

Did the Jews Foresee the World War?

Before proceeding to a more detailed study of the connection between the *written* program of the documents which are called “ The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion,” and the *actual* program as it can be traced in real life, we shall now view those plans which were future when the Protocols were uttered. It must be borne in mind, however, that what was *future* in 1896 and 1905, may be *past* today, that what was *plan* then may be *fulfillment* now. To bear this in mind will be in exact accord with the expression of Protocol 22—“ I have endeavored to indicate carefully the secrets of past and future events, *and of those momentous occurrences of the near future toward which we are rushing in a stream of great crises.*” Some of those “ momentous occurrences” have come to pass, and with them a brighter light on the Question which we are studying.

An illustration of this which is fresh in the minds of all was furnished by the Great War. Jewish comment on this series of articles has made much of the fact that one of the articles was devoted to the then prominence of the Jewish Question in Germany, and it was sought to mislead the people to think that this series was really a part of subtle German after-the-war propaganda. The fact is that articles on the Question in a number of countries were set aside in order to bring the Question itself prominently before the minds of Americans with the least delay. The postponed articles will appear in due season, though out of their order. Germany is today, with perhaps the possible exception of the United States, the most Jew-controlled country in the world—controlled within and from without—and a much stronger set of facts could be presented now than was presented in the original article (the facts of which were at first denied and later admitted by the Jewish spokesmen in the United States). For, since that article was written, public sentiment in Germany has swept the Jews largely out of public office. German public opinion exerted itself to the utmost to put German political administration back into German hands. But did that liberate Germany from the Jews? Not at all. For their entrenchments stretched further and deeper than mere display of official power. Their hold on the basic industries, the finances, the future of Germany has not been loosened in the least. It is there, unmovable. In what that hold consists, the reader will be told at some convenient time.

Germany is mentioned now, in connection with the Jews, for this purpose: It will be remembered that it was from Germany that the first cry of “ annexations” came, and it came at a time when all German war activities and war sentiment were admittedly in Jewish control. “ Annexations” was the cry that flashed across the world one day. And back across the world, from the United States, a nation that was not even a party to the war at that time, the word flashed back, “ No Annexations.” Thus by a dramatic play the whole question was thrust before the world.

Soon the people of all countries had forgotten the blood of battle, the war profiteers and every other vital point, and were discussing a matter which belonged to the end of the war and not the beginning, the question of “ annexations.” Now, when it is known who were controlling the formulation of war-aims in Germany and who were the chief counselors of the foreign policy of the United States at the same time, the projection of this question of “ annexations” into the world’s mind becomes interesting; interesting but not wholly intelligible.

Not until you read the Protocols do you get a full light on this—and this report of the Protocols which is now given the world probably dates from 1896; there is absolutely ironclad proof of the date 1905.

The Second Protocol begins on the note of war, and its opening words are these:

“ It is indispensable for our purpose that as far as possible, wars should bring no territorial advantages. This will shift war to an economic footing, and nations will perceive the strength of our superiority in the aid we render.”

Who was thinking, between 1896 and 1905, of the new “ no annexations” rule to be applied to war? Were you? Do you know of any statesman who was? We know that military men were concerned about the appliances and operations of any future war that might occur. We know that statesmen, of the more responsible sort, were working to consolidate a balance of interests that would make war extremely improbable. Who had outdistanced them all in foresight and planning sufficiently to lay down a definite program of “ no annexations?”

Fortunately the clue to the answer is supplied to us by unquestionable Jewish sources. The *American Jewish News* of September 19, 1919, had an advertisement on its front page which read thus:

“ WHEN PROPHETS SPEAK

By Litman Rosenthal

Many years ago Nordau prophesied the Balfour Declaration. Litman Rosenthal, his intimate friend, relates this incident in a fascinating memoir.”

The article, on page 464, begins: “ It was on Saturday, the day after the closing of the Sixth Congress, when I received a telephone message from Dr. Herzl asking me to call on him.”

This fixes the time. The Sixth Zionist Congress was held at Basle in August, 1903.

The memoir continues: “ On entering the lobby of the hotel I met Herzl’s mother who welcomed me with her usual gracious friendliness and asked me whether the feelings of the Russian Zionists were now calmer.

“ ‘ Why just the Russian Zionists, Frau Herzl?’ I asked. ‘ Why do you only inquire about these?’

