

Who We Are #24 — The Middle Ages Through the 18th and 19th Century



DISSIDENT MILLENNIAL (EDITOR) • 31 DECEMBER, 2017

2



by Dr. William L. Pierce

*Middle Ages Were Era of Slow, Ordered Evolution
Eastern Europe Had Different Experience With Jews than West
Reformation Resulted in Increased Judaization of Western Europe
Inside the White Citadel, Jews Wreak Havoc on Society
Capitalists, Reds Collaborate Against West*

THIS INSTALLMENT continues the history of the interaction of the Jews with the European peoples, begun in the previous installment, and carries it from the Middle

Ages into the modern era.

The salient characteristic of the Middle Ages was order. The feudal society of the early Middle Ages (from ca. 700 until ca. 1200) was a highly structured society: not only did every man have his place and every place its man, but the relationship of each man to every other was strictly defined. From the lord of the manor down to the village idiot, every person was bound to others by mutual responsibilities and obligations.

Craft and Trade Guilds

In the later Middle Ages, when feudalism gave way to newer forms after the rise of town life and the emergence of centralized states, the order remained, and so did the responsibilities and obligations. The details changed, of course, but in the towns craft and trade guilds provided as comprehensive a framework, within which a man earned his livelihood and made his contribution to the economic and industrial life of the community, as the feudal framework which had served the same purpose earlier on the manor.

That is, in 13th century Europe a man did not ordinarily decide at the age of 20 or 25 that he would try his hand at sword making, say, or importing and selling spices, and then simply hang out a shingle with the announcement “Fine Swords” or “Fine Spices,” perhaps deciding after two or three years to switch over to horse breeding or musical instrument repairing. If a man of 25 were the proprietor of a sword-making establishment, it was because at the age of 12 or so he had been apprenticed to a master sword maker and, after years of learning the trade, had passed a rigorous test of his skills and been formally admitted to the armorer’s guild.

Aid and Discipline

Thereafter, if he needed an apprentice or an assistant in his own shop, or backing in a legal dispute, or advice in dealing with a foreign supplier of raw materials, he turned to his guild for help. His guild provided not only aid, but also discipline: it regulated the sword-making industry, setting prices and standards of quality, restricting competition by limiting the number of new members allowed into the guild each year, fining or expelling members for unethical business practices or shoddy workmanship.

What was true of sword making was also true of nearly every other profession in medieval Europe. People with similar interests united in order to promote those interests. But beyond that, everyone was united, more or less, in order to promote the common interest. The master craftsmen who governed the armorer’s guild, just as the leaders of the other sectors of the community, understood the simple truth that they could not promote their own interests, in the long run, unless they also promoted the interests of the whole community.

Corporate Society

This eternal truth, like the social ideal based on it, was not a discovery of the Middle Ages, of course. Its recognition is as old as human society — older, in fact — but in the Middle Ages actual practice came a bit closer to the ideal than in many other periods of history. The corporate society which flourished in Western Europe from the mid-12th century until its destruction by the rise of finance capitalism in the 18th century was able to approach the ideal primarily because it was a substantially homogeneous society, and its institutions had developed organically over a very long period of time.

Both in theory and in practice corporatism had its flaws, the principal one being that it gained stability at the expense of innovation: medieval society was extraordinarily conservative, and technical progress came at a somewhat slower pace than it might have in a less-regulated society. On the other hand, a reasonable degree of stability is always a prerequisite for continuing progress, and the medieval compromise may not have been so bad after all.

Freedom and Order

Insofar as personal freedom was concerned, the socially irresponsible “do your own thing” attitude definitely was not so common as it is today, but neither was there a lack of opportunities for the adventurous element among the population to give expression to its urges. It should be remembered that the most common theme of the folk tales which had their origin in the Middle Ages — exemplified in the Grimm brothers’ collection — was that of the young man setting out alone into the world to make his fortune. Certainly, there was more personal freedom, in practice, in the Middle Ages for the average craftsman than there was in the capitalist period of mass production which followed even if theory would have it the other way.

For our purpose here, the essential thing about medieval society was that it was an ordered, structured society, with a population base which was, in each particular region, homogeneous. Thus, it was a society imbued with certain natural defenses against penetration by alien elements. This is the reason the Middle Ages have been given such a bad press by Jewish authors and by those who take their cues from the Jews.

