prussia was in the hands of the jews. In Prussia in 1930, the press was under the patronage of jewish State Secretary Dr. Weißman, with his subordinates Superior Councilor Goßlar as press secretary for the Prussian government and Senior Councilor Dr. Peifer as his deputy, Councilor Dr. Weichmann as press secretary in the Prussian Department of State, Dr. Hirschfeld as press secretary in the Prussian Interior Ministry. The same was true for the Reich Federation of the Press, headed by the jew Georg Bernhard. The same was true in the Protective Federation for German Writers, which had the following leaders in 1928:

 Chairman: Walter von Molo (non-jew)

 Vice Chair: Arnold Zweig (jew)

 First Secretary: Paul Guttmann (jew)

 Assistant Secretary: Frau Adele Schreiber-Krieger (jew)

 Treasurer: Dr. Léon Zeitlin (jew)

 Assistant Treasurer: Dr. Theodor Bohner (non-jew)

 Board Members: Erich Baron (jew), Johannes R. Becher (non-jew), Robert Breuer (jew), Dr, Max Deri (jew), Dr, Annie Jacker (jew), Sami Gronemann (jew), Egon Erwin Kisch (jew), Dr. Alfred Kuhn (non-Jjw), Bruno Schönlang (jew), Paul Westheim (jew).

Another column in the account of jewish deeds is the propaganda for the abolition of Paragraph 175 of the legal code, which penalized homosexuality. This, too, was demanded by the Protocols as a way of corrupting non-jewish youth. The jew Magnus Hirschfeld had worked in this area long before the war. He created the “Scientific Humanitarian Committee,” an organization of homosexuals that spread throughout Germany, as his papers clearly prove. Even before the turn of the century it had offices in Berlin, Hamburg, Munich, and the Rhineland. These cells recruited doctors, attorneys, and even clergymen who supported the jew Hirschfeld and gathered lists of names for petitions to relevant government offices.

During the post-war period, this organization that was founded and led by jews had absolute freedom. There was a “press for homosexuals” and in one of their periodicals, Friendship, the following sentences could appear unhindered, without in any way be restricted by the constitution:

 “The homosexuals. These people hope that over the years the government and people will finally realize that the legal paragraph should be eliminated and that all Germans should enjoy the same rights.” (Das Freundschaftsblatt, 1928, Nr. 52).

Besides that public mockery of the German people, the jew Willi Haas’s Literarische Welt printed the following propaganda for homosexuality between women on the occasion of the Max Reinhardt-Goldmann’s premiere of Gefangenen by Bourdet (which treated homosexuality):

 “Two men speak in one scene about a lesbian drama that presumably takes place behind the scenes. When will we see finally see a play in which this love itself, its uniqueness, its psychology, its different language, the dialog of an eroticism foreign to men, receives serious literary treatment, above all the hopeless alienation of the man against this unapproachable, incomprehensible relationship? That would certainly be new material for our theatre, which needs new material.— (Literarische Welt, 1926, Nr. 24/25).

Closely connected to the battle against Paragraph 175 is the subversive jewish effort against Paragraph 218, which forbids abortion. Here, too, the jew Magnus Hirschfeld was a leader in a crime against the German people. From the countless articles by jewish authors — not to mention the actual crimes of jewish doctors against budding life — we mention only the following:

 Abortion or Birth Control? by Dr. Martha Ruben-Wolf; Sturm gegen 218 by Dr. Friedrich Wolf; Kindersegen, Fructhverhütung, Fruchtsabtreibung by Dr. Fritz Bruchbacher; Empfängsverhütung by Magnus Hirschfeld.

This overview of the culturally and morally subversive influence of the jews is only a brief summary of the available material on several important points. It is enough to show that each point of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion about the corruption of non-jewish youth has been more than fulfilled. The best way to measure the practical effects of this attack on the existence of a healthy German nation is to consider the jewdification of the medical and legal professions, the latter of which is always ready to defend its racial comrades of other professions in court. In Berlin the percentage of non-Aryan physicians on 1 October 1933 was 52.2%, this at a time when some jews had already left Germany. The percentage for attorneys as of 1 April 1933 was 50.9%. On 30 January 1933, 28.4% of Berlin’s judges and 15.1% of its states attorney were of jewish descent.