“ ‘ Because my son,’ she explained, ‘ is mostly interested in the Russian Zionists. He considers them the quintessence, the most vital part of the Jewish people.’ ”

At this Sixth Congress the British Government (“ Herzl and his agents had kept in contact with the English Government” —*Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. 12, page 678) had offered the Jews a colony in Uganda, East Africa. Herzl was in favor of taking it, not as a substitute for Palestine,

but as a step toward it. It was this which formed the chief topic of conversation between Herzl and Litman Rosenthal in that Basle hotel. Herzl said to Rosenthal, as reported in this article: “ There is a difference between the final aim and the ways we have to go to achieve this aim.”

Suddenly Max Nordau, who seems at the conference held last month in London to have become Herzl’s successor, entered the room, and the Rosenthal interview was ended.

Let the reader now follow attentively the important part of this Rosenthal story:—(the italics are ours)

“ About a month later I went on a business trip to France. On my way to Lyons I stopped in Paris, and there I visited, as usual, our Zionist friends. One of them told me that this very same evening Dr. Nordau was scheduled to speak about the Sixth Congress, and I, naturally, interrupted my journey to be present at this meeting and to hear Dr. Nordau’s report. When we reached the hall in the evening we found it filled to overflowing and all were waiting impatiently for *the great master*, Nordau, who, on entering, received a tremendous ovation. But Nordau, without paying heed to the applause showered upon him, began his speech immediately, and said:

“ ‘ You all came here with a question burning in your hearts and trembling on your lips, and the question is, indeed, a great one, and of vital importance. I am willing to answer it. What you want to ask is: How could I—I who was one of those who formulated the Basle program—how could I dare to speak in favor of the English proposition concerning Uganda, how could Herzl as well as I betray our ideal of Palestine, because you surely think that we have betrayed it and forgotten it. Yet listen to what I have to say to you. I spoke in favor of Uganda after long and careful consideration; deliberately I advised the Congress to consider and to accept the proposal of the English Government, a proposal made to the Jewish nation through the Zionist Congress, and my reasons—but instead of my reasons let me tell you a political story as a kind of allegory.

“ ‘ I want to speak of a time which is now almost forgotten, a time when the European powers had decided to send a fleet against the fortress of Sebastopol. At this time Italy, the United Kingdom of Italy, did not exist. Italy was in reality only a little principality of Sardinia, and the great, free and united Italy was but a dream, a fervent wish, a far ideal of all Italian patriots. The leaders of Sardinia, who were fighting for and planning this free and united Italy, were the three great popular heroes: Garibaldi, Mazzini, and Cavour.

“ ‘ The European powers invited Sardinia to join in the demonstration at Sebastopol and to send also a fleet to help in the siege of this fortress, and this proposal gave rise to a dissension among the leaders of Sardinia. Garibaldi and Mazzini did not want to send a fleet to the help of England and France and they said: “ Our program, the work to which we are pledged, is a free and united Italy. What have we to do with Sebastopol? Sebastopol is nothing to us, and we should concentrate all our energies on our original program so that we may realize our ideal as soon as possible.”

“ ‘ But Cavour, who even at this time was the most prominent, the most able, and the most far-sighted statesman of Sardinia, insisted that his country should send a fleet and beleaguer with the

other powers Sebastopol, and, at last, he carried his point. *Perhaps it will interest you to know that the right hand of Cavour, his friend and adviser, was his secretary, Hartum, a Jew, and in those circles, which were in opposition to the government, one spoke fulminantly of Jewish treason. And once at an assembly of Italian patriots one called wildly for Cavour's secretary, Hartum, and demanded of him to defend his dangerous and treasonable political actions. And this is what he said: " Our dream, our fight, our ideal, an ideal for which we have paid already in blood and tears, in sorrow and despair, with the life of our sons and the anguish of our mothers, our one wish and one aim is a free and united Italy. All means are sacred if they lead to this great and glorious goal. Cavour knows full well that after the fight before Sebastopol sooner or later a peace conference will have to be held, and at this peace conference those powers will participate who have joined in the fight. True, Sardinia has no immediate concern, no direct interest in Sebastopol, but if we will help now with our fleet, we will sit at the future peace conference, enjoying equal rights with the other powers, and at this peace conference Cavour, as the representative of Sardinia, will proclaim the free and independent, united Italy. Thus our dream for which we have suffered and died, will become, at last, a wonderful and happy reality. And if you now ask me again, what has Sardinia to do at Sebastopol, then let me tell you the following words, like the steps of a ladder: Cavour, Sardinia, the siege of Sebastopol, the future European peace conference, the proclamation of a free and united Italy.' "*