The Jew in medieval Europe had relatively little elbow room. He did not fit into the well established, well ordered scheme of things. He was an outsider looking into a self-sufficient world which had little use for his peculiar talents.

The Jew, accordingly, was obliged to confine his activity to those fields of endeavor not organically related to the life of the peoples on whom he wished to prey: he did those things which others were forbidden to do or did not wish to do or were unable to do. He existed on the fringes of European society, but he was not an integral part of it.

This was the situation for the better part of a millennium, and throughout that long period the foremost goal of the Jew was to destroy the order, to break down the

structure, to loosen the bonds which held European society together, and thereby to create an opening for himself.

Mosquitoes and Jews

The common mosquito is a parasite which sucks its sustenance from the bloodstream of its host — and yet, it can do so only after it has injected some of its own saliva into the host's blood. The reason is that the nutriment the mosquito seeks, the blood cells of the host, will not flow easily into the mosquito's proboscis: in order to suck them up it must first break down their structure, and this is accomplished by the injected saliva.

Likewise, the Jew, in order to prey on other peoples, must disrupt their societies, and he accomplishes this by the injection of his own special poison into their bloodstream.

Order is the Jew's mortal foe. One cannot understand the role of the Jew in modern European history unless one first understands this principle.

The Eternal Bolshevik

It explains why the Jew is the eternal Bolshevik: why he is a republican in a monarchist society, a capitalist in a corporate society, a communist in a capitalist society, a liberal "dissident" in a communist society — and, always and everywhere, a cosmopolitan and a race mixer in a homogeneous society.

And, in particular, it explains the burning hatred the Jews felt for European institutions during the Middle Ages. It explains why the modern Jewish spokesman, Abram Sachar, in his *A History of the Jews*, frankly admits that the universal attitude of the Jews toward medieval European society was, "Crush the infamous thing!"

Yet, even in the Middle Ages the Jews did not do badly for themselves, and they certainly had little cause for complaint, except when their excesses brought the wrath of their hosts down on their heads. As was pointed out in the previous installment, the Jews established an early stranglehold on the commerce of Europe, monopolizing especially foreign trade. Even after the establishment of the merchant guilds in the 12th century freed most local trade from the Jews' control, they remained well entrenched in the import-export business.

Gold and Flesh

Their real forte, however, was in two staples of commerce forbidden to most Gentiles in Christian Europe: gold and human flesh. Aristotle's denunciations of usury had influenced the leaders of the Church against moneylending, and the practice was consequently forbidden to Christians on religious grounds — although the ban was not always strictly observed. The field was left almost entirely to the

Jews, who, in contrast to the Christians, used their religion as an explicit justification for usury:

Unto a stranger (goy) thou mayest lend upon interest but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon interest, that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all that thy settest thine hand to in the land to which thou goest, to possess it. (Deuteronomy 23:20)

It is interesting to note the sharp distinction between what it is permissible to do to a Gentile (stranger, or *goy*) and to a fellow Jew. Moses, the purported author of this basis for all Jewish business ethics, was speaking from the experience the Jews had already gained in Egypt when he indicated that the ultimate goal of moneylending to the strangers in a land “to which thou goest” was to “possess” the land.

White Slavery

When it came to the slave trade, the words of Moses were not just permissive, but imperative:

Both thy male and female slaves, whom thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen [*goyim*] that are round about you; of them shall ye buy male and female slaves.... And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your slaves forever; but over your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigor. (Leviticus 25:44-46)

It is truly said by the Jews themselves that the Hebrew spirit breathes in every word of the Old Testament!

In Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean area the guild system did not reach the full development that it did in the West and the North of Europe, and Jews in Russia, Poland, Lithuania, and parts of Italy engaged in a few trades besides moneylending and slave dealing: the liquor business, in particular. Jews eventually owned most of the inns of Eastern Europe. They also monopolized the garment industry throughout large areas of the East and the South, and the Jewish tailor, the Jewish rag-picker, and the Jewish used clothes peddler are proverbial figures.