Each point of the Protocols could be handled in the same way. In Germany alone, there is enough material from the post-war period to prove the accuracy of the statements collected in the Protocols of the Elders of Zion. We will not cover further points simply because it would take far more space than is available in this introduction. To examine some statements in the Protocols would require lengthy historical research; other statements would require specialized scientific methods.

In closing, however, we want to give just one more example of the jewish hope for absolute world domination that always surfaces in jewish literature and essays. The old jewish hatred of the Goyim, familiar from the Talmud and Schulchan aruch and in jewish history from ancient times, is brought up to the modern era in the Protocols of the Elders of Zion where it receives a political discussion of opportunities and prospects. This jewish hatred is manifested anew each day in the private lives of individual jews. This form of jewish hatred was especially expressed in novels during the post-war period, such as Der Weg nach Zion by Kurt Münzer and Arthur Landsberger’s novel Asiaten. The “American” jew Samuel Roth gives a classic example of the private expression of Yahwe’s revenge on non-jews in his book Now and Forever. It takes the form of a dialogue between him and I. Zangwill. Reichsleiter Alfred Rosenberg discussed it in his major speech at the Reich Party Rally in 1937. The following is a long quotation from this major jewish pamphlet:

 Roth:

 “They envy our intellectual leadership of Europe whose thought is jew-born and

 jew-bred. Europe not only thinks in jewish terms, but all her enterprises are motivated by

 the personalities of jews. Only once, for one trembling moment, did the mind of Europe

 raise itself above the turmoil of its mental slavery, in the rhythmic, sentimental

 meditations of Descartes. But not till the rise of Spinoza did Europe achieve a

 philosophy. Spinoza is at the heart of European thought: he prevented Descartes who

 came before him from becoming a prophet, as he prevented Emanuel Kant who came

 after him from becoming a lawgiver. As it was in the beginning so it still is now. There is

 not a program, a sentiment or a conviction a European can choose to follow but he must

 follow a jew— whether it be Bergson, Marx or Freud.”

 “Why should not the intelligentsia of Europe hate us? Time and again we have humiliated

 them. We began by giving them Christianity, and for two thousand years they have been

 trying to live up to it. A continent-full of savages loving plunder and thieving, exulting in

 rape and incest, were saddled with a religion enjoining them to love their neighbors as

 themselves. Those mountain chieftains with hidden daggers kept in readiness to strike,

 those bands of idlers accustomed to hiring out their soldierly services at so much per day were advised to turn the other cheek. If they had only had the presence of mind, how they

 would have answered their Christian teachers! But the poor European has from time

 immemorial suffered certain periodic lapses of shyness in which it is difficult for him to

 deny any one anything. In such a moment it is easy to make him believe that he is good

 and noble and nothing else. In such a moment Christianity was imposed on Europe. And

 even though Europeans have not permitted themselves to be swung entirely out of their

 natural preference for pillage and brigandry, this religion we foisted on them has

 confused their speech and freighted their treaties with vows they do not mean and cannot

 understand.”

 “But Christianity was only the first of a long series of jewish enterprises of which

 Socialism is the culminating imposition. Instinctively Europe is as much against

 Socialism as she has always been against Christianity. Why are they gradually accepting

 Socialism? Europe is simply living though another one of her periods of shyness. But

 don’t worry. Europe will soon recover. Only see what has just happened here in England.

 Why did the railway workers and the longshoremen allow the Government to starve the

 coal miners into submission? ‘You held better and steadier jobs than we did during the

 war, so you can afford to strike.’ Was that not the substance of the reply of the railroad

 workers and the longshoremen to the appeal of the coal miners? I tell you that just as

 Christianity has failed to make Christians of them Socialism will fail to make men of

 them.”

 “In the meantime Socialism and Christianity are abiding, irritating symbols of Europe’s

 mental enslavement to Israel. When the Chestertons and the Bellocs talk of race purity

 and patriotism they lie in their throats. They know that we are racially purer than they are.

 They know that we are better patriots than they are. It is their intellectual slavery which

 rankles in them, and once this is understood we can afford to ignore them completely.”