" The whole assembly was under the spell of Nordau's beautiful, truly poetic and exalted diction, and his exquisite, musical French delighted the hearers with an almost sensual pleasure. For a few seconds the speaker paused, and the public, absolutely intoxicated by his splendid oratory, applauded frantically. But soon Nordau asked for silence and continued:

" ' Now this great progressive world power, England, has after the pogroms of Kishineff, in token of her sympathy with our poor people, offered through the Zionist Congress the autonomous colony of Uganda to the Jewish nation. Of course, Uganda is in Africa, and Africa is not Zion and never will be Zion, to quote Herzl's own words. But Herzl knows full well that *nothing is so valuable to the cause of Zionism as amicable political relations* with such a power as England is, and so much more valuable as England's main interest is concentrated in the Orient. Nowhere else is precedent as powerful as in England, and so it is most important to accept a colony out of the hands of England and create thus a precedent in our favor. Sooner or later the Oriental question will have to be solved, and the Oriental question means, naturally, also the question of Palestine. England, who had addressed a formal, political note to the Zionist Congress—the Zionist Congress which is pledged to the Basle program, England will have the deciding voice in the final solution of the Oriental question, and Herzl has considered it his duty to maintain valuable relations with this great and progressive power. *Herzl knows that we stand before a tremendous upheaval of the whole world. Soon, perhaps, some kind of a world-congress will have to be called, and England, the great, free and powerful England, will then continue the work it has begun with its generous offer to the Sixth Congress. And if you ask me now what has Israel to do in Uganda, then let me tell you as the answer the words of the statesmen of Sardinia, only applied to our case and given in our version; let me tell you the following words as if I were showing you the rungs of a ladder leading upward and upward: Herzl, The Zionist Congress, the English Uganda proposition, the future world war, the peace conference where with the help of England a free and Jewish Palestine will be created.'*

“ Like a mighty thunder these last words came to us, and we all were trembling and awestruck as if we had seen a vision of old. And in my ears were sounding the words of our great brother Achad Haam, who said of Nordau’s address at the First Congress:

“ ‘ I felt that one of the great old prophets was speaking to us, that his voice came down from the free hills of Judea, and our hearts were burning in us when we heard his words, filled with wonder, wisdom and vision.’ ”

The amazing thing is that this article by Litman Rosenthal should ever have been permitted to see print. But it did not see print until the Balfour Declaration about Palestine, and it never would have seen print had not the Jews believed that one part of their program had been accomplished.

The Jew never betrays himself until he believes that what he seeks has been won, then he lets himself go. It was only to Jews that the 1903 “ program of the Ladder” —*the future world war—the peace conference—the Jewish program*—was communicated. When the ascent of that ladder seemed to be complete, then came the public talk.

A similar illustration of this is to be found in the fall of the Czar. When that event transpired it was an occasion of great rejoicing in New York, and a Gentile of world-wide fame made a speech in which he lauded an American Jew of national reputation for having begun the downfall of the Czar by providing the money with which propaganda had been made among Russian prisoners in Japan during the Russo-Japanese war. The story came out only after the success of the plot. It is not at all out of keeping that the last men to see the last act of the plot carried out, the actual murder of Nicholas Romanovitch, his wife, his young daughters and his invalid boy, were “ five Soviet deputies, the latter five all Jews.” *What began with the assistance of an American [Jew] financier, finished with Soviet deputies.*

Did International Jews in 1903 foresee the war? This Rosenthal confession is but one bit of evidence that they did. And did they do nothing but foresee it? It were well if the facts stopped at foresight and did not run on to provocation.

For the present the reader is invited to retain in his mind two points in this Rosenthal article: “ Perhaps it will interest you to know that the right hand of Cavour, his friend and adviser, was his secretary, Hartum, a Jew.” This is the way the Jewish press speaks of its own. If this paper, or a Chicago paper, or a New York paper should go through the list of the secretaries of the men of power in the world today and make the note after the names—“ His secretary, a Jew,” the Anti-Defamation Society would send letters of protest. There is one rule for the Gentile and one for the Jew, in the Jewish mind. Writing in the public prints about Hartum, he would be described as an “ Italian.”