Yankel the Jew

None of these trades earned them the love or respect of the Gentiles among whom they lived, however, and usually there was good reason for the lack of affection. The 19th-century Russian writer Nikolai Gogol paints an interesting picture of the circumstances surrounding a Jewish innkeeper in the Ukraine:

He had been living there for some time, renting land, running an inn, and gradually making all the local gentry and aristocracy dependent upon him by draining them of practically all their funds, thus making his presence strongly felt in the area. Not a single house in good repair could be found within a three-mile radius of Yankel's house; everything was left to go to ruin and every penny was spent on drink, until all that was left was poverty and rags as though a fire or a plague had swept over the place. And had Yankel remained there another ten years, he certainly would have succeeded in spreading misery over the entire province. (*Taras Bulba*, chap. 10)

East and West

The relatively greater opportunities for exploitation of the Gentiles in the East, not to mention the strong presence of the Khazar-descended Jews there, led to a gradual concentration of Europe's Jews in Poland and Russia during the Middle Ages. By the latter part of the 18th century, half the world's Jews were living in Poland. Their power became so great that many medieval Polish coins, minted during periods when Jews were in charge not only of collecting the taxes, but also of administering the treasury itself, bore inscriptions in Hebrew. The Jews even acquired title to the land on which many Polish and Russian churches stood, and they then charged the Christian peasants admission to their own churches on Sunday mornings.

The essential difference between the Jewish experience in Western Europe and that in Eastern Europe during the Middle Ages is that in the West the earlier collapse of feudalism and the rise of the craft and trade guilds allowed the Europeans to win the contest with the Jews for economic dominance. In the East the Jews had already gained such a strong position by the time industry and town life began to compete effectively with agriculture and rural life that they were able to win the ensuing contest with their Gentile hosts.

Only Mercantile Class

In the West the Europeans froze the Jews out of the industrial and much of the commercial life of medieval society; in the East the Jews froze the Europeans out. In much of Eastern Europe, Jews became the only mercantile class in a world of peasants and laborers, and they used all their cunning and all the power of their wealth to keep their Gentile hosts down.

Reaction inevitably set in in the East, however, just as it had in the West. The 17th century was a period of great uprisings against the Jews, a period when such heroes as the great Cossack Hetman and Jew-killer, Bohdan Khmelnytsky, flourished.

In the 18th century the rulers themselves were finally obliged to take strong measures against the Jews of the East, so bad had the situation become. Russia's

Catherine the Great (1729-96), who had inherited most of Poland's Jews after the partition of the latter country, extended and enforced prohibitions against them which not only limited their economic activity but banned them altogether from large areas.

The Jew as Antigen

The following generalization is certainly imprecise, and many exceptions to it can be cited, but it may nonetheless be helpful to add a further conclusion to the aforementioned difference between the histories of Jew-Gentile relations in the East and in the West: in the West the Europeans won the upper hand early, and, suffering less from the Jews than did their kinsmen in the East, had less opportunity to develop in the Western European bloodstream the antibodies which are the natural reaction to the Jewish presence.

In the East the people freed themselves from Jewish domination much later, but by the time they finally did they had developed a much stronger natural immunity to the Jewish poison. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the Pole, the Russian, the Lithuanian, the Ukrainian — the Eastern European generally — takes in his hatred of the Jews with his mother's milk, if he is not born with it, and all the pro-Jewish preachments of his church and edicts of his government do little to lessen this natural and healthy antipathy.

It is this which goes a long way toward explaining how the Poles, saddled with a communist government consisting almost entirely of Jews after the Second World War, have been able in the last three decades to do what Adolf Hitler could not: namely, make Poland into a country which is virtually Jew-free today. Of more immediate relevance at this point in our story, it is the relatively weaker natural resistance to Jews in the West which suggests why it was relatively easy for the Jews there to take advantage of the breakdown of the medieval order and the dissolution of long-established social structures in order to make new openings for themselves.

The Reformation

Another factor which undoubtedly made the West more susceptible to the Jews was the Reformation, the lasting effects of which were confined largely to Europe's northwestern regions — in fact, to the Germanic-speaking regions: Germany, Scandinavia, England, Scotland and Switzerland. The Church of Rome and its Eastern Orthodox offshoot had always been ambivalent in their attitudes toward the Jews. On the one hand, they fully acknowledged the Jewish roots of Christianity, and Jesus' Jewishness was taken for granted. On the other hand, the Jews had rejected Jesus' doctrine and killed him, saying, "His blood be on us and on our children" (Matthew 27:25), and the medieval Church was inclined to take them at their word.

In addition to the stigma of deicide the Jews also bore the suspicion which naturally fell on heretics of any sort. During the Middle Ages people took Christianity quite

seriously, and anyone professing an unorthodox religious belief, whether he actively sought converts or not, was considered a danger to the good order of the community and to the immortal soul of any Christian exposed to him.