 Zangwill:

 Suppose I grant you our intellectual leadership— I do not think it is possible to

 deny it— have not the Europeans leadership in everything else, in the conduct of great

 cities, in the arts, in military science? That is having so much more than we have that I

 still do not see why they should be angry or envious.”

 Roth:

 “There will be jews in Russia, in Germany, in Austria and in Italy. But the greater

 number of the jews will be massed in India, Persia, China and all the neighboring countries. Jews will be spread plentifully throughout the entire East, which will float

 strange colored banners fresh with triumph. The whole East will be alive with planning

 and with building. But in the midst of all this a strange, a terrible man will arise the like

 of whom has never before been seen on earth, and he will go through the market places of

 the East, and he will speak only a loathing of Europe.

 He will wander from man to man and from city to city, and his speech will be very scant

 and quiet, but something in his eyes will open up in their beholders great sluices of wrath,

 so that slowly, silently, desperately, his following will increase, and all with little clamor,

 all with little wagging of the boneless tongue.

 In time this man will become leader of an enterprise of vengeance which will start out

 modestly from Calcutta, but by the time it reaches Constantinople will number several

 millions of men carrying secreted in their clothes little yellow phials. Sweeping up the

 Steppes, their numbers will increase as by a miracle, and their great hordes will seem to

 darken the face of the earth.

 For six days and six nights the world will remain in the grip of these dark forces, for it

 took six days for God to create the world. The yellow cloud will slowly descend in their

 midst and breathing will become as painful as pulling nails from living fingers. A strange

 confusion will spread throughout the world during those dreadful six days. Having gone

 out for a stroll, a man will find on having reached the front door of his dwelling that he is

 legless. Sitting opposite a beautiful woman he will find himself gone blind. The water in

 his cup will taste like foul blood. His bones will snap like dry twigs.

 The lives of the peoples of Europe will flow out of them through the mouth, through the

 eyes, and through the dense, undented skin, in streams of foul blood wherever the strange

 man and his silent army will have passed through.

 In Russia only sucklings and illiterates will be spared— the rest will make huge graveyards

 of Moscow and Petrograd. Of Poland and the Ukraine he will make a howling wilderness,

 all the women in those countries will be put to shame before being killed as a reminder of

 what once happened to a defenseless people in their midst. The docks will spout foul

 blood where Danzig receives the sea.

 Of Belgium and Germany he will make such a slaughter-house that it will be necessary to

 build new and taller dykes around Holland that the smell of the carnage might not befoul

 a country for which his outraged memory will have no terrors. Through France he will

 sweep as a conflagration sweeps through a cornfield ….” (Samuel Roth, New and Forever (New York, 1925, p. 55 and following).

This bloodthirsty desire for murder and revenge against nonperishable peoples is constantly repeated in jewish literature and novels, and in the most varied ways. It is frightening and revolting, but nonetheless a genuine and accurate picture of the eternal enmity jews have against non-jews. The statements and demands in the Protocols are consistent with this well-nourished racial instinct, which as we have seen from the effects of the jews in Germany unscrupulously and steadily works to oppose and destroy all existing values of the community, culture, justice, and morality.

If we review once again these comments on the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, we must conclude that the theses and facts proclaimed in the Protocols and evidenced by the activities of the jews in Germany have been fully proved. The jews in post-war Germany have behaved consistently with what is written in the Protocols.

This conclusion has a large and pressing significance for all the cultured peoples of the world: they, too, must thoroughly study the jewish question in their countries. At the moment Germany is Enemy #1 of the jews. It has freed itself from this poison in its racial body through the Nuremberg Laws. Each people and each county, however, must sooner or later defend itself against subversive jewish activity. For us Germans, the memory of this time of subversion is only a warning. We have freed ourselves form the nightmare of jewish dominance. In all other states and peoples, however, there is daily evidence of similar or identical jewish subversion to be found. As long as they do not recognize and solve the jewish question and the jews continue to determine the fate of peoples — just recently the Blum’s French cabinet was 37.5% jewdified — so long will it be impossible to speak of peace between the peoples. For the future, therefore, and for ever country, there is but one warning call to reason, which also includes a call to knowledge and defense:

Peoples of the world, defend your holiest possessions!