Were the Jewish secretaries who abounded before the war, during the war and throughout the Peace Conference of less brilliance than Hartum? Were there not Hartums in England, France, Germany, yes and in Russia too (in the United States there were many) who saw the “ program of the Ladder” ? Did Max Nordau who saw it so clearly in 1903 forget it in 1914 and 1918?

We know this: the Jews in their Congress at Basle in 1903 foresaw “ the future world war.” How did they know it was to be a “ *world war*” ?

We know this also: the Protocols, perhaps as early as 1896, certainly not later than 1905, foresaw the policy of “ no annexations.”

The World War came to pass.

“ No annexations” came to pass. What was then future in the Jewish world program, is now past.

In the Protocols there are two forms of declaration. One is, “ we have.” The other is, “ we shall.” If somewhere in the world this summer the high secret spokesman of the World Program is addressing his class of International Initiates, he will have to say “ we have” in many places where this spokesman of 1896 said “ we shall.” Things have been accomplished.

“ We will represent ourselves as the saviors of the laboring classes.” That has been and is being done. “ We will deflect the thoughts of the Gentiles to industry and commerce.” That has been done. “ We will create a strongly centralized administration so as to grasp all the social forces strongly in our hands.” That has been done. “ We will adopt for ourselves the liberal side of all parties and all movements and provide orators.” That has been done. “ We will force up wages.” That has been done. “ We will at the same time cause a rise in the price of prime necessities.” That has been done. “ We will also undermine the sources of production by instilling in the workmen ideas of anarchy.” That has been done.

“ To demonstrate our enslavement of the Gentile governments of Europe, we shall show our power to one by crimes of violence, that is, by a reign of terror. ” —Protocol 7.

Who that sees Russia and beholds the attitude of the premiers of England, France, and Italy toward the Soviets, the “ enslavement” of statesmanship by a condition that tangles more gnarledly the more it is dealt with—who that sees the prostration of Europe before a wound that is deliberately kept from healing, can forbear to say: That too has been done!

“ Our plans will not upset contemporary institutions immediately. Their management will only be altered and consequently the whole procedure of their activity will thus be directed according to plans laid down by us.” That has been done.

“ We shall saddle the press and keep a tight reign upon it.” That has been done. The rein is being strongly pulled in the United States at this moment, as many an editor can testify.

“ Even if there should be those who desire to write against us, no one will print their writings.” In large part, that has been done. It has been done completely with the profit-making press.

“ We shall, as an incentive to speculation, encourage among the Gentiles a strong demand for luxuries—all-enticing luxuries.” That has been done.

“ To each act of opposition we must be in a position to respond by bringing on war through the neighbors of any country that dares to oppose us, and if these neighbors should plan to stand collectively against us, we must let loose a world war.” (Protocol 7). The term “ world war” is the same as that used by Rosenthal and Nordau. “ Herzl knows,” said Nordau in 1903, “ that we stand before *a tremendous upheaval of the whole world.*”

“ We must create unrest, dissension and mutual animosities throughout Europe and, with the help of her relationships, on other continents.” This has been done. This passage continues: “ There is a double advantage in this. First, we shall command the respect of all countries by this method, for they will realize that we have the power to create disorder or establish order at will.” This too has been done.

Truly did the spokesman of 1896 speak of “ those momentous occurrences of the near future toward which we are rushing in a stream of great crises.”

Not only was “ no annexations” achieved “ as far as possible,” just as the Protocols outlined it, but a host of other plans have matured in achievement along with it. “ No annexations” as a matter of political morality is one thing; and “ no annexations” for the reason that “ this will shift war to an economic footing and nations will perceive the strength of our superiority in the aid we render” is quite another thing. The world was with the “ no annexations” program as a matter of political morality; the other program, which used this morality as its vehicle, was hidden.

There are still other matters in this group which must receive attention, but another article will be necessary to do it. In the meantime, it is natural to wonder whether, with the program as outlined in this report of the Protocols having received fulfillment in so many particulars, a new Protocol, or a further unfolding of the Ladder has been made by the Wise Men to their Initiates; and whether any additional unveiling will ever come to the knowledge of the world. It would seem that a proper estimate of the knowledge now available would lead to such an awakening as to nullify the present program and make all future ones impossible. But Gentiles like their ease, and Judah is beckoned on by a bright star.

[THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT, issue of 21 August 1920]

<http://usa-the-republic.com/international%20jew/Did%20the%20Jews%20Foresee%20the%20World%20War.htm>