Clergy vs. Bible

Because of this ambivalence the Jews were sometimes favored by the Church and sometimes persecuted, depending to a large degree on the temper of the times and local circumstances. When the priests and bishops were in a relaxed and self-confident frame of mind, the Jews could generally count on support from the pulpit, but whenever the Church became wracked by one of its many paroxysms of militance or defensiveness, the Jews were well advised to maintain a low profile. The Reformation brought on the greatest paroxysm the Church had ever experienced, and in Catholic lands Jews fell as far from favor as they rose in Protestant areas.

What the Protestant reformers did for the Jews was give the Hebrew Scriptures a much more important role in the life of the peoples of Europe than they had enjoyed previously. Among Catholics it was not the Bible but the Church which was important. The clergy read the Bible; the people did not. The people looked to the clergy for spiritual guidance, not to the Bible.

Among Protestants that order was reversed. The Bible became an authority unto itself, which could be consulted by any man. Its Jewish characters — Abraham, Moses, Solomon, David, and the rest — became heroic figures, suffused with an aura of sanctity. Their doings and sayings became household bywords.

The Great Reformer

It is ironic that the father of the Reformation, Martin Luther, who inadvertently helped the Jews fasten their grip on the West, detested them and vigorously warned his Christian followers against them. His book *Von den Jueden und ihren Luegen* (On the Jews and their Lies), published in 1543, is a masterpiece.

Luther's antipathy to the Jews came after he learned Hebrew and began reading the Talmud. He was shocked and horrified to find that the Hebrew religious writings were dripping with hatred and contempt for all non-Jews. Luther wrote:

Do not their Talmud and rabbis say that it is no sin to kill if a Jew kills a heathen, but it is a sin if he kills a brother in Israel? It is no sin if he does not keep his oath to a heathen. Therefore, to steal and rob, as they do with their usury, from a heathen is a divine service. For they hold that they cannot be too hard on us nor sin against us, because they are the noble blood and circumcised saints. We, however, are cursed *goyim*. And they are the masters of the world and we are their servants, yea, their cattle....

I hear it said that the Jews give large sums of money and thereby are helpful to the government. Yes, from what do they give it? Not of their own, but from the property of the

rulers and subjects, whom they deprive of their possessions through usury. And thus the rulers take from the subjects what the Jews have taken ... so they can remain in the land freely to lie, slander, curse, and steal. Should not the Jews have a good laugh over the way we permit ourselves to be fooled and led around by the nose to give our money in order that they may stay in the land to practice all manner of wickedness?

The Tragedy of Luther

Alas, Luther could not have it both ways. He had already sanctified the Jews by elevating the status of their history, their legends, and their religion to that of Holy Writ. His translation of the Old Testament into German and his dissemination of the Jewish scriptures among his followers vitiated all his later warnings against the Jews. Today the church he founded studiously ignores those warnings.

Luther had recognized the evils in the Christian Church of his day and in the men who ruled the Church. He also recognized the evil in the Jews and the danger they posed to Europe. He had the courage to denounce both the Church and the Jews, and for that the White race will be indebted to him for as long as it endures.

The great tragedy of Luther is that he failed to go one step further and to recognize that no religion of Jewish origin is a proper religion for men and women of the European race. When he cut himself and the majority of the Germanic peoples off from Rome, he failed at the same time to cut away all the baggage of Jewish mythology which had been imposed on Europe by Rome. Instead he made of that baggage a greater spiritual burden for his people than it already was.

Elevation of the Old Testament

The consequence was that within a century of Luther's death much of Northern Europe was firmly in the grip of a new superstition as malignant as the old one, and it was one in which the Jews played a much more explicit role. Before, the emphasis had been on the New Testament: that is, on Christianity as a breakaway sect from Judaism, in which the differences between the two religions were stressed. The role models held up to the peoples of Europe were the Church's saints and martyrs, most of whom were non-Jewish. The parables taught to children were often of European origin.

Among the Protestants the Old Testament gained a new importance, and with it so did the Hebrew patriarchs as role models, while Israel's folklore became the new source of moral inspiration for Europe. Perhaps nothing so clearly demonstrates the change, and the damage to the European sense of identity which accompanied it, as the sudden enthusiasm for bestowing Hebrew names on Christian children.

Puritan Madness

Even before the Reformation a few Jewish names had been adopted by Europeans, but they were in most cases variations of the names of Christian saints of the Jewish race: John (Hebrew Johanan), Matthew (Hebrew Mattathiah), Mary (Hebrew Miriam), Ann (Hebrew Hannah, supposedly the name of the maternal grandmother of Jesus). In addition, a few other purely Hebrew names had come into fairly common usage in parts of Christian Europe prior to Luther's time: Adam, Daniel, David, Michael, Elizabeth, and Sarah are examples.

During the 17th century, however, practically every name from the Old Testament came into general use. The madness reached its height among the Puritans, who scorned the names of their own ancestors and christened their offspring with such atrociously alien appellations as Israel, Amos, Ezekiel, Lemuel, Deborah, Reuben, Esther, Abner, Samuel, Nathan, Noah, Ephraim, Gideon, Jesse, Rachel, Susannah, Leah, Elihu, Abigail, Benjamin, and Abraham. The Puritans brought this pernicious habit with them to America, and Hebrew names were more common in the New World than European names during the Colonial period.

Parental Ignorance

Fortunately, most of these names have fallen out of favor in the present era, but some of them persist, largely through the ignorance of parents who do not realize they are giving their child a Jewish name when they choose David, Joseph, Susan, or Ruth. Indeed, a few Jewish names are so common today that almost no one thinks of them as Jewish. What name could be more "Irish" than Mike, or more "English" than Johnny?

Ironically, a number of perfectly good European names are avoided today, because they are thought of as "Jewish-sounding" — the consequence of their popularity among Jewish name-changers. Such are Seymour, Sidney, Sheldon, Stanley, Melvin, and Murray, for example.

Since ignorance of this topic is so abysmal among the White population today, and since we are concerned with identity above all else in this series, a brief diversion on names seems in order here. The European ancestors of today's White Americans spoke a variety of languages, each of which provides a rich source of names bearing a purely European identity, with no Semitic taint.

Germanic Names

In terms of the number of descendants of these ancestors in the United States today, the Germanic languages should be by far the most important of these sources. Names of Germanic origin are fairly easy to spot; most of them are compounds of common Germanic words designating things (animals, weapons) or attributes (wisdom, brightness, a color, nobility, courage). Thus: Albert (*noble-bright*), Arnold (*eagle-power*), Baldwin (*bold-friend*), Bernard (*bear-hard*), etc.

In addition to these numerous compound names, there are several very common one-syllable Germanic names. Examples are Carl (Karl, Charles) and Earl.

Generally, names ending in *-ald* or *-old* (“*power*” or “*authority*”), such as Gerald, Harold; *-ard* (“*hard*”), such as Al(l)ard, Richard; *-bert* (“*bright*”), such as Herbert, Robert; *-gar* or *-ger* (“*spear*”), such as Edgar, Roger; *-mond* or *-mund* (“*protection*”), such as Edmund, Raymond; *-olf*, *-alph*, or *-ulf* (“*wolf*”), such as Adolf, Ralph; *-rad* or *-red* (“*counsel*”), such as Alfred, Conrad; *-ric* (“*ruler*”), such as Eric, Frederic(k); or *-win* (“*friend*”), such as Edwin, Godwin are Germanic.

Many Germanic feminine names are derived directly from corresponding masculine forms: Alberta, Caroline, Charlotte. But there are also many purely feminine forms: Adelaide (and the related form Alice), Astrid, Audrey (from Etheldreda), Belinda, Bertha, Clotilde, Edith, Matilda, etc.

Celtic Names

The Celtic languages provide fewer names, but some of those are fairly popular today. Examples are Alan (Allan, Allen), Barry, Brian (Bryan), Bridget, Conan, Donald, Douglas, Duncan, Gladys, Gwendolyn, Joyce, Kenneth, Malcolm, Muriel, Lloyd, Neil, Owen, and Una.

Easily as common as the Celtic names today are those which come directly from Greek and Latin — not because many of our ancestors were Greeks or Romans, but because those two languages were widely used for literary purposes in Europe until a few centuries ago. Many feminine names, in particular, are in this group.

Classical Names

A few such names stemming from either Greek (G.) or Latin (L.), are: Agatha (G.), Agnes (G.), Alexander and Alexandra (G.), Andrew and Andrea (G.), Anthony and Antonia (L.), August and Augustine (L.), Barbara (G.), Beatrice (L.), Bernice (G.), Cecil and Cecelia (L.), Clara (L.), Claude and Claudia (L.), Constance (L.), Cornelius and Cornelia (L.), Den(n)is and Denise (G.), Diana (L.), Eugene and Eugenia (G.), Florence (L.), George and Georgia (G.), Grace (L.), Gregory (G.), Helen — also Elaine, Eleanor, Ellen, Nell (G.), Irene (G.), Julius and Julia (L.), Katherine — also Catherine, Cathy, Kate, Kitty (G.), Laurence and Laura (L.), Margaret — also Marguerite, Margot, Gretchen, Greta, Madge, Meg, Marjorie, Rita (G.), Martin, Nicholas (G.), Patrick and Patricia (L.), Phil(l)ip (G.), Phyllis (G.), Priscilla (L.), Rhoda (G.), Sophia (G.), Stella (L.), Sylvia (L.), Theodore and Dorothy (G.), Timothy (G.), Ursula (L.), Valerie (L.), Victor and Victoria (L.), Vincent (L.), and Virginia (L.).

It goes without saying, of course, that no one is to blame for the name his parents bestowed on him, for whatever reason. But no well-informed, racially conscious White parents today have any excuse for naming a child of theirs Matthew or Michael, Rachel or Ruth.

If one of the more common Germanic, Celtic, or Classical names will not do, it is far better to dip back into the richness of the European past for a less common name, like Alaric or Adalbert, Gerda or Gunilda, than to stick the poor tot with a Hebrew label for life.

And there is no reason why parents of Polish, Ukrainian, or Russian ancestry in this country should not name a child Casimir or Igor, Ludmila or Vera. But, please, not Ivan or Masha, which are merely Slavicized variants of Hebrew names!

There are a number of currently available books on the origins and meanings of given names. An inexpensive one which, although far from exhaustive, is authoritative and especially thorough in giving the original source and meaning of each of the 1,200-1,500 names it treats, is *The Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names* by E.G. Withycombe.

Welcome Chaos

The Reformation did more for the Jews than merely sanctifying the Old Testament. It shattered the established order of things and brought chaos in political as well as spiritual affairs — chaos eagerly welcomed by the Jews. Germany was so devastated by a series of bloody religious wars that it took her a century and a half to recover. In some German principalities two-thirds of the population was annihilated during the conflicts between Catholics and Protestants in the period 1618-1648, commonly known as the “Thirty Years War.”

Everywhere during the 17th century the Jews took advantage of the turmoil, moving back into countries from which they had been banned (such as England), moving to take over professions from which they had been excluded, insinuating themselves into confidential relationships with influential leaders in literary and political circles, profiting from the sufferings of their hosts and strengthening their hold, burrowing deep into the rubble and wreckage of medieval society so that they could more easily undermine whatever rose in its stead.

French Revolution

In the following century came Europe’s next great cataclysm, which broke down what was left of the old order. It was the French Revolution — and it was the first major political event in Western Europe in which Jews played a significant role, other than as financiers. Even so, public feeling against the Jews was such that they still found it expedient to exercise much of their influence through Gentile front men.

Honoré Gabriel Riqueti, Comte de Mirabeau (1749-91), the Revolution’s fieriest orator — the spendthrift, renegade son of an aristocrat, disowned by his father and always in need of a loan — was one of these. Another was the bloodthirsty monster Maximilien Marie Isidore de Robespierre (1758-94), dictator of the Revolutionary Tribunal which kept the guillotine busy and spilled France’s best blood into the

gutters of Paris while the rabble cheered. Both Mirabeau and Robespierre worked tirelessly for their Jewish patrons, supporting legislation granting new rights and privileges to the Jews of France and denouncing French patriots who opposed the Jewish advances.

Napoleon and the Jews

It was in the new series of European wars spawned by the Revolution, in which Napoleon Bonaparte (1769-1821) was the leading figure, that the Jews extended the gains they had made in France to much of the rest of Europe. Behind Napoleon's armies, which were kept solvent by Jewish moneylenders, marched a ragtag band of Jews to oversee the pulling down of all barriers against their brethren in each country in which French arms triumphed. Ghettos were abolished, all restrictions on Jewish activities were declared void, and anyone who spoke out against the Jews was in danger of being put before a military firing squad.

Despite the enormous services he performed for the Jews, it is clear from his comments, on many different occasions, that Napoleon personally despised them. "The Jews are a vile people, cowardly and cruel," he said in reference to some of the atrocities committed by Jews during the Reign of Terror. They are "the most despicable race in the world."

In a letter of March 6, 1808, to his brother Jerome, Napoleon wrote:

I decided to improve the Jews. But I do not want more of them in my kingdom. Indeed, I have done all to prove my scorn of the vilest nation in the world.

And when, in 1807, Napoleon issued decrees limiting the extent to which Jewish moneylenders could prey on the French peasantry, the Jews screamed in rage against him.

Finance Capitalism

But the damage had already been done; Napoleon had pulled down the last of the barriers, and by the time of his disgrace and exile the Jews were solidly entrenched nearly everywhere.

It was not merely politics which had changed by the 19th century, making European society more vulnerable to the Jews. Society itself had undergone a fundamental transformation with the rise of finance capitalism and the factory system. The old, organic lifestyles were gone, along with the corporate social structure the Jews had found so hateful because it was so impenetrable. In Europe spiritual man was fighting a losing battle against economic man in the struggle to determine the

course of future developments, and the Jews had allied themselves firmly with the latter.

With the transformation of individual craftsmen, tradesmen, and small landowners into interchangeable units of labor, the Jews could slip in anywhere, and they did. Not content with having all avenues open to them, they continued their efforts to break down order and structure of every sort — only now they were working on the inside instead of the outside and were a thousand times deadlier.

The continued social and political upheavals of the 19th century were proof enough of this. Liberalism was the ostensible driving force behind the agitation and disturbances of the period 1815-1848, but actually there were a number of forces at work, and both Gentiles and Jews were responsible.

In the year of culmination — 1848 — the Jews unveiled a new weapon in their age-old war against European man, and this time it was an entirely Jewish weapon: Karl Marx (1818-83), the descendant of a long line of rabbis and Talmudic scholars, published his *Communist Manifesto*. [Ed. note — The *Manifesto* was co-authored by the Gentile Friedrich Engels.]

Three-Front War

The revolution of 1848 did not succeed; another seven decades of undermining and a World War would be required before Jewish Marxism could gain its first bloody triumph over the hated *goyim*. But from the middle of the 19th century the Jews waged their war against Gentile society on three fronts simultaneously.

On the capitalist front the Rothschild family set the pace. The descendants of a Frankfurt rabbi, Meyer Amschel (1743-1812), who switched from Torah-thumping to loan-sharking in the last part of the 18th century and waxed enormously rich as a result, they began by lending money at interest on commercial ventures, graduated to financing European wars, and ended up as bankers to entire nations.

They bought their way into the degraded English and Austrian nobilities, and they had their hands in virtually every industry, business, and government ministry in Europe by 1850. And behind the Rothschilds scrambled a hungry horde of other Jewish money men. With the medieval structure which had been an insurmountable barrier to them only a faint memory in the minds of the Gentiles, the Jews spread their grasp everywhere in the world of ownership and management.

Social Democracy

On the communist front Marx's most illustrious disciple was Ferdinand Lassalle (1825-1864), the son of a wealthy Jewish merchant in Breslau. A gifted and tireless agitator for the communist cause, Lassalle founded the Social Democratic Party of Germany in 1863, from which the other social democratic parties of Europe sprang.

His career was cut short, however, when he brashly proposed marriage to the daughter of an aristocratic German family, and the girl's outraged lover put a bullet into the presumptuous Jew's head.

Gentiles were involved in the communist movement, just as they were involved in Rothschild-style capitalism, but Jews thoroughly dominated it. Although the leader of the Bolshevik faction which launched the revolution of 1917 in Russia, Lenin, was only one-quarter Jewish, easily three-quarters of the other leading communists prior to the Second World War were Jews.

It has been on the third front, however, that the Jews have done the greatest damage. In a sense both the Jewish capitalists and the Jewish communists, the Rothschilds and the Marx's, despite their enormous power over the Gentile world, always remained outsiders. It was those Jews who pushed their way into the professions — into teaching Gentile university students, into writing books for Gentile readers, into composing music for Gentile audiences, into painting pictures and directing films for Gentile viewers, into interpreting and passing judgment on every facet of Gentile culture and society for Gentile newspaper readers — who really got inside the Gentile citadel.